5-2021

A Quantitative Study of Gender-Stereotypical Perception of Women's Leadership Styles Among Employees in Non-Governmental Organizations in Kabul, Afghanistan

Sakina Hassani
ni9883zj@go.minnstate.edu

A Quantitative Study of Gender-Stereotypical Perception of Women's Leadership Styles

Among Employees in Non-Governmental Organizations in Kabul, Afghanistan

By

Sakina Hassani

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Science

In Industrial/Organizational Psychology

May, 2021

Thesis Committee:
Daren Protolipac, Chairperson
Marcy Young Illies
James Tan

Abstract

This research aimed to investigate the relationship between various leadership styles; transformational, transactional, Laissez Faire, task-oriented, and/or relationship-oriented styles, and stereotypical perception of women's leadership, by surveying male and female employees in non-governmental organizations in Kabul, Afghanistan. Differences in leadership scores based on participants' gender and stereotypical beliefs helped identify how gender-based stereotypes can affect Afghan employees' perception of women's leadership styles. This study found that there is no statistically significant difference between men and women in their transformational leadership dimensions. However, women had higher mean scores on both relationship orientation and task orientation, opposite to the hypothesis that men would be higher on task-oriented leadership behavior than women. Furthermore, it was found that gender cannot predict employees' gender-role attributes, while gender-role role attributes can predict employees' leadership styles. Employees higher on agentic attribute were higher on transformational and transactional leadership than employees with higher communal attribute. Employees with higher communal attributes were higher on task and relational leadership than those higher on agentic attributes. Finally, this study found that regardless of gender, employees with agentic attributes rate a female leader as more transactional and task-oriented, while employees' communal attributes cannot predict a female leader's leadership styles.

Acknowledgment

First and foremost, I am extremely grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Protolipac, for his invaluable advice, continuous support, and patience during my graduate study. I would also like to thank my esteemed professors Dr. Young Illies and Dr. Illies, for their continuous support. My professors' immense knowledge and plentiful experience have encouraged me in all the time of my academic journey and daily life. I would also like to thank Dr. Tan for their technical support on my study. I am thankful to all my classmates in the I/O Psychology program, who were always there to help me, and have made my study and life in the U.S. a wonderful time. I would like to express my gratitude to Fulbright and P.E.O. International Peace Scholarship that provided me with this invaluable opportunity.

My gratitude extends to my parents, family, and friends who supported me despite all the challenges in Afghanistan and in the U.S. and helped me to achieve my goals. Without their tremendous understanding and encouragement in the past few years, it would be impossible for me to complete this academic journey. Finally, I would like to specifically thank my friend and mentor, Sarah Thurley, whose support, encouragement, and advice helped me become who I am now.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction and Review of Literature

Scholars have researched leadership in organizations for decades (Northouse, 2018). Among different leadership theories, transformational leadership has been perceived as the most favorable style for improving employees' inspiration and engagement and encouraging them to go beyond their personal goals for the sake of the group's goals and values. Transformational leadership has been studied since the early 1980s within different cultures (Northouse, 2018). Asian leadership literature shows transformational leadership as the most researched style that emphasizes how members' motivation towards common goals and values impacts all aspects of organizational outcomes (Effelsberg et al., 2014; & Koo & Park, 2018). This is congruent with a significant characteristic of Asian culture; collectivism, which also explains the preference of group goals over individual goals (Koo & Park, 2018). Leaders influence followers to achieve the shared tasks while supporting them and showing them confidence and trust in a friendly manner (Fayyaz et al., 2014).

Afghanistan, in addition to being a patriarchal and developing country, manifests a collectivist culture and may benefit from transformational leadership styles as well as task and relationship-oriented styles in organizations in order to restore stability after many years of war (Mujtaba & Sadat, 2010; Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010; Nijat & Muratzashvili, 2015). The paternalistic aspect of Afghan culture manifests the emphasis on building and maintaining relationships and respect. The paternalistic and collectivistic culture and a need for development after years of war create a strong need for the right type of leadership (Mujtaba & Sadat, 2010). Afghans need leaders who emphasize doing the right task at the right time as well as caring about the relationships within the organizations and with society (Mujtaba & Sadat, 2010)

Women in patriarchal, developing societies face many challenges and need to combat negative attitudes in order to build and improve their careers so that they can occupy elite positions (Mutabai et al., 2016). Although the Bonn Conference in 2001 guaranteed a new era for women's political participation in Afghanistan, women in Afghanistan are still underrepresented in leadership positions. Women's role in the Afghan government is mostly symbolic, and women are not actively enrolled in decision-making (Larson, 2016). In the Afghan government, the rules were still administered by men even after the Taliban government (Manganaro & Alozie, 2011).

Women do not accept their underrepresentation in leadership positions (Manganaro & Alozie, 2011), and throughout history, Afghan women have not been afraid to lead despite potential negative consequences. As Dr. Sima Samar, the Former Chair of the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission, stated, "I have always been in danger, but I do not mind… I believe we will die one day, so I said let's take the risk and help somebody else" (Thompson, 2015, p. 17). The international community has been playing a cooperative role in engaging women in power. They have the opportunity to advocate for the inclusion of women in Afghan leadership and to employ women in strong, significant positions within their organizations (Amiri et al., 2004; Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015).

Throughout history, women have been fighting for their rights and for leadership opportunities. Leadership has often been seen as a masculine trait in male-dominated organizations. Gender-stereotypical perception of leadership has acted as a major obstacle in women's leadership journey and has often disqualified them from leadership positions worldwide, including Afghanistan (Eagly & Heilman, 2016; Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015; Echavez et al., 2016). However, early 21st century research conducted by Duehr and Bono

(2006) revealed that gender stereotypes have been changing in the last 15 to 30 years. Women are more often accepted for leadership positions by male managers, and women are more associated with successful leadership (Duehr & Bono, 2006).

Transformational leadership has often been perceived as a feminine leadership style (Duehr & Bono, 2006), and women tend to view female managers as being more successful transformational leaders. Women are perceived to be more relationship-oriented regarding their leadership behavior, while men are perceived as more task-oriented (Stelter, 2002). However, women's leadership styles often continue to be based on the stereotypical perception of each gender, including the way women describe themselves (Eagly and Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011a; & Saint-Michel, 2018). Although gender stereotyping has decreased, people may unconsciously hold prejudice and gender-based tendencies (Duehr & Bono, 2006), and this is why there continues to be a need to investigate gender stereotypes in order to understand how they affect women's leadership (Eagly & Heilman, 2016).

Statement of the Problem

Experiencing decades of war in Afghanistan, women have faced many problems in their lives. They have experienced many barriers in their career path, starting from finding a job to fighting for leadership and elite positions. Stereotypical beliefs based on gender differences are known as barriers that need to be identified, analyzed, and resolved to provide competency-based leadership opportunities for women.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was first to identify whether stereotypes related to women's leadership style exist among male and female employees in non-governmental organizations. The second purpose of the research study was to find how these gender stereotypes can affect participants' perception of themselves and women's leadership styles.

Research Questions

1. Do men and women in Afghanistan non-governmental organizations rate their own leadership styles differently, such that men rate themselves more transactional and task-oriented and women rate themselves more transformational and relationship-oriented?

2. Are there differences in how men and women rate their own gender-role identity in an Afghanistan non-governmental organization population?

3. Do employees' gender-based stereotypical beliefs impact their perception toward a female leader's transformational leadership qualities?

4. Do employees' gender-based stereotypical beliefs impact their perception toward female leader's leadership styles?

Leadership Definition

After many years of research and scientific improvements, there is no common definition of leadership, and it can be conceptualized differently across cultures (Northouse, 2018). There have been many ways to define leadership in the 19th and 20th centuries. Scholars used different terms to define or conceptualize leadership. Leadership covered the terms such as "control and centralization of power with a theme of domination," which was emphasized in the first three decades of the 20th century, or the term "process" being used in the 21st century to define different types of leadership (Northouse, 2018, p. 2). Leadership as a process conceptualizes the impact an individual has on a group of people toward achieving a common goal. The aforementioned four-component definition (process, group, influence, and shared goal) covers the three themes in leadership definition in the 1950s, including group theory, relationship for a shared goal, and effectiveness as a result of influence (Northouse, 2018).

Scholars suggested different perspectives such as the focus of group processes, personality trait perspective, behavioral perspective, power relationship, or transformational process to conceptualize leadership. Eagly and Carli (2007) define leadership as being in charge or as a person's authority over a group of people. The definition of leadership they present includes both formal managerial positions and informal becoming a leader in organizations by motivating and influencing the members toward the group, nation, or organization's goals. However, Nijat and Murtazashvili (2015) claimed that leadership does not specifically demand authority. They define leadership as leading people despite having a position of authority over their followers or not. Individuals in a position of authority might not necessarily be leaders; however, authority can be used as a leadership tool (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015).

This study focused on male and female employee's perceptions of leadership qualities of themselves and a female leader in Afghanistan non-governmental organizations. It investigated transformational leadership qualities and task versus relationship-oriented leadership behaviors among non-governmental employees in Afghanistan.

Transformational Leadership

Among different leadership theories, transformational leadership conceptualizes leadership as a process followers follow toward the team's goal, appearing above people's expectations. As a transformational process, leadership happens when the followers and the leader help each other grow and increase the group's morality and motivation (Paludi & Coates, 2011a; Northouse, 2018). Thirty-four percent of the research is focused on transformational and charismatic leadership (Northouse, 2018).

Bass and Riggio (2006) claimed that as transformational leadership focuses on the followers' inspiration and motivation, it is most favorable by the current competitive working groups (Northouse, 2018; Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010). Furthermore, a transformational leader is a source of inspiration for the followers to go beyond their expectations (Saint-Michel, 2018). This is the base for transformational leadership by the political sociologist James MacGregor Burns who believed that leadership is to motivate followers for the leader and followers' common goal, and it is different from having power as a leader (Northouse, 2018; Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010).

Transformational vs. Transactional Leadership

According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership is different from transactional leadership, a process of exchange between the leader and followers. He illustrated that a

politician who claimed "no new taxes" is an example of a transactional leader who promises to exchange the benefits of being elected by not adding new taxes (Northouse, 2018). Transformational leadership inspires followers to show creativity, trust the leadership, and engage in a group vision while appreciating followers' achievements (Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010). A transformational leader inspires the followers to become the best that they can be while considering their needs to be met. Transformational leadership is for both leader and followers' psychological benefits as it also improves the leader's self-esteem and positive affect (Zeinabadi, 2013). Transformational leadership has been perceived as a highly effective leadership style, while transactional leadership's effectiveness is related to the "contingent reward" component.

Transactional leadership is effective when employees receive a contingent reward for their good performance, and consequently, it is related to the employees' satisfaction with their supervisors (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Employees perceive transformational as an effective leadership style compared to transactional leadership, as transformational is more future-oriented while transactional leadership is more involved with rewarding employees, correcting their mistakes, and overall, focusing on followers' responsibilities (Samantha & Lamprakis, 2018; Eagly & Carli, 2003).

A Model of Transformational Leadership

Bass (1985) believed that transformational and transactional leadership are not the opposite of each other, but they are a single continuum that can be manifested together in a good leader's behavior (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In Bass' expanded transformational leadership model, there are seven components, four of which describe transformational leadership, two of

them present transactional leadership, and one element describes Laissez-Faire or non-leadership component. Bass' model of transformational leadership considers followers more than the leader (Northouse, 2018; Zeinabadi, 2013). This followers' attentive model of leadership helps followers to become more conscious about the ideal and specific goals, go beyond their profit for the common profit, and to motivate followers to meet the more significant needs of the group as a future-oriented leadership style (Paludi & Coates, 2011b; Eagli & Carli, 2003).

The four dimensions of transformational leadership in Bass' model include Idealized influence or charisma, Inspirational motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized consideration (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Contingent rewards or Constructive transactions and Management by exception or corrective transactions are transactional leadership components in Bass's leadership model. Finally, Laissez-Faire or non-transactional is the non-leadership factor of the transformational leadership model (Northouse, 2018; Zeinabadi, 2013).

Transformational Leadership Factors

Idealized Influence. The idealized influence, also called charisma, describes leaders who have a high level of moral and ethical behaviors and are admirable for the followers (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Based on this factor, a transformational leader receives deep respect and trust from the followers as they support their followers by providing vision and mission by being a team member. This factor is the model's emotional factor, which determines transformational leaders as a unique person whose influence is measured on two components: attributional and behavioral components. These two components describe how followers perceive their leader attributes and observe their leader's behavior (Northouse, 2018; Zeinabadi, 2013).

Inspirational Motivation. The second factor describes the leaders who motivate members through inspirational communication. Transformational leaders have their own inspirational words and expressions with their followers, which keeps them trying beyond their interests and stay tied to the group's vision and goal (Northouse, 2018; Zeinabadi, 2013). They expect high standards to challenge their followers while showing optimism for reaching the meaningful goals (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Intellectual Stimulation. Leaders with intellectual stimulation approach motivate their followers to show creativity and innovation in problem-solving. They encourage members to challenge their own and their leader's and organization's ideas, notions, and values. They are supportive and open to new ideas and approaches that help the team achieve their shared mission (Northouse, 2018; Zeinabadi, 2013).

Individualized Consideration. The fourth factor of transformational leadership describes the leaders who listen to their followers' needs and care about them. This kind of leaders plays the role of a coach and provides the followers with their advice. They are the leaders while being an assistant and a mentor to their followers to help them achieve beyond their expectations (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; & Zeinabadi, 2013).

All four factors describe a leadership process in which there is a learning, growing, and improving climate. Followers of a transformational leader receive the support for a high-quality task implemented in a trustworthy and respectful environment (Northouse, 2018; Eagly & Carli 2003).

Transactional Leadership Factors

Contingent Reward. The first transactional leadership factor, which is also called constructive transaction, describes an exchange process between the leader and followers. The contingent reward factor represents an environment where the leader expects members to put an effort to achieve a goal or accomplish a task for which they will receive a reward (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Eagly & Carli, 2003). Notgrass (2014) found that this factor is effective when members realize a high-quality relationship between the leader and the members (as cited in Northouse, 2018).

Management by Exception. The second factor of transactional leadership can be represented in two forms: passive and active. The active form of management by exception includes leaders who use corrective criticism right after a follower makes a mistake or violates the rules (Northouse, 2018; Eagly & Carli, 2003). The passive form is used by the leader who does not watch followers closely and does not talk to them about their problems or weaknesses. The leader waits for feedback or actions to take until the problems have arisen (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Unlike contingent reward, management by exception utilizes the negative amplification (Northouse, 2018).

Non-leadership Factors

The seventh factor of the transactional-transformational continuum, laissez-faire leadership, describes the absence of leadership (Martin, 2015). This factor indicates that the leader is not always available to support followers with meeting their needs, making decisions, taking responsibility, and exchange with them (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Eagly & Carli, 2003). This factor has been counted as a negative factor, while it is also seen as a strategy implemented

intentionally by the leader. A leader who uses this factor as a part of their transformational leadership process lets their followers work independently, have the autonomy to make decisions, and determine themselves among others in the group (Northouse, 2018). Northouse (2018) claimed that although it has not been proven that using laissez-faire factor with transformational leadership factors is more effective, it could potentially be a good approach to combine different types of leadership to lead followers more productively. Transformational leadership studies have found that transformational and transactional factors are positively correlated with each other while negatively correlated with Laissez-faire leadership (Antonakis, 2001; Day & Antonakis, 2011; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Tejeda et al., 2001 as cited in Samantha & Lamprakis, 2018).

Organizations with a transformational leadership approach have a specific vision respected and accepted by employees within a supportive, creative, and empowering culture. The organization's vision helps the employees follow a common interest based on individuals' ideas and interests where they can experience a feeling of belonging and self-efficacy and cooperate despite the opposite opinions (Northouse, 2018).

Task-oriented and Relationship-oriented Leadership

Leadership behavior is another leadership theory which was investigated in this study. According to the Ohio State study's categorization, leaders adopt two types of leadership behaviors: Consideration and initiating structure (Stelter, 2002; Taberno et al., 2009). This was later supported by the Michigan studies, namely task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership styles instead of initiating structure and consideration, respectively (Fayyaz et al.,

2014). Task-oriented leaders emphasize the role of their followers, goals achievement, task accomplishment, as well as a straightforward way of communication in the group (Stelter, 2002; Taberno et al., 2009). Relationship-oriented or relational leaders prioritize caring and respect for their followers and provide a supportive and appreciative environment (Henkel et al., 2019). Both leadership styles are effective and essential as task-oriented style increases leader's performance, and relational style impacts followers' satisfaction (Taberno et al., 2009). A task-oriented leader manages, makes plans, and coordinates activities for their followers and provides technical and professional support (Shanmugam et al., 2007). A relational leader expresses their trust, care, confidence, and friendliness to their followers and gives them this idea that the leader cares about their problems through coaching and mentoring (Fayyaz et al., 2014; Henkel et al., 2019).

A task-oriented communication style is a top-down style where the leader tells the followers what, when, how, and where to do the tasks in order to increase task accomplishments (Huang & Mujtaba, 2009). Task-oriented behavior increases subordinates' achievement because they monitor their performance, give them clear goals and objectives, choose efficient employees, and take part in employees' technical jobs (Manyak & Mujtaba, 2013). Performance satisfaction, group effectiveness, positivism, and productivity are higher among groups with task-oriented leaders (Manyak & Mujtaba, 2013; Taberno et al., 2009). Task-oriented leaders are less employee-oriented and focus more on the organization's target and on reaching goals on time (Ruzgar, 2018; Shanmugam et al., 2007). They are good at delegating responsibilities and ensuring that their duties are fulfilled in a productive manner (Ruzgar, 2018).

Relational leaders focus more on achieving goals through building trustworthy relationships, commitment, and cooperation in a supportive and inspiring environment (Manyak & Mujtaba, 2013; Mikkelson et al., 2019). Relational leaders pay specific attention to their employees' emotional support and personal needs (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). Relational leaders spend time meeting with their employees on their personal needs and problems and care about their welfare. They try to create a non-competitive work environment where they can interact friendly and learn more about their employees' strengths and weaknesses (Ruzgar, 2018).

However, task and relationship-oriented leadership are two different styles; it does not mean that a leader will show only one of these two or be at two extremes of a line. An effective leader can adopt task and relational leadership based on the needs and perform better (Mikkelson et al., 2019). For example, a task-oriented style can be more beneficial for the first-line employees who need more direction and technical support from their supervisors. When the employees are familiar with the job, they require less task-oriented leadership and more relational leadership (Taberno et al., 2009).

Leadership in Asian Countries

The impact of gender on leadership styles may be different in different cultures and sub-cultures. The number of studies investigating the effects of gender on leadership styles in different cultures and sub-cultures is infrequent (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Research has been conducted on leadership styles in different countries, but there is still a considerable gap in cross-cultural research to find the non-Western countries' leadership styles (Park et al., 2019).

Asian Cultures emphasize humility, collectivism, high power distance, modesty, and consensus (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Park et al., 2019). An Asian-American man says, "The Asian personality tends to be low-key, quiet. We will talk when there is a requirement to talk. White males will pound the table." (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p.131). collectivism and power distance affect people to accept the importance of leaders and value the leader-member relationship as modesty and respect for elders and superiors (Park et al., 2019).

Park et al. (2019) reviewed studies in four Confucian countries, including China, South Korea, Singapore, and Japan, to investigate four leadership styles, charismatic, directive, participative, and supportive. They found charismatic leadership as an effective leadership style for both employees and leaders in Confucian countries. Directive leadership was found effective on leaders' perceived job performance in all countries while negatively impacting team cohesiveness and citizenship behavior in Japan, Korea, and Singapore. Supportive leadership had a positive impact across all four countries leadership outcomes, while participative leadership was effective only in China and Japan (Park et al., 2019).

There were some similarities and differences in findings of a study conducted by Dorfman et al. (1997) on six leadership behaviors in three Asian and two western countries. They found leader supportiveness, contingent reward, and charismatic behaviors to be effective in all countries, the United States, Mexico, South Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. However, directive leadership was found ineffective in the United States, South Korea, and Japan while having a high impact on Taiwan and Mexico. Participative leadership was found effective in the United States and South Korea while having no impacts in Taiwan, Japan, and Mexico. Finally,

contingent punishment had a positive impact in the United States, a negative impact in Mexico and Japan, and had no impact in South Korea (Dorfman et al., 1997).

Although transformational leadership practiced by successful leaders has been supported globally, perceptions of transformational leaders' attributes may be different across cultures (Ardichvili & Gasparishvili, 2001). Ardichvili and Gasparishvili's (2001) study examining socio-cultural values, internal work culture, and transformational leadership of Russian, Georgian, Kazakh, and Kyrgyz managers revealed Russia being lower in transformational leadership than Georgia. However, there were no significant differences between the four countries in overall transactional and laissez-faire leadership. There were some significant differences in the leadership dimensions, such that Russia was lower than Georgia, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan on intellectual stimulations and individualized consideration. On inspirational motivation, Kazakhstan was lower than Russia and Georgia and higher than Kyrgyzstan. Kyrgyzstan was lowest in contingent reward, while Georgia was the lowest in Management-by-exception among all. Overall, there was a high level of laissez-faire leadership in all four countries and higher transactional and laissez-faire scores than the U.S. samples (Ardichvili & Gasparishvili, 2001).

Leadership in Afghanistan

One question of interest is what leadership style would be preferable in cultures outside of the United States, such as Afghanistan. Being a member of a society with a culture of respecting elders and caring about relationships, Afghans seem to be more influenced by a leadership style that is congruent with the followers' culture as well as their needs for

improvement, such as transformational leadership style, task-oriented, and relationship-oriented (Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010; Mujtaba & Sadat, 2010).

Kaifi and Mujtaba (2010) surveyed 300 Afghans living in the United States, and 502 Americans, using a social media network to measure differences in their transformational leadership scores. The results released a statistically significant mean difference in Afghans ($M=$ 41.27, $SD = 4.26$) and Americans' ($M= 39.61$, $SD = 1.61$) transformational score ($t = 7.83$; $p <$ 0.001), with Afghans had a significantly higher transformational leadership mean score. Research conducted by Ayaz (2018) investigated the overall effect of leadership behavior (task and relationship-orientation) on employees' work effectiveness in four private hospitals in Jalalabad, Afghanistan. The results showed that leadership behavior would significantly impact employees' work effectiveness.

Mujtaba (2019) investigated Afghan and Japanese participants' leadership tendencies toward task orientation and relationship orientation. The results showed that Afghans are high on both task-oriented and relationship-oriented behaviors and Japanese participants had moderate task- and relationship-oriented leadership behaviors. However, both Afghan and Japanese participants showed statistically significant higher scores on relationship-orientation than task-orientation, which might be due to Afghans and Japanese's high context and collectivistic culture (Mujtaba, 2019).

Considering the needs of a developing country after many years of war and the culture of respect and relationship importance among Afghans (Nijat & Muratzashvili, 2015), this research studied transformational, transactional, task-oriented, and relationship-oriented leadership styles in Afghanistan.

Gender and Leadership

The number of women in leadership positions has been increasing, and women have been occupying elite positions more over time (Eagly & Carli, 2007). However, there is a concern of why men still hold a higher number of powerful positions compared to women. This suggests that there are still barriers to women's path and progress that keep them away from higher positions, high-paid jobs, and organizational power (Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010; Paludi & Coates, 2011a).

Do men and women have different leadership styles?

Considering the difference between cultures, it may be more difficult for women to negotiate for higher positions in Asian cultures as they already face gender-based stereotypes (Wu et al.,2000; Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). Several studies have been conducted on the topic of leadership style differences between men and women, while the number of women holding leadership positions and being known as leaders has been recently increasing (Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Carli, 2003). Some argue that gender is not related to leadership style and effectiveness, while others believe there is a difference between men's and women's leadership (Zeinabadi, 2013).

The influence of gender roles causes women to have fewer opportunities to lead, share their ideas, and manifest as leaders while causing men to have more opportunities to manifest as leaders (Eagly and Karau, 1991). Women having fewer opportunities to hold superior positions may be the reason for a difference in leadership styles and leadership effectiveness among men and women. Women need to show higher quality of leadership performance compared to men to be seen as effective leaders (Kark et al., 2012). Research findings on eight leadership traits

"(honest, intelligent, hard-working, decisive, ambitious, compassionate, outgoing, and creative)" demonstrated that women received higher ratings than men on five of them, even though they have not reached higher leadership positions compared to men (Paludi & Coates, 2011a).

Gender and Transformational Leadership

Studies have found that women are rated as having more transformational leadership characteristics than men, even when being evaluated by male subordinates, and they utilize more contingent reward behaviors than male leaders (Eagly et al., 2003).

A research study using a meta-analytic procedure by Eagly et al. (2003) found that women have higher transformational leadership scores, except for the Idealized Influence (behavior), compared to male leaders as they tend to be more supportive and inspirational to their subordinates and they use transactional leadership styles only when they use rewards as a component of transactional leadership. Conversely, men have higher transactional leadership scores as they use active and passive management-by-exception more than women. Finally, men who take fewer managerial responsibilities showed a more laissez-faire leadership style than women (Eagly et al., 2003)). Shoya Zichy's study on personality found that 65 percent of women are "feeling" decision-makers and can motivate others better (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011b). Eagly and Carli (2007) argued that women are more transformational because it does not seem a particularly masculine style, even the individualized consideration component of transformational leadership is culturally feminine. Women care for and support people around them more than men.

Research findings on the stereotypical perception of leadership styles stated that women are seen as more transformational than men, even if men show more communal and less agentic attributes (Saint-Michel, 2018). This belief has been holding for a long time in leadership literature. Kark (2004) reported the result of studies conducted by Hackman et al. (1992) and Kark (2000) as an example that supports a strong correlation between transformational leadership and gender characteristics. Later in 2012, Kark et al. stated that despite attributing transformational leadership style to women for being communal, women might sometimes need to express more masculine attributes than their male counterparts. It happens when they work in highly male-dominated and bureaucratic organizations, with the managerial positions being occupied by males and lower-level positions by women.

The result of a study among 400 male and female teachers rating 77 male and female principles in Tehran, Iran, showed that Female principals compared to males obtained significantly higher scores on the overall transformational leadership (Wilks' $\Lambda= 0.93$, F (4, 394) $= 7.55$, $p< 0.05$) and all the transformational leadership dimensions (Zeinabadi, 2013). This is the opposite of Martin's (2015) result, indicating no statistically significant mean differences between the overall use of transformational and transactional leadership by male and female academic library leaders who participated in the study. However, the result breaking down the transformational leadership components showed a statistically significant mean difference between groups, with women higher in idealized attributes and inspirational motivation.

Maher (1997) research study had a sample of 262 male and female undergraduate evening students at a Midwestern urban university rate their supervisors' transformational and transactional leadership and found conflicting results compared to the previously discussed

studies. There were no significant differences between the actual male and female managers on any of the transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire scores of the MLQ Form- 5X. However, they found that rating a stereotypical leader is affected by subordinate gender, such that female subordinates rated the stereotypical female leaders more transformational and transactional and less laissez-faire than the male stereotypic leader. In contrast, men did not rate female and male stereotypic leaders differently. Van Engen et al. (2001) also found no significant differences between transformational leadership scores of male and female managers working in four of the largest department stores of a retail organization in the Netherlands.

The above studies' results are thought-provoking to investigate if and how there are different transformational leadership scores among male and female Afghan employees. Thus, the hypotheses are made as such:

H1a: Men will rate themselves higher on transactional leadership qualities.

H1b: Women will rate themselves as having higher transformational leadership qualities compared to males.

H1c: Men will rate themselves as having higher Laissez Fair leadership qualities compared to women.

Gender and leadership behavior

Studies showed stereotypical gender differences explaining women as more relational leaders and men as more task-oriented leaders (Stelter, 2002; Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Embry et al., 2008). The gender stereotype exists in the organization and expects the leaders to behave according to their gender (Madden, 2011). Men are expected to show a more task-oriented and

instrumental leadership style, while women are expected to show a more relationship-oriented and interpersonal leadership style (Embry et al., 2008).

Eagly and Johnson (1990) meta-analyzed 162 studies to investigate sex differences in leadership styles. The overall result revealed a slight sex difference in leadership styles, with women showing higher relational and task leadership styles than men without considering the types of studies (organizational, assessment, and laboratory). Their meta-analysis showed that in an organizational setting where selected managers are trained and socialized on their roles, the gender-stereotypic leadership style decreased. This was supported by the laboratory studies' findings where leaders were selected through emergence rather than appointment, which showed less stereotypical leadership behaviors. However, in laboratory or assessment settings where the people were not selected or trained to occupy leadership roles, they manifested more stereotypical leadership behaviors. However, considering task and relational styles as two ends of a measure showed no sex differences between men and women's leadership behavior (Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Carli, 2003).

The traditional belief that determines leadership as a masculine, authoritative approach has made women disqualified since they are known to be relationship-oriented (Boatwright and Forrest, 2000). Albeit some studies found similarities in men and women's leadership styles and humanity, women were found less autocratic than men (Oshagbemi and Gill, 2003; and Lorber, 2001 as cited in Shanmugam et al., 2007). This suggests ignoring biological differences between males and females in a workplace with gender equality (Shanmugam et al., 2007).

Huang and Mujtaba (2009) conducted a study among 249 Taiwanese men and women.

They assessed the relationship between stress, task orientation, and relationship orientation of

male and female participants. The result of their study indicated that men were more task-

oriented and women were more relationship-oriented. Boatwright and Forrest (2000) researched

1009 employees from three American organizations on their preferred leadership behavior, using

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The survey results revealed that female

employees preferred relational leadership or worker-oriented more than male employees ($t=$

3.09, F (1, 1003), $p=$ .002). After controlling for age and education, gender was a significant

predictor of worker-centered or relational leadership style preferences. However, the relationship

between gender and relational leadership preference was mediated by employees' connectedness

needs. This is while gender was not a significant predictor of job-centered or task-oriented

leadership behavior. The result showed that men did not have a higher preference for task-

oriented or job-centered leadership.

Boatwright and Forrest (2000) suggested that instead of merely investigating differences

in male and female participants' preferences, it would be more meaningful to investigate

leadership differences between male and female leaders. However, their study showed that

adding connectedness needs made the effect of gender on leadership style insignificant. This

justifies participants' preference for a worker-centered or relational leadership style to connect

with their leader and coworkers. These two leadership styles were perceived as complementary

and would work better when a leader combines those two in their leadership behavior.

However, a study conducted by Sikdar and Mitra (2009) found no significant correlation

neither between self-female congruence and task-oriented leadership style (r=0.229, ns) nor

between self-female congruence and people-oriented leadership style (r= -0.0458, ns). There was a significant correlation between self- male congruence and task-oriented leadership style (r= 0.341, p< 0.01), while there was no significant correlation between self-male congruence and people-oriented leadership style (r= 0.143, ns). This explains that men had a higher tendency towards a task-oriented leadership style. At the same time, women had no significant tendency toward neither task nor relational leadership styles (Sikdar and Mitra, 2009).

The result of a study conducted by Manyak & Mujtaba (2013) to measure differences in task and relationship orientation of 139 Ugandans and 484 Americans was close to the other research. The results indicate that there is no significant difference (t (64) =-1.92, ns) between the Ugandan women's task (M = 41.5, SD = 7.11) and relationship orientation (M = 43.23, SD = 5.79), while there is a significant difference (t (73) =-2.91, p > .05) in the task (M = 40.12, SD = 6.83) and relationship orientation (M = 43.00, SD = 5.08) of male Ugandans in favor of relationship orientation, which might be due to low sample size.

The result of the study among Americans indicates that American women have significant mean differences (t (299) =-9.89, p > .05) in their task (M = 36.86, SD = 7.88) and relationship (M = 42.49, SD = 5.92) orientation with a higher mean in relationship orientation. However, there was a significant mean difference (t (183) =-3.24, p > .05) in the task (M = 38.90, SD = 7.20) and relationship-orientation (M = 41.16, SD = 6.15) for American men, too, in favor of relationship orientation. This study showed that American men and women and Ugandan men are more relationship-oriented while Ugandan women are neither task nor relationship-oriented (no statistical significance).

Thus, it is hypothesized that the relationship between gender and leadership styles are as such:

H2a: Men will rate themselves higher on task-oriented leadership style.

H2b: Women will rate themselves as having a higher relationship-oriented leadership style compared to males.

Prejudice against Women Leaders

Women still need to overcome barriers that they have been dealing with for centuries. The only difference between women's situation in the past and now is the type of obstacles or their nature (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011a). Paludi and Coates (2011a) asserted that the percentage of female executives of *Fortune 500* is 13.5, and of the corporate board, seats is 15.2. To describe prejudice and discrimination women experienced throughout history, Eagly and Carli (2007) use three different metaphors; the concrete wall, the glass ceiling, and the labyrinth.

The Concrete Wall. Women faced with different and rigid rules and regulations stopped them from leadership positions and prevented them from receiving their basic rights. Women were not able to achieve higher positions because they did not have the required qualifications. The lack of capability originated from the fact that women did not have the opportunities to receive higher education and become professionals. All those clear boundaries on women's path acted as the concrete wall metaphor for women's leadership (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

In the 20th century, women, in the U.S., did not have the right to vote and were not treated equally as men. In the late 20th century, some organizations even refused to hire women for basic

positions in the professional fields. Women were even excluded from the blue-collar jobs as they were seen as masculine occupations and were expected to be given to male candidates. In the past, men were believed as the breadwinners and women as the homemakers (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011a; Echavez et al., 2016). This idea caused women to be seen as disqualified for the jobs and to perceive the house as the best place for women (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011a). In the concrete wall era, discrimination against women was seen as a natural difference, and women accepted this idea, while some women fought against it. Combatting against the concrete wall caused women to overcome it and engage in their society and achieve some organizations' positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

The glass ceiling. Later on, in the glass ceiling era, women had the opportunities to work, but it was a shift in the barriers. Women were still unable to get the positions of power where they could have the authority for critical decision-making (Eagly & Carli, 2007). The glass ceiling metaphor was used by two journalists in the Wall Street Journal, accompanied by the picture of a woman trying to push the glass ceiling above herself. The metaphor explained that women have an invisible ceiling above them as a barrier, limiting them to achieve higher-level leadership positions. The ceiling indicates that women are moving toward the upper level, and the term glass metaphors invisibility of the impediments women face while improving (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011b). Women were discriminated against differently now. Employers preferred to invest in male employees because they believe that women are more likely to quit the job and start a family. Some interviewers tried to find out women's family status indirectly. Thus, women had the opportunity to work in lower-level positions, but they were kept away from leadership positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011b).

The labyrinth. In 2004, The Wall Street Journal published another article accompanying a picture of fifty highly successful executive women with happy faces. They stated that the glass ceiling is overcome, and women have the opportunity to get leadership positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Eagly and Carli (2007) believe that it is true that women hold the elite positions and the path to the higher positions is found by women, but they need to bear difficulties to find the roads to the higher positions. They labeled women's current complicated situation toward leadership and the position of power and authority as going through "the labyrinth" (Paludi & Coates, 2011a).

Eagly and Carli (2007) claimed that women are still kept away from senior positions, but it does not happen as visible as before. The traditional disqualification of women from elite positions is not applied any longer. Now, women hold elite positions more, while their capabilities are seen as more suspicious. This is because leadership is seen masculine (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011a; Sikdar & Mitra, 2009). Gender biases can be harmful to women more when it comes to decision-making for superior leadership positions. Male leaders tend to give elite leadership positions to another man, which causes more prejudice against women (Eagly & Carli, 2003). The concepts of the concrete wall, the glass ceiling, and the labyrinth show the prejudice toward female leaders and their potentials. Women receive a less favorable evaluation of their qualifications and potentials than male leaders due to prejudicial traits (Eagly et al., 2003).

Afghan women in the workplace

In Afghan society, men as breadwinners are responsible for family income and to protect and care for the family's needs, and women have only the household responsibilities (Echavez et al., 2016). Among men and women, it is men who should be the leader in and out of the home. Women are more influenced, and men, more influential (Echavez et al., 2016). Women are underrepresented mainly in a different area, specifically in the economic growth of the country. The presence of women in positions of authority is mostly without or with weak support, decision-making role, and financial and human resources, which means that it is a symbolic role (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015).

Despite all the challenges, strong women, supportive family, and education, including religious information, helped women engage in leadership roles. After they received a 25 percent quota in parliament in the 2004 Afghan Constitution, women occupied some national and subnational positions (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). This shows an improvement in women's leadership as they receive the support of the law. Another example that demonstrates support of law for women's leadership is the California law. In 2018, the California then-governor signed into law SB 826, requiring both domestic and foreign corporations with their headquarters in California to have at least one female director on their board by December 31, 2019. This can be increased by the size of the corporations by December 31, 2021, to at least two women on board (Weber, n.d.). As for Afghanistan, the Afghan government provided opportunities for women to play a political role. However, a lack of cooperation by religious leaders and customary institutions has made it challenging to promote women's leadership as there is a need for men's engagement in this regard (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). Men still have a second-gender or

sexual image of women's role rather than an intellectual role, which causes them not to be involved in improving women's situation and leadership in Afghanistan (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015).

In a male-dominated environment where men control authority, evaluation, and wages, women face discrimination and obstacles on their progress path (Eagly & Carli, 2003). In developing countries such as Afghanistan, due to social norms and discrimination against women, where the jobs are limited, only men deserve paid positions, while women should be working for unpaid, low-paid, and low-quality jobs. (Junussova et al., 2019). This is while The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are set with women's economic empowerment as a globally-prioritized policy, considering the significant role of international development organizations regarding gender equality and women empowerment. (Junussova et al., 2019).

To compare employed men and women's wages, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2012) reported that Afghani women have 16% lower salaries than men comparing the median wages. This is an improvement comparing the 2008 report released by the Ministry of Women Affairs of Afghanistan (MoWA), which showed a 50% difference between men's and women's average wages (Junussova et al., 2019).

The result of a gender analysis in 2013 implemented by USAID (the United States of America's International Development) at the subnational government level released that women are still a minority group in the organizations that have occupied mostly blue-collar positions such as cleaners or guards or farming, and making carpets and handicrafts (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015; Junussova et al., 2019). Women are mostly working in the service industry

rather than the production industry, which causes them to be out of business leadership, and not an active contributor to economic empowerment (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015; Junussova et al., 2019). The International Labor Organization's 2016 report released women globally, occupying only 22% of governmental positions, and less than 30% of the Afghan national labor force is occupied with women (Junussova et al., 2019).

Recently, the Asia Foundation survey report in 2019 released that overall, 76% of survey participants were supporters of Afghan women working outside of the house, which was 5.7% higher than the rate in 2018. Of all, 83.1% of female and 68.8% of male participants were supporters of women working out of the house, which is related to financial empowerment and women's right enhancement (Akseer et al., 2019). The Asia Foundation report showed high support for employed women.

Gender Stereotypes on Women's Leadership

Stereotypes are the cognitive perception people utilize to think about and evaluate specific groups' characteristics without considering the actual differences between the members (Eagly and Carli, 2003; Sikdar & Mitra, 2009). Role congruity theory coined by Eagly and Karau (2002) explains people's stereotypical perception related to the social roles. Eagly and Karau's (2002) role congruity theory states that members of a group will be evaluated according to the social role that their group plays and requires them to behave accordingly. The traditional delegation of social roles such that men occupy the position of power and women occupy lower positions created the idea of what men should and what women should do to be congruent with their roles (Hoyt & Burnette, 2013).

The role congruity theory projects that female leaders are perceived according to their social role as women. The incongruity between women's social role expectation and their leadership behavior will result in being perceived and evaluated less favorably than those whose behavior and role are congruent (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Hoyt & Burnette, 2013). The consequence of role incongruity is women having fewer opportunities to hold leadership positions and be perceived less as successful leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002). This is due to predominantly characteristics describing social roles such that leadership has been traditionally seen as a masculine trait or role as men are described as agentic, assertive, and powerful while women being seen as kind, friendly, and flexible. Leadership characteristics traditionally were congruent with men's characteristics (Hoyt & Burnette, 2013; Eagly & Carli, 2003). Thus, a female leader has more chances to be rejected as people expect her to show less agentic qualities, and when a female leader shows more agentic, she may be judged as too masculine (Eagly et al., 2003).

Gender stereotypes have been studied, documented, and have been shown less possible to change. Gender stereotypes not only describe men and women (descriptive) but also prescribe how each one should be (prescriptive) (Sikdar & Mitra, 2009; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Gender stereotypes gave the idea of women holding caring positions while men holding directing positions (Hoyt & Burnette, 2013). Women experience prejudice when they work in a male-dominated industry and are perceived as less professional and less successful as a consequence of incongruity between their occupation and their socially expected roles (Garcia-Retamero, and Lopez-Zafra, 2006).

The result of a meta-analysis stated in Eagly and Carli's (2003) book revealed that women's representation in the elite positions has increased since the barriers toward women leadership have been decreasing, and women's leadership roles in the organization have been seen as organizational progress. Also, women in the United States have been increasingly entering male-dominated roles as their psychological characteristics and behaviors have changed toward their roles (Eagli &Carli, 2003). People react differently to how a woman leads or implements work than the way a man leads or does the work. People expect women leaders to be strong and sensitive while having strong male leaders would be enough to evaluate them as qualified (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011a).

Researchers stated that men are characterized mostly as agentic and women as Communal (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Saint-Michel, 2018; Paludi & Coates, 2011a; Eagly & Carli, 2003). Men's agentic stereotypical perception describes men to be more confident, independent, assertive, rational, and decisive. Women's stereotypical communal perception describes them as more sensitive, warm, friendly, helpful, nurturing, and more concerned about others (Northouse,2018; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Paludi & Coates, 2011a; Eagly & Carli, 2003). Although the masculine dominant of leadership has decreased, women have problems holding with leadership positions and having organizational flexibility and power (Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010).

Women have a more difficult time and experience stereotypes because they are expected to show communal qualities, while leadership is associated with the agentic qualities that are thought to be masculine characteristics (Northouse, 2018; Paludi & Coates, 2011a; Zaeinabadi, 2013; Kark et al., 2012). Communal characteristics are perceived to show stereotypical femininity expressed by women, while agentic attributes are perceived to be masculine

characteristics and should be presented by men. As in Bem Sex-Role Inventory, masculinity items are the agentic traits that are perceived to be more desirable for men, and femininity traits are the communal ones that are desirable for women (Bem, 1981). Men are not concerned with being evaluated as too masculine or too feminine, while this is a big concern for women routed from the stereotypes and biases that existed on women and men's roles (Eagly & Carli., 2007).

In the meantime, women have a hard time being evaluated as effective female leaders while not being feminine enough (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Hoyt & Burnette, 2013; & Hernandez Bark et al., 2016). Women try to blend a range of characteristics to create their style of leadership. As women in the position of authority, they are assertive and at the same time friendly and supportive to their followers, while it is not expected from male leaders (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Kark et al. l., 2012). Babcock explained the dominance of masculine values in the workplace as the second-generation of gender biases (Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010).

Women and Leadership roles in Afghanistan

In a male-dominated environment, women receive a better evaluation in non-male-dominated leader roles than in a male-dominated leadership role (Eagly et al., 1992). Men have a higher chance of promotion in a male-dominated environment (Eagly & Carli, 2003). The result of a study conducted by Wu et al. (2000) among a group of American, Japanese, and Taiwanese female managers showed that their leadership style was transformational rather than an autocratic style. Japanese managers also showed a bigger problem regarding their gender and social roles in a patriarchal, collectivistic culture. They need to discuss with their colleagues to

decide as they are not risk-takers, which is the opposite of female American managers, independent and risk-takers in decision-making (Wu et al., 2000). Meanwhile, many countries still have not accepted women's leadership effectiveness, and there are some regulations against women leaders (Hernandez Bark et al., 2016).

Countries in conflict with an impending threat tend to have a male leader, where women have less chance of being a leader (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Furthermore, women getting placed in a position of authority does not necessarily mean that they are leaders as it might be chosen to meet the goal of the raw number of female leaders to just apparently satisfy gender equality seekers (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). International supporters of Afghanistan have invested a lot to involve women in leadership as politicians, business leaders, or civil society leaders, primarily focused on female political leaders (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). People in Afghanistan believe that leaders are those in a position of authority; that is why when they think of leaders, they remember formally selected "Jihadi leaders," "civil society leaders," "women leaders," or "religious leaders." (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015, p.5).

In addition to gender as a first obstacle, women who lack "wealth, education, followership, political capital, or social status" cannot be seen as leaders in an Afghan society (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015, p.5). Leadership needs to be studied despite authority while engaging men and women in promoting women's leadership because considering authority in Afghanistan could be equal to withdrawing women from leadership capabilities (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). International supporters also participated in this situation by hiring males for elite positions, even though they are a partner of the government to promote women's leadership in Afghanistan (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). As the major efforts to place women in

the position of authority or promote women's leadership in Afghanistan, we can name creating

the Ministry of Women's Affair (MoWA) in 2002 and gender units within each ministry in 2004

(Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015).

The result of the Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (AREU) survey conducted

showed that among 400 participants, 80% of them believe that men are better leaders than

women (Echavez et al., 2016). According to Junussova et al. (2019), 88% of Afghan employed

women are confident in their skills to meet the employers' expectations, 58% claimed to have

training opportunities for professional improvement, but 63% of women said they are not

supervised by a female manager in 2013, while in 2016, only 4.3% of Afghan women were

working in management positions, and only 10.7% of Afghan women were involved in decision

making.

Regarding the support of women leadership in Afghanistan, the result of a survey

conducted by The Asia Foundation in 2019 released that women more than men are supporters

of women's leadership positions. Of all, 67.3% of men and 75.2% of women strongly or

somewhat supported women holding a position of community development councils (CDC),

53.4% of men and 61.3% of women supported women holding a position of CEO, 50.9% of men

and 59.9% of women supported women being the governor of a province, 51.7% of men and

60.8% of women were a supporter of women holding a minister or cabinet member position.

Finally, 43.2% of men and 54.2% of women were a supporter of women running for the

presidency (Akseer et al., 2019).

Focusing on quotas in assigning women to leadership positions have caused a lack of

attention to the capability of women as leaders and the capacity to motivate, empower and

develop their followers (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015), while Transformational leadership focuses on empowerment, motivation, and development of followers (Kark, 2004). The government and international community tried to involve women in leadership, but they did not provide sufficient support and training programs to prepare women leaders facing challenges and barriers in society (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). Thus, women got involved in corruption while being disconnected from people. To fill this gap, a USAID program, namely PROMOTE, has been implemented to train women for leadership positions in different civil society organizations (Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015). This is while men think that the leadership training programs for women made the path easier for them to get a job. Men's role and belief regarding women's leadership, engaging them in the topic, and women's representation in leadership roles, inspire us to study the interface of gender and transformational leadership among men and women employees (Kark, 2004; Nijat & Murtazashvili, 2015).

Impact of Stereotypes on Women's Leadership Style Perception

Women's leadership style can be seen based on the stereotypical perception of their gender as female, even if they identify themselves with stereotypically male attributes (Saint-Michel, 2018). Eagly and Carli (2007) state that people's expectation is affected by how the members of a group think of themselves. If a considerable number of women describe themselves with communal characteristics and only a few of them describe themselves with agentic characteristics, other people would think of them the same. This means that the way women think of themselves impacts society's stereotypes (Eagly and Carli, 2007; Saint-Michel, 2018).

Maher's (1997) study on gender differences in transformational leadership components and gender-related stereotypes revealed a significant effect of gender on transformational and transactional leadership scores of a stereotypic leader.

The results of the study conducted by Sikdar and Mitra (2009) revealed that leadership, in general, is perceived as consisting of mostly masculine ($r= 0.73$, $p < 0.01$) characteristics than feminine ($r=0.41$, $p < 0.01$), even though both were statistically significant. Saint- Michel (2012) conducted a study in four French organizations from each 25 to 30 leaders were selected along with at least five subordinates to examine the relationship between sex, gender-stereotypical identity, and transformational leadership. The leaders were given a questionnaire to rate their gender role identity and demographic characteristics, while later, the followers were given another questionnaire to rate their leaders' leadership style. The research finding showed that followers rated their leaders more transformational when they had a stronger communal attribute from their follower's point of view. Also, followers rated their leaders as more transformational when their leader was female with a higher communal attribute, which means there is a moderation effect of a leader's sex on the relationship between their communal orientation and transformational leadership. Female leaders with highly communal attributes are perceived as more transformational than highly communal male leaders (Saint-Michel, 2018; Kark et al., 2012). Oppositely, women with the high agentic attribute are perceived as more transformational than men with the same agentic attributes rate (Saint-Michel, 2018).

The difference between men and women in a group is not only based on the way they are treated, but it can be how different they behave (Eagly and Karau, 1991). Eagly and Karau (1991) state that people may not select leaders according to how they help others interpersonally

and behave morally well. People may choose their leaders mostly based on their task orientation. This shows how people define leadership, not just blindly choosing men. They choose men as their leaders over women because they define leadership as more task-oriented behaviors (Eagly and Karau, 1991). The social and organizational context that defines leadership qualities and evaluators' characteristics caused the differences in evaluating women slightly more negatively as leaders than men (Eagly et al., 1992).

Research by Mujtaba & Sadat (2010) in Herat, Afghanistan, and in the United States on Afghans studied the leadership behavior of 106 local Afghan respondents and 219 Afghans working in the United States. The results showed that overall, Afghans (local and expatriate) have a higher relationship orientation. Female expatriate Afghans and local male Afghans showed a significantly higher relationship orientation than task-orientation, while for Male expatriates and female locals, the difference was not statistically significant. Overall, relationship orientation was higher than task-orientation among Afghans regardless of their gender, education, and tenure (Mujtaba & Sadat, 2010).

The current study measured how gender-role identity predicts leadership style among non-governmental organizations' employees in Kabul, Afghanistan. Thus, the following hypotheses were tested:

H3: Gender-role identity of the participants will predict their own personal
transformational leadership score ratings, such that participants with higher communal
attributes will rate themselves as having higher scores on the transformational
leadership scores, and the participants with higher scores on agentic attributes will have
higher scores on transactional leadership scores.

H4: Gender-role identity of the participants will predict their own personal leadership style, such that participants with higher communal attributes will rate themselves as having higher scores on the relational leadership scores, and the participants with higher scores on agentic attributes will have higher scores on task-oriented leadership scores.

H5: Stereotypical perception of leadership (Agentic and Communal attributes) mediates the relationship between participants' gender and the female leadership score, such that employees with agentic attributes will rate the female leader as more transactional and employees with communal attributes will rate the female leader as more transformational.

H6: Stereotypical perception of leadership (Agentic and Communal attributes) mediates the relationship between participants' gender and the female leadership score, such that employees with agentic attributes will rate the female leader as more task-oriented and employees with communal attributes will rate the female leader as more relationship-oriented.

Chapter II: Method

Participants and Procedures

The present study measured the stereotypical perception of women's transformational leadership among both male and female participants. According to the result of a priori power analysis conducted using G*Power 3.1.9.7, to test a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), using medium effect size ($d = .21$) (Badura et al., 2018), and an alpha level of .05, the number of participants in this study was needed to be at least $n = 106$ to achieve a power of .95. After the IRB approval, data collection was implemented via distributing a Qualtrics survey link to the participants, using a snowball approach, and posting on social media. Inclusion criteria for participating in the survey were being an Afghan citizen, living in Afghanistan, and being employed in any Non-Governmental Organizations in Kabul. Thus, those who were non-Afghan citizens, governmental employees, and working out of Kabul were automatically removed from the study. The total number of participants was 199. Of all, 44.2% were women, 52.3% were men, and 3.5% did not report their gender. The average age of participants was 30. 51 years ($M = 30.51$, $SD = 6.30$).

Concerning the education level of the participants, no one responded as having less than a high-school education and no Ph.D. participants. 3.5% of participants reported their education level as high school, 68.3% as undergraduate, 27.6% as Master's degree, and finally, only one of participants did not reveal their education level.

Instruments

Consent. Participants were informed of the study goals and procedure by providing them with an implied consent form at the beginning of the questionnaire, including a brief overview of the project's purpose, freedom for withdrawing from the survey, and confidentiality of the responses.

Translation Process. All the measures were carried out in two languages, English and Persian. The measures were translated into Persian and reverse translated from Persian into English by two translators who know both English and Persian to ensure that the Persian questions reflect the English questions' meaning.

Procedure. Participants received six questionnaires simultaneously: A short Bem Sex Role Identity scale, a 10-item I-PANAS-SF, an Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ - Form 5X) to rate their leadership qualities, and a modified version of the MLQ (Form 5X) to rate their female leader, A Leadership Behavior questionnaire to rate their leadership styles, and a Leadership Behavior questionnaire to rate their female leader's leadership styles. The modified MLQ (Form 5X) and Leadership Behavior Questionnaire had an additional instruction explaining that they need to rate a female leader whom they know as a supervisor, colleague, or political leader. Participants first rated themselves on I-PANAS-SF and BSRI to assess the mood affect and the gender-role identity. Then, they rated their transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership style by answering the MLQ (Form 5X) and their task-orientation and relationship-orientation by responding to Leadership Behavior Questionnaire. Finally, they rated their female leader's transformational and transactional leadership style by answering the

modified version of MLQ (Form 5X) and their female leader's task orientation and relationship orientation by responding to the modified version of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire.

Demographics. Participants were asked to report their gender, age, education level, citizenship, organization type, and whether they work in Kabul or other provinces.

Transformational Leadership Measure. Participants responded to a 45-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) on a five-point Likert scale (0 = Not at all; 1 = Once in a while; 2 = Sometimes; 3 = Fairly often; and 4 = Frequently, if not always). MLQ has been developed by Avolio and Bass (2004) and has been used and validated over the last two decades around the world. MLQ has been known as the most standard instrument for assessing transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership scales and has been used by many researchers (Kaifi & Mujtaba, 2010; Martin, 2015; Saint-Michel, 2018; Kark et al., 2012; Hernandez Bark et al., 2016; & Van Engen, et al., 2001). The MLQ (Form 5X) has been found to have a strong Cronbach's Alpha reliability ($\alpha = .90$ and $\alpha = .94$). Transformational ($\alpha = .87$ and $\alpha = .93$) and transactional ($\alpha = .70$ and $\alpha = .71$) leadership subscales had good Cronbach's Alpha reliability, too. However Laissez-Faire scale had lower Cronbach's Alpha reliability ($\alpha = .65$ and $\alpha = .66$). It also has a strong validity that clearly differentiates between the leadership model's nine factors (Northouse, 2018; Avolio & Bass,1990). Some of the items in the MLQ (Form 5X) are such as: "I spend time teaching and coaching," "I talk optimistically about the future," "I keep track of all mistakes," and "I avoid making decisions" (Northouse, 2018, p.191).

Stereotypical Gender Perception Measure. Participants responded to a short version of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Short BSRI), which contains 30 items on a 7- point response scale.

The Short BSRI has been used the most to measure stereotypical gender perception and has high convergent validity through strong correlation ($r = .57$, $p < 0.05$) with the Masculine Gender Role Stress (MGRS) scale (Bem, 1981; Saint-Michel, 2018; Kark et al., 2012; Powell et al., 2002; & Bargeron, et al., 2006; & Carver, et al., 2013). The Cronbach's Alpha reliability of both agentic ($\alpha=0.81$) and communal ($\alpha=0.89$) scales were found to be high. Some of the items in BSRI are such as "love children, defend my own beliefs, Conscientious, and Unsystematic" (Carver et al., 2013).

Leadership Behavior Questionnaire. Participants responded to a 20-item questionnaire measuring leadership behavior, which assesses task- and relationship-oriented leadership style. The answers are on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1= never, 2 = seldom, 3 = occasionally, 4= often, and 5 = always (Northouse, 2018; Manyak and Mujtaba, 2013; and Huang and Mujtaba, 2009). Northouse created the Leadership Behavior Style as a simple format of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Manyak and Mujtaba, 2013). The Leadership Behavior Questionnaire can be completed as self-reporting or for rating supervisor, peer, or subordinates. The questionnaire had an overall high Cronbach's alpha of ($\alpha=0.93$ and $\alpha=0.96$). Task-oriented scale's reliability ($\alpha=0.90$ and $\alpha=0.94$) was found to be higher than relationship-oriented scale ($\alpha=0.84$ and $\alpha=0.92$). Some of the items in the questionnaire are such as "Tells group members what they are supposed to do, Acts friendly with members of the group, Sets standards of performance for group members, and Helps others in the group feel comfortable" (Northouse, 2018).

I-PANAS-SF. Participants responded to a 10-item questionnaire measuring positive and negative affect at the time of taking the survey. The five positive affective states were active, attentive, inspired, determined, and alert. The five negative affective states were afraid, upset, hostile, nervous, and ashamed. Participants rated their affective states on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1= not at all, 2= a little, 3= moderately, 4= Quite a bit, and 5= extremely. The International Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule Short-Form (I-PANAS-SF) was developed by Thompson (2007) as a measure of the affective component of subjective well-being. The scale is found by Thompson (2007) to have acceptable internal reliability and convergent and criterion-related validity (Karim et al., 2011). The Positive Affect scale of I-PANAS-SF had a reliability of (α=0.81) and the Negative Affect scale had a reliability of (α=0.84). (see Appendix A).

Data Analysis

Data Cleaning. Upon completion of the survey, data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (IBM SPSS 25). Data were cleaned to check the missing values, skewness, kurtosis, multicollinearity, and multivariate outliers.

Descriptive Statistics. After data cleaning, descriptive statics were obtained for the continuous variables, and frequencies were obtained for the categorical variables. A Pearson correlation was run to understand the relationship between variables and variables' dimensions.

Reliability. The measures used in this study were well-known regarding reliability. However, the internal consistency reliability was obtained to assure the reliability of the scales as they were used in a different culture than where they were developed.

Hypothesis Testing. To test the hypotheses, Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) and Mediation analysis were run. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance

(MANCOVA) was run to test hypotheses H1 and H2 to determine the mean differences in transformational, transactional, laissez Faire, task-oriented, and relationship-oriented scores for male and female participants. Multiple regression, then hierarchical regression was run to test hypotheses H3 and H4 to determine participant's gender-role identity predicting participants' leadership styles. For mediation analysis, testing Hypotheses H5 and H6, Preacher and Hayes (2004) Bootstrapping method was used to estimate the effect of participants' gender-role identity on the relationship between their gender and the leadership style of themselves and a female leader.

Chapter III: Results

Data Cleaning

The initial action taken in cleaning data was to identify and correct for missing data. Each construct was analyzed through a frequency command to determine participants' response rate, skewness, and kurtosis of responses. It was found that there is a high percentage of missing data, specifically on female leader's transformational leadership (43.7%) and leadership behavior scales (45.7%), and participants' leadership behavior scales (43.7%). Since the number of missing data was high, pairwise and listwise deletion methods were selected to deal with missing data. It is worth noting that all the analyses were run using a replace with the mean method, too. Replace a high percentage of missing data with mean caused low variance. Thus, analyses were run using either the pairwise or listwise deletion method. Pairwise and Listwise deletion methods decreased the number of participants; however, it was very close to the required sample size calculated by G*Power.

Data were normally distributed, and most of the variables fell within the +/- 2 rule of thumb, which was used to determine if any transformation would be needed. Some skewness and kurtosis were found, which were not severe, and there was no need for transformation. The maximum Mahalanobis distance score within regression was compared to the cutoff score of 59.703, showed one multivariate outlier in the data. Checking the multivariate outlier's responses revealed that the case was normal and there was no need to remove it.

To test for multicollinearity, a Pearson correlation of .70 was used as a cutoff score. It was determined that none of the variables have a correlation of higher than .70 with each other, apart from task-oriented and relationship-oriented scales that were strongly correlated with each

other. However, none of the variables' Tolerance values were lower than 0.1, and none of the

variables' VIF were higher than 10. It means that there was no multicollinearity on other

measures, and the variables were within the acceptable range, indicating they were independent

constructs.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Descriptive statistics, including the means and standard deviation, were obtained for each

scale and its dimensions (see Table 1 in Appendix B). Additionally, Pearson correlation was

obtained in order to understand the relationship among the variables and dimensions of the

variables. Comparing three dimensions of transformational leadership among participants,

transformational leadership ($M = 4.06$, $SD = .54$) had a higher mean than transactional ($M = 3.77$,

$SD = .56$) and laissez-faire ($M = 2.60$, $SD = .90$) leadership styles. This was the same order as the

female leader's mean score. Participants rated a female leader higher on transformational ($M =$

3.94, $SD = .79$) than transactional ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .65$), and laissez-Faire ($M = 2.84$, $SD = .92$).

Participants' relationship-oriented mean score ($M = 4.23$, $SD = .58$), was higher than their task-

oriented leadership ($M = 4.19$, $SD = .67$), while a female leader's task-oriented leadership ($M =$

4.09, $SD = .86$) had a higher mean that the relationship-oriented leadership ($M = 4.02$, $SD = .83$).

Correlations

Correlations of participants' transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. The

Correlation between participants' transformational and transactional leadership scores was

positive and statistically significant ($r = .74$, $p < .05$). On the other hand, transformational

leadership had no statistically significant correlation with laissez-faire leadership ($r = .02$, $p =$

.08), and transactional leadership was positively related to laissez-faire leadership ($r = .27$, $p <$

.05). This indicates that participants' transformational leadership quality is positively related to their transactional leadership, while not related to their laissez-faire leadership quality.

It was found that the dimensions of transformational leadership were all significantly correlated, with positive correlation coefficients ranging from ($r = .23$, $p < .05$) to ($r = .67$, $p <$ .05). The dimensions of transactional leadership were all significantly correlated, with positive correlation coefficients ranging from ($r = .18$, $p < .05$) to ($r = .33$, $p < .05$). However, laissez-faire leadership dimension had a statistically significant and positive correlation with the Management-by-exception passive and active dimensions ($r = .47$, $p < .05$) ($r = .24$, $p < .05$) of transactional leadership, respectively and almost no correlation with contingent reward ($r = .00$, $p = .97$). The correlation between Laissez-faire leadership and transformational leadership's dimensions was not significant.

Correlation of Female leader's transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire.
The Correlation between female leader's transformational and transactional leadership scores was positive and statistically significant ($r = .66$, $p < .05$). However, neither transformational ($r = -.18$, $p = .07$) nor transactional leadership ($r = .13$, $p = .17$) had a statistically significant correlation with laissez-faire leadership. This indicates that only female leader's transformational and transactional leadership qualities are positively related to each other.

The dimensions of transformational leadership were all significantly correlated, with positive correlation coefficients ranging from ($r = .49$, $p < .05$) to ($r = .78$, $p < .05$). Furthermore, the dimensions of transactional leadership were all significantly correlated, with positive correlation coefficients ranging from ($r = .19$, $p < .05$) to ($r = .41$, $p < .05$). However, laissez-

faire leadership dimension had a statistically significant and positive correlation with the Management-by-exception passive and active dimensions ($r = .41, p < .05$) ($r = .21, p < .05$) of transactional leadership, respectively, and no statistically significant correlation with contingent reward ($r = -.13, p = .18$). The correlation between Laissez-faire leadership and transformational leadership's dimensions was not significant.

Task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership behavior. Participants' task-oriented leadership and relationship-oriented leadership had a strong and positive correlation with each other ($r = .84, p < .05$). female leader's task-oriented leadership and relationship-oriented leadership were also positively correlated with each other ($r = .80, p < .05$). Female leader's task-oriented leadership was significantly correlated with participants' task-oriented ($r = .54, p < .05$) and relationship-oriented leadership ($r = .66, p < .05$). Female leader's relationship-oriented leadership was significantly correlated with participants' task-oriented ($r = .50, p < .05$) and relationship-oriented leadership ($r = .54, p < .05$).

Correlation of Bem Sex-Role Identity scale. Agentic dimension of BSRI had a statistically significant correlation with its communal dimension ($r = .67, p < .05$), participants' transformational ($r = .51, p < .05$) and transactional leadership ($r = .45, p < .05$), and female leader's transformational ($r = .32, p < .05$) and transactional leadership ($r = .20, p < .05$). Both agentic and communal dimensions of BSRI were not significantly correlated to neither participants' nor female leader's laissez-faire leadership. Overall, participants' agentic attributes are positively and highly related to participants' communal attributes and transformational and transactional leadership, while had a positive but smaller correlation with female leader's. However, BSRI agentic had a smaller significant correlation with participants' task-oriented ($r =$

.38, $p < .05$), participants' relationship-oriented ($r = .41$, $p < .05$), female leader's task-oriented ($r = .21$, $p < .05$), but not correlated with female leader's relationship-oriented leadership ($r = .14$, $p = .15$).

Communal dimension of BSRI was statistically significantly correlated with participants' transformational ($r = .51$, $p < .05$), transactional ($r = .45$, $p < .05$), task-oriented ($r = .48$, $p < .05$), and relationship-oriented leadership ($r = .48$, $p < .05$). BSRI Communal was significantly correlated with female leader's transformational ($r = .35$, $p < .05$), transactional ($r = .29$, $p < .05$), task-oriented ($r = .36$, $p < .05$), and relationship-oriented leadership ($r = .26$, $p < .05$) (see Table 1 in Appendix B).

Hypotheses Testing

MANCOVA

Hypothesis 1 stated that male employees would rate themselves higher on transactional and laissez-faire leadership qualities than female and female employees will rate themselves higher on transformational leadership. To test these hypotheses, Multivariate Analysis of Covariance was run with the affective state as a control variable to see if gender can differentiate employees' transformational leadership scores. The results revealed that after controlling for affective state, there were no statistically significant differences between men and women on the combined transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership scores of participants (Wilks' $\Lambda = .988$, $F(3,120) = .495$, $p = .686$, *partial η^2 = .012*). Univariate Analysis of Covariance did not reveal any significant effect of gender on transformational ($F(1,125) = .186$,

$p = .667$), transactional, and laissez-faire qualities, either. Thus, the first hypothesis was not supported.

To test hypotheses 2a and 2b, Multivariate Analyses of Covariance were run with the affective state as a control variable to see if gender can differentiate employees' leadership behavior scores. Hypothesis 2 stated that male employees would rate themselves higher on task-oriented leadership qualities, and female employees will rate themselves higher on relationship-oriented leadership. The results revealed that after controlling for affective state, there were statistically significant differences between men and women on the combined task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership styles of participants (Wilks' $\Lambda = .940$, F (2,99) = 3.133, $p < .05$, *partial η2* = .060). Women ($M = 4.31$, $SD = .59$) had higher mean score of task-oriented leadership than men ($M = 4.14$, $SD = .70$). Moreover, women ($M = 4.241$, $SD = .53$) had slightly higher mean score of relationship-oriented leadership than men ($M = 4.238$, $SD = .59$). Thus, hypothesis 2a was not supported, whereas hypothesis 2b was supported as women rated themselves higher than men on both leadership behaviors.

To further investigate the effect of gender on other variables, more MANCOVA's and ANCOVA's were conducted. After controlling for affective state, gender was not differentiating participants' sex-role identity (communal and agentic attributes). However, after controlling for affective state, participants' gender did significantly differentiate female leader's transformational leadership scores (Wilks' $\Lambda = .910$, F (3,93) = 3.051, $p < .05$, *partial η2* = .090). Men had higher mean score on all three, transformational ($M = 4.03$, $SD = .56$), transactional ($M = 3.71$, $SD = .57$), and laissez-faire ($M = 3.01$, $SD = .98$) leadership qualities than women's transformational ($M = 3.87$, $SD = .84$), transactional ($M = 3.68$, $SD = .62$), and laissez-faire ($M =$

2.62, *SD* = .80). However, gender was not a significant predictor of female leader's task and relationship orientation (see table 2 in Appendix C).

Regression

To test hypotheses 3 and 4, Multiple regression were run to test if participants' communal and agentic attributes can predict their leadership styles. The result of multiple regression showed that after controlling for affective state, participants' agentic and communal attributes together can predict 34% of their transformational leadership qualities (R^2 = .34, F (3,124) = 21.16, p < .05), while agentic attribute (β = .36, t(127) = 3.90, p < .05) was a stronger predictor of transformational leadership than communal attributes (β = .29, t(127) = 3.21, p < .05). Moreover, the result of hierarchical regression revealed that after controlling for affective state, agentic attributes (ΔR^2 = .08, F (3,124) = 21.16, p < .05) can significantly predict participants' transformational leadership qualities above and beyond communal attributes (R^2 = .257, F (2,125) = 21.67, p < .05). Furthermore, the result of multiple regression showed that after controlling for affective state, participants' agentic and communal attributes together can predict 26% of their transactional leadership qualities (R^2 = .26, F (3,125) = 14.33, p < .05), while agentic attribute (β = .31, t (128) = 3.10, p < .05) was a stronger predictor of transactional leadership than communal attributes (β = .26, t(128) = 2.66, p < .05).

The result of hierarchical regression revealed that after controlling for affective state, agentic attributes (ΔR^2 = .06, F (3,125) = 14.33, p < .05) can significantly predict participants' transactional leadership qualities above and beyond communal attributes (R^2 = .20, F (2,126) = 15.61, p < .05). This means that those who rate themselves higher on agentic attributes would

show higher transformational and transactional leadership than those who are more communal. Thus, hypothesis 3 is partially supported (see table 3 in Appendix D).

The result of multiple regression to test hypothesis 4 stated that after controlling for affective state, participants' agentic and communal attributes together can predict 25% of their relationship-oriented leadership behavior ($R^2 = .25$, $F (3,102) = 11.07$, $p < .05$), while only communal attribute ($\beta = .36$, t(105) = 3.14, $p < .05$) had a significant coefficients beta weights on predicting relationship-oriented leadership, but not agentic attribute ($\beta = .17$, t(105) = 1.45, $p = .15$). The result of hierarchical regression revealed that after controlling for affective state, communal attributes ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $F (3,102) = 11.07$, $p < .05$) can significantly predict participants' relationship-oriented leadership qualities above and beyond their agentic attributes ($R^2 = .17$, $F (2,103) = 10.74$, $p < .05$). The agentic regression weight ($\beta = .41$, t(105) = 4.57, $p < .05$) was significant before adding communal scores. After adding communal scores ($\beta = .36$, t(105) = 3.14, $p < .05$), the agentic standardized regression weight decreased and it was not significant anymore ($\beta = .17$, t(105) = 1.45, $p = .15$). This means that those who have higher communal attributes would show higher relationship-oriented leadership style.

To predict task-oriented leadership score by participants' communal and agentic attributes, after controlling for affective state, multiple regressions were run. The result was the same as for relationship-oriented. The participants' agentic and communal attributes together can predict 23% of their task-oriented leadership qualities ($R^2 = .23$, $F (3,102) = 9.94$, $p < .05$), while only communal attribute ($\beta = .40$, t(105) = 3.40, $p < .05$) had a significant coefficients beta weights on predicting task-oriented leadership, but not agentic attribute ($\beta = .11$, t(105) = .90, $p = .37$).

The result of hierarchical regression revealed that after controlling for affective state, communal attributes ($\Delta R^2 = .09$, $F(3,102) = 9.94$, $p < .05$) can significantly predict participants' task-oriented leadership qualities above and beyond their agentic attributes ($R^2 = .14$, $F(2,103) = 8.26$, $p < .05$). The agentic regression weight ($\beta = .37$, $t(105) = 4.06$, $p < .05$) was significant before adding communal scores. After adding communal scores ($\beta = .40$, $t(105) = 3.40$, $p < .05$), the agentic standardized regression weight decreased and it was not significant anymore ($\beta = .11$, $t(105) = .90$, $p = .37$). This result provided partial support to hypothesis 4 since those who had higher communal attributes rated themselves higher on both task- and relationship-oriented leadership styles (see table 4 in Appendix D).

To further test the effect of participants' sex-role identity on other variables, even though not-hypothesized, more multiple regression analyses were run. The result showed that participants' agentic and communal scores together can significantly predict three types of a female leader's leadership qualities; transformational ($R^2 = .16$, $F(3,100) = 6.36$, $p < .05$), transactional ($R^2 = .10$, $F(3,101) = 3.66$, $p < .05$), and task-oriented ($R^2 = .15$, $F(3,98) = 5.83$, $p < .05$). In all analyses, the communal attribute does the prediction above and beyond the agentic attribute.

Finally, the last group of regression analyses were run to test if participants' leadership style can predict their rating of a female leader's leadership style. The results indicated that only participants' transformational scores can significantly predict female leader's transformational ($\beta = .38$, $t(105) = 2.81$, $p < .05$), while only participants' transactional can predict female leader's transactional scores ($\beta = .40$, $t(106) = 2.93$ $p < .05$). This means that those who rate themselves higher on transformational will rate a female leader higher on transformational, and those with a

higher transactional style will rate a female leader's style as more transactional. Furthermore, only participants' relationship-oriented significantly predicted female leader's task-oriented (β = .54, t(102) = 3.62, $p < .05$) and relationship-oriented styles (β = .39, t(102) = 2.29, $p < .05$), while participants' task-oriented scores did not significantly predict any of the female leader's leadership behavior. This would be indicated that those who have higher relationship orientation would rate a female leader higher on either task-oriented or relationship-oriented style.

Mediation

The PROCESS procedure for SPSS version 3.5.3 was run to test the indirect effect of gender on female leader's leadership style through participants' sex-role identity (agentic/masculine and communal/feminine). The significance of the hypothesized indirect effect, using bootstrapping procedure were tested through computing unstandardized indirect effects for each of 5,000 bootstrapped samples, and the 95% confidence interval. To test hypothesis 5, bootstrapping analyses were run to find if communal attributes can mediate the relationship between participants' gender and female leader's transformational leadership and if agentic attributes can mediate the relationship between participants' gender and female leader's transactional leadership.

The bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect is estimated to lie between -.0944 and .1403 with a 95% confidence interval. It can be concluded that the indirect effect is not significant as it crosses over zero. Thus, the communal attribute does not mediate the relationship between gender and female leader's transformational leadership (see table 5 in Appendix E).

Regarding the mediatory role of agentic attributes, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was estimated to lie between -.1607 and -.0020 with a 95% confidence interval. It

can be concluded that the indirect effect is significant as it does not cross over zero and it is significantly different from zero. Thus, the agentic attribute does mediate the relationship between gender and female leader's transactional leadership. Hypothesis 5 was partially supported as participants' agentic attribute can mediate the relationship between gender and female leader's transactional leadership, while participants' communal attribute does not mediate the relationship between gender and female leader's transformational leadership (see table 6 in Appendix E). This means that among employees, those who are more agentic/masculine would rate the female leader as more transactional despite their gender.

Bootstrapping analyses were run to test hypothesis 6. It was aimed to find if communal attributes can mediate the relationship between participants' gender and female leader's relationship-oriented leadership behavior and if agentic attributes can mediate the relationship between participants' gender and female leader's task-oriented leadership behavior. Hypothesis 6 was partially supported as participants' agentic attribute can mediate the relationship between gender and female leader's task-oriented leadership, while participants' communal attribute cannot mediate the relationship between gender and female leader's relationship-oriented leadership.

The bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect is estimated to lie between -.1187 and .0744 with a 95% confidence interval. The indirect effect is not significant as it crosses over zero. Thus, the communal attribute cannot mediate the relationship between gender and female leader's relationship-oriented leadership behavior (see table 7 in Appendix E). The bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was estimated to lie between -.2391 and -.0035 with a 95% confidence interval for the agentic attributes mediating the relationship between gender and

female leader's task-oriented leadership style. It can be concluded that the indirect effect is significant as it does not cross over zero and it is significantly different from zero. Thus, agentic attribute mediates the relationship between gender and female leader's task-oriented leadership behavior (see table 8 in Appendix E). This states that employees with higher agentic attribute, would rate the female leader as more task-oriented despite their gender of being a man or a woman.

Chapter IV: Discussion

This study was conducted to investigate the gender-based stereotypical perception of Afghan non-governmental employees towards their own leadership and toward women's leadership styles. PANAS was used to control for the effect of participants' mood on their responses, which was found non-significant. Thus, employees' responses were not affected by their mood. This study's first finding was that participants rated both themselves and the female leader higher on transformational than transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. However, this congruence was not found in leadership behavior. Participants had a higher score on relationship-oriented, but they rated their female leader higher on task-oriented while having overall high scores on both leadership behaviors for both themselves and a female leader. This indicates that Afghan non-governmental employees perceive women leaders to be more task-oriented than relationship-oriented and more transformational than transactional. This can be related to Afghanistan being a collectivistic and developing country, where there is a need for a leader who would help people to transform the current situation through transformational leadership characteristics, such as idealized influence and inspirational motivation. Moreover, living in a developing country after many years of war, people would need a leader who is more focused on doing the tasks and supervise employees to reach the goals. This is in agreement with the finding of Park et al. (2019) that showed charismatic and directive leadership as the effective leadership styles in four other Asian countries, including China, South Korea, Singapore, and Japan. Kaifi and Mujtaba (2010), comparing 300 Afghans and 502 Americans, found Afghans higher on transformational leadership than Americans. Ayaz's (2018) study revealed both task and relationship behaviors as highly effective leadership styles among the employees in four

private hospitals in Jalalabad, Afghanistan. Interestingly, this study's finding was similar to Mujtaba (2019), who found Afghans having a high tendency towards both task and relationship-oriented, while different from Mujtaba (2019) regarding their findings that Afghans and Japanese were higher on relationship-oriented behavior than task-oriented behavior.

Second, participants' gender did not predict their transformational leadership dimensions. This study did not provide support for the first hypothesis. Thus, one cannot predict Afghan women showing higher transformational leadership styles, and Afghan men use more transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles as it was hypothesized. Afghan non-governmental employees' gender cannot reveal their leadership preference. These findings were different from a few other studies. Eagly et al. (2003) found that women are more transformational leaders, except for the Idealized Influence (behavior) compared to men. Kark (2004) and Hackman et al. (1992) found a strong correlation between transformational leadership and gender (as cited in Kark, 2004). The results of a study conducted by Zeinabadi (2013) revealed women being significantly higher on transformational and transactional leadership than men. This study's findings were similar to the results of studies conducted by Martin (2015), Maher (1997), and Van Engen et al. (2001) that showed no significant differences between men and women on transformational leadership dimensions.

However, this study found a significant mean difference between males and females in predicting their leadership behavior. Women were significantly higher on both task and relational leadership behavior than men. This indicates that Afghan women express more relationship-oriented behavior and more task-oriented than men. This finding is consistent with

Eagly and Johnson's (1990) meta-analysis that found a slight sex difference in leadership styles, with women higher on both task and relational leadership styles, without considering the type of study (organizational, assessment, and laboratory). However, Huang and Mujtab's (2009) study among 249 Taiwanese found a different result, as men were found more task-oriented and women more relationship-oriented. Sikdar and Mujtaba (2009) also found opposite results, such that men had a higher tendency to task-oriented leadership style while there was no relationship between gender and task and relational leadership among women. This inconsistency might be due to the small sample size and the fact that the current study was conducted only on non-governmental employees.

Third, regarding rating employees' gender-role identity, gender does not affect predicting employees' gender-role identity, while gender-role identity can predict employees' transformational leadership. This study's result indicated that those who were higher on their agentic attribute tend to show more transformational and transactional leadership styles than those who rated themselves higher on communal attributes. This means that both transformational and transactional leadership styles are more common and used by employees with the agentic attribute, and there is no gender-based stereotypical perception of one's own transformational leadership style. This might be because leadership in general is perceived as more of a masculine characteristic than a feminine characteristic regardless of gender, as found by Sikdar and Mitra (2009). However, those who were highly communal than agentic tend to show more of both task-oriented and relationship-oriented behaviors. This means that communal employees would show more task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership styles, while no prediction for agentic employees, which can be due to the strong association between these two

leadership styles. As Boatwright and Forrest (2000) stated that these two leadership behaviors were perceived as complementary and would work better when a leader combines them in their leadership style.

Fourth, the bootstrapping mediation analysis provided statistically significant results for agentic attributes and non-significant results for communal attributes mediating the relationship between gender and female leader's leadership style. Employees' agentic attributes mediate the relationship between their gender and female leader's transactional and task-oriented leadership. This means that those who have higher agentic attribute would rate a female leader higher on transactional and task-oriented leadership, regardless of participants' gender. This indicates that this is not employees' gender that leads them towards choosing a female leader's style; rather, it is how they define their gender identity that affects the way they see women's leadership style in Afghanistan. However, participants' communal attribute had no effect on predicting a female leader's leadership style. This is in contrast with Kark et al. (2012) study that found a stronger association between a leader's transformational leadership (as a whole) and perceived femininity than perceived masculinity. They found that the lower the managers' femininity, the greater the difference between male and female transformational leadership, but they did not find a significant effect regarding masculinity and male and female transformational leadership. This is the opposite of the belief that women are seen as more transformational than men, even if men show more communal attributes than agentic (Saint-Michel, 2018).

Implications and Direction for Future Studies

This study contributes to understanding leadership qualities in an Afghan context and how women's leadership is perceived among Afghan employees. It contributes to theory and practices of leadership in Afghanistan related to gender-based stereotypes. This study's findings will be used for future research and implications by Industrial/ Organizational psychologists, leadership researchers, and gender studies investigators in an Afghan context.

Moreover, this study revealed that researchers need to Consider gender-role identity, rather than simply gender, to study leadership style. Gender was not able to predict leadership styles, while the participants' sex-role identity was a significant predictor of their and women's leadership styles. Findings of this research, improving by future studies, would help Afghan HR, I/O, and leadership programs practitioners to design and implement better leadership training based on research conducted in Afghanistan, rather than those in western countries. This study would help design training programs for expatriate staff willing to work in Afghanistan based on Afghans' preferred leadership styles, as most of them come from western, developed countries to Afghanistan as a country with different cultures, values, and expectations.

This research could be an initial step toward academically studying leadership, women's leadership, stereotypical perception of leadership in Afghanistan. Future studies may be conducted on leadership in governmental organizations and investigate governmental employees' tendency toward leadership styles of themselves and women's leadership. Studies might be conducted on how gender-based stereotypical perception of governmental employees can affect women's leadership in Afghanistan. Researchers need to consider studying gender-

role identity as their predictor in addition to gender and to compare the differences between governmental and non-governmental organizations.

Future studies may need to be focused on the relationship between one's leadership and its impact on rating women's leadership in Afghanistan. To study this relationship, further analyses were run on the current dataset. The results were interesting, as participants higher on transformational leadership rated female leaders higher on transformational leadership. Participants higher on transactional leadership rated female leaders higher on transactional, participants higher on relationship-oriented rated female leaders higher on relational leadership. There was congruency between participants' leadership style and their perceptions of women's leadership styles. However, the task-oriented leadership style of participants did not predict a female leader's task orientation. This showed that participants' leadership styles were more congruent with female leaders' leadership styles than their gender-role identity and gender. The possible explanation for this congruency might be the projection. The projection occurs when followers rate their female leader's leadership style according to their own potential leadership quality.

Finally, future studies may need to be conducted on the relationship between gender identity and women's leadership style through one's own leadership styles. All the mediation effects were significant when the bootstrapping method was run to investigate if participants' leadership style can predict women's leadership styles in Afghanistan despite employees' communal and agentic attributes.

Limitation

Like every study, this study had some limitations. First of all, a lack of access to enough academic resources in Afghanistan on leadership and gender-based issues affected this research. A part of the few studies published in journal articles, it was found that most of the resources are those that are published as a report of developmental projects and organizations' work.

The second major limitation of this study was a lack of enough support for academic research in Afghanistan. Data collection, using snowball method, took a long time and required many networking efforts in Afghanistan to contribute and publish the survey link on their social media to get the minimum sample size. The third limitation, related to the second one, was a large number of missing data, especially on female leader's leadership styles. A considerable number of missing data would question the importance of the survey and the importance of women's leadership in Afghanistan. As the number of missing data was so high, it was not a good idea to replace it with mean as it decreased the variability of the responses. To solve this problem, a Pairwise solution was selected for the analyses. The following points can be thought of as the reasons for missing data.

It is assumed that the length of the survey, 177 items, caused demotivation in participants to take the survey thoroughly. However, a lack of interest in women's leadership in a traditional, masculine country might be another reason that participants left the survey items unanswered.

The second reason for the missing data could be a possibility of software error, as some of the participants conducted the researcher and asked for the link directly. This issue might cause other participants to either not taking the survey or not finishing the survey.

Third, as a developing country after many years of war, Afghan women do not hold leadership positions as much as they do in a developed country. This might affect some participants not being able to think of any specific female leader to evaluate so that they did not answer the female leader's section of the survey.

Finally, this study may not fully represent all Afghanistan population due to use of only non-governmental employees, and future studies need to survey governmental employees, too. Thus, future studies need to consider the above limitations in their studies and take actions to reduce their effects.

To sum up, despite all the challenges, this study revealed that Afghan non-governmental employees' leadership style is more transformational and relationship-oriented, while they perceive their female leaders to be more transformational and task-oriented. Female employees practice both task-oriented and relationship-oriented, while gender cannot differentiate male and female's transformational leadership. Finally, employees with higher agentic attributes perceive Afghan female leaders to be more transactional and task-oriented regardless of their gender, while the communal attribute of employees cannot predict their perception toward women's leadership styles. It is concluded that this is not gender that determines women's leadership styles perception among nongovernmental employees, but this is how employees define themselves as agentic or communal that may affect their perception of women's leadership style in Afghanistan. Thus, future studies need to focus on gender-role identity in the Afghan population.

References

Akseer, T., Hayat, K., Keats, C. E., Kazimi, R. S., Maxwell-Jones, C., Shiwan, S. M., . . .

    Yousufzai, A. F. (2019). Afghanistan in 2019: A survey of the Afghan people. T.

    Akseer & J. Rieger (Eds.). *The Asia Foundation*

Amiri, R., Hunt, S., & Sova, J. (2004). Transition within tradition: Women's participation in

    restoring Afghanistan. *Sex Roles, 51* (5/6), 283- 291. Retrieved from

    https://doi:0360-0025/04/0900-0283/0

Ardichvili, A., & Gasparishvili, A. (2001). Socio-cultural values, internal work culture and

    leadership styles in four post-communist countries: Russia, Georgia, Kazakhstan

    and the Kyrgyz Republic. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management,*

    1, 227-242.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire [Third Edition*

    Manual].

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Manual and Sampler*

    Set (3rd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.

Ayaz, M. Q. (2018). Leadership behavior and work effectiveness: Investigating private health

    sector Jalalabad, Afghanistan. *American Journal of Financial Management, 1* (1),

    1-10.

Badura, K. L., Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Yan, T. T., & Jeon, G. (2018). Gender and

leadership emergence: A meta-analysis and explanatory model. *Personnel*

Psychology, *71*(3), 335–367. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12266

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, Better, Best. *Organizational Dynamics*, *13*(3), 26–40.

https://doi-org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2

Bargeron, M. D., Block, J. C., & Echtenkamp, A. B. (2006). Disabling the able: Stereotype threat

and women's work performance. *Human Performance, 19*(2), 133-158.

Bem, S. L. (1981). *Bem Sex-Role Inventory*.

Boatwright, K. J., & Forrest, L. (2000). Leadership preferences: The influence of gender and

needs for connection on workers' ideal preferences for leadership behaviors. *The*

Journal of Leadership Studies, 7(2), 18-34.

Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-

factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 11* (2)*,* 238-263

Carver, L. F., Vafaei, A., Guerra, R., Freire, A., & Phillips, S. P. (2013) Gender Differences:

Examination of the 12-Item Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI-12) in an Older

Brazilian Population. *PLOS ONE, 8*(10): e76356.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0076356

Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership

    in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership

    processes across cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3),* 233–274.

Duehr, E. E., & Bono, E. J. (2006). Men, women, and managers: Are stereotypes finally

    changing? *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 815-846.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the

    evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 807-834. Retrieved from

    https://doi:10.1016/j.leagua.2003.09.004

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become*

    leaders. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Eagly, A. H., & Heilman, M. E. (2016). Gender and leadership: Introduction to the special issue.

    The Leadership Quarterly, 27, 349-353. Retrieved from

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.04.002

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational,

    transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing

    women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(4), 569-591.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis.

    Psychological Bulletin, *108*(2), 233-256.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(5), 685-710.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*(3), 573-598. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295X.109.3.573

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G., (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*(1), 3-22.

Echavez, R. C., Mosawi, M. S., & RE Pilongo, W. L. (2016). The other side of gender inequality: Men and masculinities in Afghanistan. *Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit*

Effelsberg, D., Solga, M., & Gurt, J. (2014). Getting followers to transcend their self-interest for the benefit of their company: Testing a core assumption of transformational leadership theory. *Journal of Business Psychology, 29*, 131-143. Retrieved from http://doi:10.1007/s10869-013-9305-x

Embry, A., Padgett, M. Y., & Caldwell, C. B. (2008). Can leaders step outside of the gender box: An examination of leadership and gender role stereotypes. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 15*(1), 30-45.

Fayyaz, H., Naheed, R., & Hasan, A. (2014). Effect of task-oriented and relational leadership style on employess performance; Moderating impact of communicator competence. *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research, 3,* 1-9

Garcia-Retamero, R. & Lopez-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles, 55,* 51-61

Henkel, T. G., Marion, J. W., & Bourdeau, D. T. (2019). Project manager leadership behavior: Task-Oriented Versus Relationship-Oriented. *Journal of Leadership Education, 18*(2). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.12806/V18/I2/R8

Hernandez Bark, A. S., Escartín, J., Schuh, S. C., & Dick, R. (2016). Who leads more and why? A mediation model from gender to leadership role occupancy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(3), 473–483. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2642-0

Hoyt, C. L. & Burnette, J. L. (2013). Gender bias in leadership evaluations: Merging implicit theories and role congruity perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulettin*, *39*(10), 1306–1319. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213493643

Huang, K. Y., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2009). Stress, task, and relationship orientation of Taiwanese Adults: An examination of gender in this high-context culture. *Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237409419

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 755-768.

Junussova, M., Iamshchikova, M., Hashim, N., Khan, A. M., Kakar, P., Wardak, F., & Rajabi, S. (2019). The role of women in the economic development of Afghanistan. *University of Central Asia*

Kaifi, A. B., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2010). Transformational leadership of Afghans and Americans: A study of culture, age and gender. *Journal of Service Science & Management*, *3*, 150-158. https://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2010.31019

Karim, J., Weisz, R., & Ur Rehman, S. (2011). International positive and negative affect schedule short-form (I-PANAS-SF): Testing for factorial invariance across cultures. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 2016-2022. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.046

Kark, R. (2004). The transformational leader: Who is (s)he? A feminist perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(2), 160–176. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810410530593

Kark, R., Waismel-Manor, R., & Shamir, B. (2012). Does valuing androgyny and femininity lead to a female advantage? The relationship between gender-role, transformational leadership and identification. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 23(3), 620–640. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.12.012

Koo, H., & Park, C. (2018). Foundation of leadership in Asia: Leader characteristics and leadership styles review and research agenda. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 35*, 697-718. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-017-9548-6

Larson, A. (2016). Women and power: Mobilizing around Afghanistan's Elimination of Violence Against Women Law. *Overseas Development Institute.* 1-38.

Madden, M. (2011). Four gender stereotypes of leaders: Do they influence leadership in higher education? *Wagadu, 9,* 55-88.

Maher, J. K. (1997). Gender-related stereotypes of transformational and transactional leadership. *Sex Roles, 37*(3/4), 209-225. Retrieved from https://doi.org/0360-0025/0800-0209S12.50/0

Manganaro, L. L., & Alozie, O. N. (2011). Gender role attitudes: Who supports expanded rights for women in Afghanistan? *Sex Roles, 64,* 516-529. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-9931-6

Manyak, T. G., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2013). Task and relationship orientations of Ugandans and Americans. *International Business and Management, 6* (1)*,* 12-20. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3968/j.ibm.1923842820130601.1010

Martin, J. (2015). Transformational and transactional leadership: An exploration of gender, experience, and institution type. *Libraries and The Academy, 15*(2), 331-351. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2015.0015

Mikkelson, A. C., Sloan, D., & Hesse, C. (2019). Relational communication messages and leadership styles in supervisor/employee relationships. *International Journal of Business Communication, 56* (4), 586-604. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488416687267

Mujtaba, B. G. (2019). Leadership orientation of Afghan and Japanese respondents: A study of "Guzaara" or getting along in Asia. *Information Management and Business Review, 11* (1), 24-39.

Mujtaba, B. G. & Sadat, S. K. (2010). Leadership knowledge of local and expatriate Afghans: Are they leaning more toward tasks or relationships. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 1* (3), 1-12.

Mutabai, C., Yussuf, I. A., Timamy, F., Ngugi, P., Waraiciri, P., & Kwa, N. (2016). Patriarchal societies and women leadership: Comparative analysis of developed and developing nations. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 4*(3), 356-366

Nijat, A., & Murtazashvii, J. (2015). *Women's Leadership roles in Afghanistan.* United States Institute of Peace, 3, 150-158. https://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2010.31019

Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: theory & practice* (8th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE

    Publication.

Paludi, A. M. & Coates, E. B. (Eds.). (2011a). *Women as transformational leaders: From*

    grassroots to global interests. Vol.1. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Paludi, A. M. & Coates, E. B. (Eds.). (2011b). *Women as transformational leaders: From*

    grassroots to global interests. Vol.2. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Park, S., Han, S. J., Hwang, S. J., & Park, C. K. (2019). Comparison of leadership styles in

    Confucian Asian countries. *Human Resource Development International, 22,* 91-100.

Preacher, K. J. & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects

    in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 36*

    (4)*,* 717-731.

Ruzgar, N. (2018). The effect of leaders' adoption of task-oriented or relationship-oriented

    leadership style on leader-member exchange (LMX), in the organizations that are active

    in service sector: A research on tourism agencies. *Journal of Business Administration*

    Research, 7 (1)*,* 50-60. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.5430/jbar.v7n1p50

Powell, N. G., Butterfield, A. D., & Parent, D. J. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes:

    Have the Times changed? *Journal of Management, 28*(2), 177-193

Saint-Michel, S. E. (2018). Leader gender stereotypes and transformational leadership: Does leader sex make the difference? *Management*, 21(3), 944–966. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3917/mana.213.0944

Samanta, I., & Lamprakis, A. (2018). Modern leadership types and outcomes: The case of Greek public sectors. *Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, 23(1), 173–191. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi/2018.23.1.173

Shanmugam, M., Amaratunga, R. D. G., & Haigh, R. P. (2007). *Leadership styles: Gender similarities, differences and perceptions.* University of Salford Institutional Repository. http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/37269/.

Sikdar, A., & Mitra, S. (2009). An exploration of gender stereotypes in perception and practice of leadership, Global Conference on Business and Economics. *Cambridge University Press*, 1-8.

Stelter, N. Z. (2002). Gender differences in leadership: Current social issues and future organizational implications. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 8* (4)*, 88-99

Taberno, C., Chambel, M. J., Curral, L., & Arana, J. M. (2009). The role of task-oriented versus relationship-oriented leadership on normative contract and group performance. *Social Behavior and Personality, 37* (10)*, 1391-1404. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2009.37.10.1391

Thompson, E. R. (2007). Development and validation of an internationally reliable short-form of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 38-227.

Thompson, J. R. (2015). Dying to lead: Women leaders in Afghanistan during the 2012-2014 transition and beyond. *Information Age Publishin, Inc.* 3-22.

Van Engen, L. M., Der Leeden, V. R., & Willemsen, M. T. (2001). Gender, context and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 581-598.

Weber, S. N. (n.d.). *Women on Boards*. California Secretary of State. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/women-boards.

Wu, W., Lin, C., & Lee, L. (2000). Personal characters, decision-making patterns and leadership styles of female managers: A comparative study of American, Taiwanese, and Japanese female managers. *Cross Cultural Management - An International Journal*, 7(4), 18-32.

Zeinbadi, R. H. (2013). Social exchange outcomes of transformational leadership: Comparing male and female principals of public primary schools in Iran. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(7), 730–743

Appendix A

Research Questionnaire (Sample Items)

Consent Form
You are invited to participate in a research study about perception of Women's Leadership styles in Kabul, Afghanistan. This research is a part of a thesis project for the Master of Science in Industrial/ Organizational Psychology at St. Cloud State University. It will take approximately 30 minutes of your time to complete. The purpose of this research is to investigate Afghan employees' attitudes toward women's leadership in Afghanistan.
If you agree to be part of the research study, you will be asked to answer several questions about the leadership style of yourself and a female leader. Pick a female leader that you know as a supervisor, colleague, or a national leader and rate the female leader on this study's questions.
Data that will be collected is confidential. Participating in this study is completely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with your employer or the researcher. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.
If you have questions about this research study, you may contact the researcher, Sakina Hassani at shassani@go.stcloudstate.edu or the advisor, Dr. Protolipac at dsprotolipac@stcloudstate.edu . Results of the study can be requested from the researcher.
Chose the option "Yes, I agree." if you are at least 18 years of age, you have read the information provided above, and you have consent to participate.

Gender: Male Female	Afghanistan Citizen: Yes No	Education Level: Some High school High School Graduate Undergraduate Graduate Ph.D.	Age:
Where do you currently work?		1.Kabul 2.Other provinces	
Which organization do you currently work in?		1.Governmental Organization 2.Non-governmental organization	

BSRI Items	Response Items: Please rate yourself on each item on a scale from 1 (Never or almost never true) to 7 (Almost always true).						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Love children							
Defend my own beliefs							
Conscientious							
Unsystematic							

PANAS Items:	Response Items: Please rate your feeling at the moment using a scale of 1 to 5 for each item.				
	1: Not at all	2: A little	3: Moderately	4: Quite a Bit	5:Extremely
Active					
Determined					
Attentive					
Inspired					
Alert					
Afraid					
Nervous					
Upset					
Hostile					
Ashamed					

MLQ Items: Participants	Response Items: Please rate yourself on each item on a scale from 0 to 4.				
	0: Not at all	1: Once in a while	2: Sometimes	3: Fairly often	4:Frequently, if not always
I talk optimistically about the future					
I spend time teaching and coaching					
I avoid making decisions					
The Leadership Style Questionnaire Items: Participants	Response Items: Please rate yourself on each item on a scale from 1 to 5.				
	1: Never	2: Seldom	3: Occasionally	4:Often	5: Always
1. I tell group members what they are supposed to do					
2. I act friendly with members of the group					
3. I set standards of performance for group members.					
4. I help others in the group feel comfortable					
MLQ Items: Female Leader	Response Items: Please rate an ideal female leader you would like to have on each item on a scale from 0 to 4.				
	0: Not at all	1: Once in a while	2: Sometimes	3: Fairly often	4:Frequently, if not always
She talks optimistically about the future					

She spends time teaching and coaching					
She avoids making decisions					
The Leadership Style Questionnaire Items: Female leader	**Response Items: Please rate your female leader on each item on a scale from 1 to 5.**				
	1: Never	2: Seldom	3: Occasionally	4:Often	5: Always
1. She tells group members what they are supposed to do					
2. She acts friendly with members of the group					
3. She sets standards of performance for group members.					
4. She helps others in the group feel comfortable					

Appendix B

Table 1

Descriptive and Correlations

Variables	N	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Gender	192	1.46	0.50													
2. Age	138	30.51	6.30	-0.378												
3. Education	198	3.24	0.51	0.039	.229**											
4. PANAS Positive	179	3.68	0.87	-0.056	-0.128	-0.039	0.81									
5. PANAS Negative	157	2.03	0.90	-0.018	-0.076	-0.028	-.388**	0.84								
6. PANAS	179	2.93	0.66	-0.021	-0.17	-0.087	.589**	.606**								
7. BSRI (Agentic)	157	4.86	1.08	-0.151	0.083	-0.017	.389**	-0.16	.207**	0.81						
8. BSRIf (Communal)	150	5.49	1.10	-0.027	0.012	0.071	.365**	-.257**	0.024	.672**	0.89					
9. BSRI	159	5.02	0.94	-0.040	0.034	0.03	.448**	-.205*	.249**	.906**	.880**					
10. Contingent Rewards Self	136	4.06	0.69	0.023	0.014	0.164	.249**	-.200*	-0.037	.482**	.488**	.518**	0.61			
11. Intellectual Stimulation Self	133	4.16	0.63	-0.038	0.051	0.141	.261**	-0.145	0.073	.455**	.510**	.562**	.604**	0.65		
12. Management-by-exception Passive Self	131	3.26	0.84	-0.028	-0.021	-0.162	-0.023	0.109	.179*	0.126	0.129	.199*	.177*	0.171	0.56	
13. Management-by-exception Active Self	131	3.76	0.75	-0.146	-0.049	-0.118	.179*	-0.088	.177*	.235**	0.172	.277**	.328**	.410**	.308**	0.6
14. Laissez-Faire Self	130	2.60	0.90	-0.014	-0.044	-0.068	-0.06	.197*	0.163	0.025	-0.053	-0.009	0.003	-0.122	.472**	.240**
15. Idealized Behavior Self	132	4.04	0.67	-0.046	0.085	0.066	0.149	0.024	.181*	.431**	.344**	.454**	.513**	.574**	.279**	.409**
16. Idealized Attribute Self	130	3.85	0.71	-0.085	-0.149	-0.064	0.148	-0.007	0.136	.328**	.187*	.232**	.396**	.223*	.243**	.320**
17. Idealized total Self	132	3.95	0.56	-0.061	-0.052	0	.193*	0.018	.215*	.485**	.336**	.444**	.574**	.494**	.349**	.443**
18. Inspirational Motivation Self	129	4.10	0.66	0.106	-0.112	0.033	.297**	-0.176	0.124	.409**	.402**	.455**	.636**	.648**	.232**	.336**
19. Individualized Consideration Self	128	4.03	0.69	0.068	-0.094	0.094	.228**	-0.113	0.121	.449**	.489**	.492**	.592**	.607**	.248**	.513**
20. Transformational Self	134	4.06	0.54	0.025	-0.045	0.081	.251**	-0.12	0.099	.513**	.513**	.554**	.702**	.819**	.299**	.500**
21. Transactional Self	136	3.77	0.56	-0.045	-0.001	0.024	.192*	-0.109	0.041	.449**	.446**	.521**	.842**	.603**	.621**	.656**
22. Contingent Rewards FL	111	3.89	0.82	0.017	0.001	0.147	.210*	-0.147	0.052	.247**	.351**	.348**	.368**	.272**	.206*	0.165
23. Intellectual Stimulation FL	108	3.94	0.87	-0.070	-0.033	0.045	.340**	-0.111	.218*	.341**	.347**	.394**	.306**	.375**	0.151	0.181
24. Management-by-exception Passive FL	103	3.27	0.86	-0.017	-0.044	-0.077	-0.063	0.078	0.18	0.055	0.145	0.145	.237*	0.13	.559**	.387**
25. Management-by-exception Active FL	101	3.71	0.66	0.017	-0.084	-0.066	0.119	-0.123	0.084	0.121	0.141	.210*	.292**	.276**	.309**	.472**
26. Laissez-Faire FL	102	2.84	0.92	-.207*	0.124	-0.035	0.019	0.111	0.161	0.167	0.03	0.109	0.013	-0.161	.368**	.325**
27. Idealized Behavior FL	103	3.96	0.75	-0.053	-0.051	0.014	.295**	-0.189	0.137	.313**	.376**	.415**	.430**	.432**	.214*	.363**
28. Idealized Attribute FL	103	3.88	0.85	-0.027	-0.095	-0.015	0.191	-0.129	0.076	.232*	.282**	.239*	.305**	0.099	0.128	0.081
29. Idealized total FL	103	3.91	0.70	-0.046	-0.083	0	.271**	-0.171	0.122	.309**	.375**	.369**	.415**	.291**	.196*	.247*
30. Inspirational Motivation FL	104	4.06	0.80	-0.111	-0.099	0.017	.294**	-0.187	0.117	.232*	.376**	.355**	.281**	.317**	0.149	0.164
31. Individualized Consideration FL	101	3.88	0.84	-0.131	-0.03	-0.031	.232*	-0.147	0.077	.262**	.308**	.307**	.329**	.215*	0.118	0.179
32. Transformational FL	109	3.94	0.79	-0.031	-0.077	0.054	.342**	-0.132	.236*	.318**	.349**	.395**	.337**	.359**	.206*	0.16
33. Transactional FL	111	3.69	0.65	0.025	-0.01	0.088	0.164	-0.087	0.198	.198*	.292**	.305**	.365**	.265**	.401**	.349**
34. Task-Oriented behavior Self	111	4.19	0.67	0.122	-0.013	0.02	.313**	-.397**	-0.033	.380**	.477**	.500**	.435**	.622**	0.025	.230*
35. Relationship-oriented behavior Self	109	4.23	0.58	-0.011	-0.06	0.128	.210*	-.278**	-0.023	.414**	.481**	.520**	.500**	.583**	0.13	.258**
36. Total Behavior Self	112	4.20	0.61	0.081	-0.04	0.085	.272**	-.362**	-0.036	.404**	.500**	.528**	.492**	.625**	0.07	.254*
37. Task-Oriented behavior FL	107	4.09	0.86	0.081	-0.051	0.044	.197*	-.233*	0.004	.215*	.362**	.387**	.407**	.454**	0.083	0.183
38. Relationship-oriented behavior FL	106	4.02	0.83	0.028	-0.044	0.007	0.15	-.259*	0.025	0.141	.259**	.293**	.332**	.379**	0.088	.203*
39. Total Behavior FL	108	4.05	0.83	0.067	-0.052	0.043	.218*	-.257*	0.061	.222*	.334**	.395**	.397**	.439**	0.087	.202*

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Reliability estimates are provided in diagonal.
FL= Female Leader Self= Participants

Descriptives and Correlations

Variables	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
1. Gender															
2. Age															
3. Education															
4. PANAS Positive															
5. PANAS Negative															
6. PANAS															
7. BSRI (Agentic)															
8. BSRIf (Communal)															
9. BSRI															
10. Contingent Rewards Self															
11. Intellectual Stimulation Self															
12. Management-by-exception Passive Self															
13. Management-by-exception Active Self															
14. Laissez-Faire Self	0.65														
15. Idealized Behavior Self	0.021	0.62													
16. Idealized Attribute Self	0.16	.290**	0.41												
17. Idealized total Self	0.141	.805**	.798**												
18. Inspirational Motivation Self	-0.035	.659**	.307**	.614**	0.66										
19. Individualized Consideration Self	0.071	.672**	.427**	.677**	.652**	0.6									
20. Transformational Self	0.019	.799**	.494**	.808**	.867**	.872**	0.87								
21. Transactional Self	.270**	.585**	.437**	.653**	.612**	.630**	.740**	0.7							
22. Contingent Rewards FL	0.1	.328**	.204*	.335**	.324**	.431**	.407**	.366**	0.76						
23. Intellectual Stimulation FL	0.049	.358**	0.183	.356**	.426**	.383**	.452**	.305**	.721**	0.82					
24. Management-by-exception Passive FL	.326**	.218*	.277**	.309**	0.166	.308**	.269**	.502**	.199*	0.027	0.6				
25. Management-by-exception Active FL	.253*	.204*	0.17	.231*	.358**	.366**	.366**	.481**	.410**	.370**	.304**	0.38			
26. Laissez-Faire FL	.463**	0.028	.235*	0.174	-0.077	0.086	0.003	.273**	-0.133	-.217*	.413**	.214*	0.66		
27. Idealized Behavior FL	0.047	.466**	.416**	.530**	.442**	.517**	.564**	.478**	.734**	.741**	0.093	.364**	-0.176	0.7	
28. Idealized Attribute FL	0.139		.631**	.483**	0.156	.232*	.272**	.273**	.479**	.495**	0.057	.207*	0.064	.535**	0.63
29. Idealized total FL	0.111	.332**	.606**	.578**	.333**	.416**	.469**	.424**	.686**	.697**	0.091	.320**	-0.049	.859**	.891**
30. Inspirational Motivation FL	0.029	.340**	.265**	.362**	.374**	.361**	.412**	.290**	.717**	.782**	0.051	.305**	-.299**	.778**	.548**
31. Individualized Consideration FL	0.129	0.192	.406**	.356**	0.177	.286**	.301**	.314**	.661**	.750**	0.013	.413**	-0.061	.683**	.732**
32. Transformational FL	0.096	.372**	.282**	.432**	.407**	.416**	.466**	.338**	.773**	.920**	0.058	.393**	-0.18	.847**	.716**
33. Transactional FL	.258**	.329**	.261**	.376**	.354**	.484**	.439**	.482**	.883**	.615**	.617**	.663**	0.132	.609**	.379**
34. Task-Oriented behavior Self	-.213*	.422**	.267**	.407**	.501**	.466**	.572**	.341**	.408**	.370**	0.022	.252*	-.241*	.472**	.271**
35. Relationship-oriented behavior Sel	-0.1	.541**	.381**	.544**	.526**	.521**	.640**	.444**	.443**	.370**	0.132	.224*	-0.168	.541**	.316**
36. Total Behavior Self	-0.171	.488**	.326**	.480**	.529**	.508**	.619**	.409**	.445**	.383**	0.076	.246*	-.214*	.521**	.301**
37. Task-Oriented behavior FL	-0.048	.379**	.288**	.400**	.418**	.405**	.505**	.358**	.582**	.509**	0.081	.286**	-.278**	.650**	.465**
38. Relationship-oriented behavior FL	-0.058	.364**	.216*	.343**	.295**	.330**	.394**	.289**	.527**	.453**	0.089	.219*	-0.245	.582**	.412**
39. Total Behavior FL	-0.057	.388**	.263**	.388**	.374**	.385**	.469**	.348**	.571**	.502**	0.088	.262**	-.277**	.643**	.458**

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

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

Reliability estimates are provided in diagonal.

FL= Female Leader   Self= Participants

Variables	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39
1. Gender											
2. Age											
3. Education											
4. PANAS Positive											
5. PANAS Negative											
6. PANAS											
7. BSRI (Agentic)											
8. BSRIf (Communal)											
9. BSRI											
10. Contingent Rewards Self											
11. Intellectual Stimulation Self											
12. Management-by-exception Passive Self											
13. Management-by-exception Active Self											
14. Laissez-Faire Self											
15. Idealized Behavior Self											
16. Idealized Attribute Self											
17. Idealized total Self											
18. Inspirational Motivation Self											
19. Individualized Consideration Self											
20. Transformational Self											
21. Transactional Self											
22. Contingent Rewards FL											
23. Intellectual Stimulation FL											
24. Management-by-exception Passive FL											
25. Management-by-exception Active FL											
26. Laissez-Faire FL											
27. Idealized Behavior FL											
28. Idealized Attribute FL											
29. Idealized total FL											
30. Inspirational Motivation FL	.750**	0.84									
31. Individualized Consideration FL	.787**	.716**	0.76								
32. Transformational FL	.888**	.905**	.904**	0.93							
33. Transactional FL	.560**	.575**	.543**	.660**	0.71						
34. Task-Oriented behavior Self	.417**	.452**	.275**	.428**	.355**	0.9					
35. Relationship-oriented behavior Self	.484**	.524**	.304**	.468**	.420**	.841**	0.84				
36. Total Behavior Self	.463**	.506**	.298**	.467**	.404**	.969**	.950**	0.93			
37. Task-Oriented behavior FL	.629**	.657**	.435**	.590**	.501**	.544**	.658**	.585**	0.94		
38. Relationship-oriented behavior FL	.561**	.576**	.430**	.562**	.458**	.501**	.535**	.539**	.796**	0.92	
39. Total Behavior FL	.621**	.648**	.453**	.604**	.494**	.519**	.632**	.562**	.955**	.947**	0.96

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

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

Reliability estimates are provided in diagonal.

FL= Female Leader   Self= Participants

Appendix C

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Multivariate Analysis of Variance in transformational leadership and leadership behavior

Measure	Men		Women		F	Wilks' Lambda	Partial η2
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*			
Transformational Self	4.05	0.55	4.08	0.50			
Transactional Self	3.82	0.57	3.76	0.47	0.50	0.99	0.01
Laissez-Faire Self	2.61	0.92	2.58	0.87			
Task-Oriented	4.14	0.70	4.31	0.59	**3.13**	**0.94**	**0.06**
Relationship-oriented	4.238	0.59	4.241	0.53			
Agentic attributes	5.02	1.08	4.69	0.93	2.88	0.96	0.04
Communal attribute	5.52	1.16	5.47	1.09			
Transformational FL	4.03	0.56	3.87	0.84			
Transactional FL	3.71	0.57	3.68	0.62	3.05	0.91	0.09
Laissez-Faire FL	3.01	0.98	2.62	0.80			

Bold: Significant at p > .05

Appendix D

Table 3

Results of Two Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Transformational Leadership and Transactional Leadership

Block	Transformational	Transactional
Block 1		
PANAS	0.08	0.02
R2	0.01	0.001
Block 2		
PANAS	0.02	0.01
Communal Attribute	**0.50**	**0.45**
R2	**0.26**	**0.199**
ΔR2	**0.25**	**0.198**
Block 3		
PANAS	-0.02	-0.027
Communal Attribute	**0.23**	**0.26**
Agentic Attribute	**0.36**	**0.306**
R2	**0.34**	**0.256**
ΔR2	**0.08**	**0.057**

Note. All regression weights reported in the table are standardized.
Bold: Significant at $p > .05$

Table 4

Results of Two Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Task-oriented Leadership and Relationship-oriented Leadership

Block	Task-oriented	Relationship-oriented
Block 1		
PANAS	0.02	-0.07
R2	0.00	0.01
Block 2		
PANAS	-0.03	-0.13
Agentic Attribute	**0.38**	**0.41**
R2	**0.14**	**0.17**
Δ*R2*	**0.14**	**0.17**
Block 3		
PANAS	0.00	-0.09
Agentic Attribute	0.11	0.17
Communal Attribute	**0.40**	**0.36**
R2	**0.23**	**0.25**
Δ*R2*	**0.09**	**0.07**

Note. All regression weights reported in the table are standardized.
Bold= Significant at p < .05

Appendix E

Table 5

Results of Bootstrapping Mediation Analysis Predicting Female Leader's Transformational Leadership by Gender Through Communal Attribute

Model	R2	F	df1	df2	p	LLCI	ULCI
Model							
Constant					0.0000	1.5361	3.4097
Gender					0.6391	-0.3661	0.2258
Communal Attribute	**0.1246**	7.1135	2.0000	100.0000	0.0003	0.1291	0.4198
Indirect effect						*BootLLCI*	*BootULCI*
Communal Attribute						-0.944	0.1403

Bold: Significant at p > .05

Table 6

Results of Bootstrapping Mediation Analysis Predicting Female Leader's Transactional Leadership by Gender Through Agentic Attribute

Model	R2	F	df1	df2	p	LLCI	ULCI
Model							
Constant					0.0000	1.9902	3.6405
Gender					0.4278	-0.1550	0.3628
Agentic Attribute	0.0462	2.4957	2.0000	103.0000	0.0291	0.0150	0.2739
Indirect effect						*BootLLCI*	*BootULCI*
Agentic Attribute						-0.1607	-0.0020

Bold: Significant at p > .05

Table 7

Results of Bootstrapping Mediation Analysis Predicting Female Leader's Relationship-Oriented Leadership by Gender Through Communal Attribute

Model	R2	F	df1	df2	p	LLCI	ULCI
Model							
Constant					0.0000	1.7684	3.8168
Gender					0.7309	-0.2688	0.3819
Communal Attribute	**0.0627**	3.2442	2.0000	97.0000	0.0128	0.0428	0.3510
Indirect effect						*BootLLCI*	*BootULCI*
Communal Attribute						-0.1187	0.0744

Bold: Significant at p > .05

Table 8

Results of Bootstrapping Mediation Analysis Predicting Female Leader's Task-Oriented Leadership by Gender Through Agentic Attribute

Model	R2	F	df1	df2	p	LLCI	ULCI
Model							
Constant					0.0000	1.449	3.6881
Gender					0.1624	-0.098	0.5766
Agentic Attribute	**0.0709**	3.7783	2.0000	99.0000	0.0101	0.0568	0.4104
Indirect effect						*BootLLCI*	*BootULCI*
Agentic Attribute						-0.2391	-0.0035

Bold: Significant at p > .05