**Transformational Leadership in the Canadian Forces:
Implications for Female Leaders (and Other Designated Groups)**

Literature Review

Prepared for the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute

June 2002

Submitted by:

Dr. Catherine Loughlin
Faculty of Management
University of Toronto
Toronto, ON

Kara A. Arnold
Ph.D. Candidate
School of Business
Queen's University
Kingston, ON

Transformational Leadership in the Canadian Forces:
Implications for Female Leaders (and Other Designated Groups)

"Leadership…the art of influencing human behaviour to accomplish
a mission in the manner desired by the leader" (CFP318)

"Leadership…the ability to hide your panic from others" (anonymous)

There are as many definitions of leadership as there are contexts in which it is

demonstrated. The first definition offered above is from the Department of National Defence,

and is the official definition of leadership in the Canadian Forces. Unfortunately, this definition

evokes as many questions as it answers (e.g., what if the leader's desires are counter-

productive?). The second definition was given to one of the authors by a seasoned military

officer, and may be truer than most of us care to acknowledge (particularly in a military context).

Regardless of which definition one prefers (and we could have offered many more to choose

from), ambiguity surrounding the definition of leadership is the norm, not only within the

military, but within most public and private sector organizations today. In contrast, one thing all

of these organizations agree upon is that leadership is a key factor in organizational success.

Leaders influence the attitudes and behaviours of followers in significant ways, and followers'

perceptions of their leaders affect personal and organizational outcomes.

Few contexts more readily display the importance of effective leadership than the armed

forces, where leadership decisions can have life or death consequences. In this paper we will

focus on how leadership style interacts with sex[1] in influencing subordinates' perceptions of a

leader and their willingness to follow him or her. Transformational leadership (see p. 15-16 for

definition) is a style of leadership receiving a great deal of attention recently in academic and

business circles. By the end of this review three key questions will be investigated in this regard:

1) Is transformational leadership effective in a military setting? 2) Are women who exhibit

transformational leadership perceived as equally effective to men who exhibit this style of

leadership in a military setting? 3) What further research is needed to test the efficacy of this

leadership style within the military, and specifically for women in leadership roles?

       We begin this review by discussing the context in which the Canadian Forces currently

operate. Second, the integration of women into the military and the roles women have played in

this male dominated environment are discussed. Third, traditional models of leadership and

findings with respect to sex differences with these styles are examined. Fourth, the theory of

transformational leadership and the full range model of leadership is introduced, and the

literature investigating its effectiveness in both the military and other contexts is reviewed. Fifth,

we discuss sex-based differences in this model of leadership. Sixth, sex role stereotypes and

how these interact with the assessment and evaluation of female leaders is considered,

particularly in male dominated environments. Finally, we conclude with a summary of what is

currently known in this area and suggest promising areas for future research.

Leadership in the Canadian Forces Context

   Globalization, the unprecedented pace of technological development, intense public scrutiny

of business ethics, and increasing diversity in the workforce are all trends that are having an

impact on business as well as the Canadian Forces (CF). There have been unprecedented

leadership challenges for the CF following the collapse of the Soviet Union (Bentley, n.d.).

---

[1] As we will discuss shortly, authors have differentiated between sex as a biological distinction and gender as related to the roles of being male or female in our society, we will do likewise.

Since 1990, international forces have been transformed and this has changed the nature of

conflicts in which the CF have been involved. The 'Debrief the Leaders' Project found that "the

scope, intensity, tempo and ambiguity inherent in operations in the 1990's caught the CF

unaware" (Bentley, n.d., Executive summary p. 4). This is in contrast to previous time periods

where operations had a clearer focus and the "doctrine in the trinity of mission, own troops, self

in that order", could more easily be maintained (Bentley, n.d., p. 11). September 11, 2001 also

brought a new war on terrorism which "involve[s] a landscape of military action that is

completely unfamiliar" (Ignatieff, 2002, p. 5). Advanced technologies are having a significant

impact on how war is waged (Irwin, 2002, p. 53). Analysts have termed this a Revolution in

Military Affairs (RMA) (Irwin, 2002). Throughout this period of change, the CF have operated

under conditions of fiscal restraint and downsizing. Societal expectations of the CF have also

been changing. High profile scandals associated with Somalia and Bacovici (Bentley, n.d.),

incidents of rape, abuse, and incompetent handling of such cases (O'Hara, 1998), and public

outcry over hazing rituals in the Canadian Airborne Regiment (Winslow, 1999), have spurred an

unprecedented demand for transparency within the Forces (Bentley, n.d.). The environment in

which the CF is operating is turbulent and uncertain.

    In terms of the increasing diversity in the workforce, in the year 2000 it was estimated that

over 80% of people entering the Canadian workforce were designated group members (women,

minorities, aboriginals; Minister's Advisory Board on Canadian Forces, 2001). In addition to

this change in composition, young workers today bring with them different values and attitudes

towards work than previous generations (Loughlin & Barling, 2001). The new generation will

not be as willing to sacrifice their lives for their work and they reject older models of authority

and leadership (Loughlin & Barling, 2001). These trends will all impact on CF recruiting. If the

CF wishes to attract the best and brightest people, the integration of women, minorities and aboriginals will need to be a top priority, and the training of non-traditional and young leaders a necessity.

Currently, the Canadian Forces are dominated by white-men and the culture could be described as traditional, hierarchical, and authoritarian (Beitz &Hook, n.d.). Violence is regarded as acceptable (Workman, 1997). The white-male dominated culture of the Forces and the negative attitudes towards workforce diversity are illustrated by comments in the Minister's Advisory Board report on the Canadian Forces (2001). For example, the often negative comments about women in the Forces heard from students at the Royal Military College (RMC) dispel thoughts that younger generations will be more willing to accommodate different groups if left to their own accord. For example: "… the standards have been lowered so much for all these people that we are no longer a fighting force", "I just don't believe a woman could carry me out if I was wounded in battle", and "The Israelis tried having women in their combat units and it didn't work. Now it's our turn to be ridiculed by other countries". Negative comments were also heard with respect to aboriginals and minorities. For example, "the CF is becoming a cheap welfare form of support by bringing in all these Aboriginals", and "visible minorities are getting free education…", "minorities would not be as loyal to Canada as we are". Suffice it to say, diversity in the military is not being openly embraced.

With respect to recruiting, issues surrounding diversity in sex, sexual orientation, nationality and ethnicity must be addressed if the CF are to thrive in the coming decade. While we will focus much of our review on women in the military, it is important to realize that the issues women in leadership face are not so different from issues any designated group face (e.g., aboriginals, minorities, homosexuals). We also note that the culture of the military may also

have a negative impact on white men, even though they are the majority of the organizations'

members and leaders. For example, although women have struggled with violence, rape and

abuse in the military without supportive channels through which to complain (O'Hara, 1998),

men have also had difficulty with abuses in the Forces. Men who complain about their treatment

find themselves "struggling to overcome the same obstacles to [their] … career[s] that military

women have described facing when they spoke out about abuse" (When men are the victims,

1998, p. 19). Men may also find it difficult to deal with issues concerning family such as

relocation and prolonged separations (Workman, 1997). In this traditional and conservative

organization, a man who chooses to put his family first would be hard pressed to explain this

decision. As is so often the case, we are talking about fear of change, and the acceptance of

diversity, and this has little to do with sex, colour, or sexual orientation. This basic principle

must be borne in mind throughout our review. We cannot simply address the "issue of women in

leadership in the military" without addressing the CF's willingness to tolerate heterogeneity

among its members in general (e.g., how easy would it be for an openly homosexual male to

move into a high position in the CF?).

     Given the above, briefly considering the experience of another designated group in the CF

will set the stage for our discussion and offer insight into the challenges (and opportunities for

change) with regard to designated groups in general. With respect to sexual orientation, prior to

1988, gays and lesbians were prohibited from serving in the CF (Belkin & McNichol, 2000).

Openly homosexual individuals were prohibited from enlisting, and soldiers found to be

homosexual were dismissed. Under increasing pressure from the passage of the Canadian

Human Rights Act (CHRA) in 1978, and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1985,

the CF changed their policy in 1988. Soldiers found to be homosexual were not dismissed, but

asked to leave. If they chose to stay they would be denied promotions, training courses, security

clearances, transfers and reenlistment (Belkin & McNicol, 2000). Michelle Douglas and four

others filed suit against the CF challenging their policies on homosexuals. In 1992 the

Department of National Defence settled the case against Michelle Douglas and in so doing

acknowledged that their policy was in violation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In 1992

the ban on homosexuals serving in the CF was lifted. In 1996 same-sex couples in the CF were

accorded the same benefits as heterosexual couples (Belkin & McNichol, 2000). However, what

is most instructive for our purposes, is that lifting this ban did not have the negative

consequences so many feared before the change. In fact, fear that there would be increased

sexual harassment by homosexual soldiers, that gay-bashing would increase, that soldiers would

resign or refuse to work with homosexuals have all proven to be largely unfounded (Belkin &

McNichol, 2000). As is often the case, fear of change may be worse than change itself. This

does not mean that it comes easily, and the small number of people taking advantage of same-sex

couple benefits shows that there are still issues of acceptance with respect to sexual orientation

(e.g., of the estimated 3.5% of service personnel who are homosexual only 17 people had filed

for same-sex benefits as of April 1999; Belkin & McNichol, 2000). Nonetheless, this

demonstrates that at times policies may precede, and in fact foster, acceptance of designated

groups in the forces.

Women in the Canadian Forces and Integration into Male Dominated Occupations

In terms of women's integration into the Forces, a judgement by a Human Rights Tribunal in

1989 directed the Canadian Forces to immediately remove employment restrictions based on sex

(with the exception of submarine duty) and also gave the organization until 1999 to achieve

gender integration in both the Regular and Reserve Forces. While many aspects of the

advancement of women have improved in the CF since 1989, the Minister's Advisory Board on

Canadian Forces (2001) found that there was still significant progress to be made. This report

indicated that there continue to be barriers to women's advancement in the Canadian Forces.

Some of the barriers that have been identified include attitudes and behaviours towards women,

high attrition rates for women, and lack of flexible career options. These barriers are similar to

barriers faced by women in business (Fagenson, 1993).

    Women account for 11.8% of officers in the Canadian military and many of these women are

serving in traditionally female areas such as medical/dental and support positions (Tanner, 1999

as cited in Minster's Advisory Board, 2000). Women in the combat arms make up a smaller

percentage of the population: 2.1 % of non-commissioned members [NCM's] and 5.0 % of

officers in 1996 (Davis Report, 1997). Visible minorities make up 2.5% of the CF, and

aboriginals 1.8% (Minster's Advisory Board, 2000). The percentages for officers in the regular

force are smaller at 2% and .7% respectively (Minster's Advisory Board, 2000).

    In combat support environments women, minorities, and other designated groups may

encounter more formidable barriers than elsewhere in the military (Davis Report, 1997). The

perceptions of men with respect to the employment of women in combat arms are generally quite

negative (Davis Report, 1997). The key issues for women in combat arms include physical

standards of strength and stamina; double standards (specifically the perception of inconsistent

applications of physical standards to women); quotas which promote the perception that there is

no screening of female candidates; harassment and the lack of accountability of leaders for the

harassment; fraternization and the perception that women receive special attention from senior

males; ill-fitting kit and equipment; little or no special access to facilities for women; lack of a

critical mass of women; family issues (treatment during pregnancy, emergency and extended

childcare) and finally, morale (for both men and women; Davis Report, 1997).

One of the most pervasive problems of those listed above is that of physical achievement.

This is used as an over-riding indicator of leadership ability, and other skills that women may

possess are typically discounted. Consequently, women in leadership roles are typically

accorded less respect and support than their male counterparts (Davis Report, 1997).

The tendency for definitions of leadership to become "male normative" (i.e., based on areas

where men dominate) is not surprising. For some time now men have been the only ones doing

the defining. Authors have noted the same tendency in other areas of male dominance. For

example, in academia, some authors have cautioned against the tendency for reason and logical

thought to become synonymous with masculinity. In discourse, the masculine is taken as the

norm and the feminine as marking the difference (Katila & Merilainen, 1999). Without

overstating the role of language in discussions of leadership, we would also refer the reader to

the recent remarks made by Jacques Castonguay (military historian and psychologist) in Ottawa.

He pointed out that leadership within the CF actually varies according to linguistic origin (i.e.,

francophone versus Anglophone). For example, francophones are believed to exercise authority

in different ways than anglophones (e.g., being more likely to say "let's go" vs. "go do it").

Language can influence behaviour, and we have much to learn about how our definitions of

leadership in the military influence perceptions of leaders. New definitions of leadership must

be sought, and ones that are not based on masculine models alone are essential. Members must

accept that the nature of war/peacekeeping has changed. We are in a knowledge/technology

based era. To base definitions of leadership on outdated standards (e.g., physical strength vs.

mental ability) is to sentence the CF to stagnation and decay. We need new definitions of

leadership and new qualities associated with it, if the CF are to thrive in the years to come.

Whether it be in the military, business (Fagenson, 1993; Fine, 1987), educational institutions

(Basinger, 2001), or professions such as engineering (McKay, 1992), there are certain

similarities in the challenges that women (and individuals from designated groups) face in

traditional male dominated environments. For example, women employed in non-traditional

occupations are presumed to be at a disadvantage due to the intense scrutiny caused by their

proportional scarcity (i.e., tokenism; Kanter, 1977), their deviation from occupational norms,

expectations that men perform better on stereotypically masculine tasks, and status differentials

(Yoder, Schleicher & McDonald, 1998). Being a token (working in groups of fewer than 15%

women) has been found to be associated with increased pressure to perform, social isolation, and

with a constant fight against stereotypes to be seen as one really is (Kanter, 1977; Yoder et. al.,

1998). The violations of stereotypes that occur when women perform stereotypically male roles

may result in questions about their competency and have a negative impact on performance

appraisals (Yoder et. al., 1998). Performance and behaviour on the job tends to be evaluated

based as much on stereotypes as individual characteristics and ability (Kanter, 1977). Women in

these roles find that there is an initial "credibility gap" that must be overcome and many times

this gap is too formidable an obstacle (Yoder et. al., 1998). Women leaders in male dominated

industries report a high level of pressure from discrimination and those who enact an

interpersonally oriented leadership style have been found to report worse mental health than men

(Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999). Studies consistently show that after controlling for education

and work experience women are still less likely to be moved into positions of authority than

men, and that the percentage of women in an occupation is negatively associated with earnings.

Women in male dominated work environments are subjected to more negative interactions such as criticism and bias, as well as more sexual harassment than men (Morris, 1996). Although sexual harassment has received a fair bit of attention in recent years, it should also be noted that women frequently experience gender based harassment as well. Gender harassment refers to "generalized sexual remarks and derogatory behaviour that is gender-based and hostile but non-specific" (Parker & Griffin, in press, p. 1). Women also experience different and more negative consequences from gender harassment than do men. For women, gender harassment is associated with over-performance anxiety and psychological distress. The same relationship was not supported for men (Parker & Griffin, in press). We could extrapolate that the results women experience from sexual harassment would be even more negative than from gender harassment. Clearly women who lead in male dominated contexts have added challenges to overcome in order to be successful.

Interestingly, despite all of the negative findings discussed above, some recent research offers promise within the present context. Based on a representative sample of almost 6000 households in Israel, Kraus and Yonay (2000) found that women actually had the highest chances of having access to positions of authority (e.g., ability to promote and reward others; make policy decisions etc.) when they worked in male-dominated occupations! These authors found that both men and women in male-labelled jobs were more likely to exercise authority than women in other kinds of jobs, and that it is the nature of the job more than the sex of the employee, that affects levels of authority. In direct opposition to Kanter's theory (that women in female-organizations will have more access to authority due to increased support and influence) these authors found support for Blalock's ethnic competition theory. This theory states that because the competition between men and women is weaker in male-dominated occupations,

men have a smaller incentive to discriminate against women (or perhaps it would be more visible

if they were to do so). The authors acknowledge that some will argue that women pursuing

careers in male-dominated occupations are qualitatively different from the majority of women in

female-dominated occupations to begin with (i.e., more ambitious, career-oriented, and self-

assured by nature), and this possibility cannot yet be ruled out. Regardless, these findings run

counter to Kanter's theory and suggest that the presence of large numbers of women in an

occupation does not necessarily rectify women's lack of authority in the workplace. It is moving

into male-dominated occupations that seems to increase women's access to positions of authority

and power. Given the preponderance of male-labelled jobs available in the CF, this actually puts

the military in a better position than might have been presumed for promoting women into

positions of leadership.

Traditional Leadership Theories

   Leadership is one of the most researched topics in organizational behaviour. Among the

various theories of leadership, the behavioural perspective is the one that has been investigated

most frequently with respect to male and female differences in leadership. This approach to

leadership was developed in studies at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan

beginning in the late 1940's and in Blake and Moulton's Managerial Grid (Robbins & Langton,

2001). Two clusters of effective leader behaviours were identified. The first cluster focuses on

tasks, and was labelled 'initiating structure' (Ohio studies), 'production orientation' (Michigan

studies) or 'concern for production' (Managerial Grid). The second cluster focuses on

relationships with people, and was labelled 'consideration' (Ohio studies), 'employee

orientation' (Michigan studies) or 'concern for people' (Managerial Grid). The task oriented

cluster included behaviours such as "having subordinates follow rules and procedures,

maintaining high standards for performance, and making leader and subordinate roles explicit"
(Eagly & Johnson, 1990, p. 236). The interpersonal orientation included behaviours such as
"helping and doing favours for subordinates, looking out for their welfare, explaining
procedures, and being friendly and available" (Eagly & Johnson, 1990, p.51). These dimensions
are generally considered to be orthogonal (e.g. the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
[LBDQ]), although some researchers have conceptualized them as two ends of a continuum
(Least Preferred Co-Worker; Fiedler, 1967) (Eagly et. al., 1992). The other distinction in
leadership styles that has been investigated frequently enough to be included in meta-analyses is
the extent to which the leader behaves in a democratic fashion and encourages followers to
participate in decisions or the extent to which he/she behaves autocratically and does not allow
follower participation in decisions (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). These dimensions evolved out of
early experimental research and have been labelled democratic versus autocratic or participative
versus directive (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

Sex Differences in Traditional Theories: Task versus Interpersonal Orientations and
Participative versus Autocratic Leadership

Some authors have suggested that there is a distinctly feminine leadership style and that
women leaders are in a unique position because they are more likely to exhibit this style (c.f.
Helgesen, 1990). Prior to the early 1990's beliefs about sex and leadership styles were split in
terms of whether male/female differences were presumed to exist (practitioner literature) or were
presumed not to exist (academic literature; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Four influential meta-
analyses have been conducted over the last 10 years examining the question of sex of the leader[2]

---

[2] Note that in the leadership literature, and in organizational behaviour literature in general, biological sex is often
confused with the psychologically based concept of gender (c.f. Lefkowitz, 1994). Eagly and colleagues are
investigating sex-based differences versus gender-based differences. This confusion is also apparent in other

and the impact on leadership styles (task versus interpersonal styles and autocratic versus

democratic leadership), assessment of leaders, and effectiveness of leaders (Eagly and Johnson,

1990; Eagly, Karau & Johnson 1992a; Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992b; Eagly, Karau, &

Makhijani, 1995). Meta-analyses performed prior to Eagly and Johnson (1990) examined only a

small percentage of the studies looking at female versus male leadership styles (c.f. Dobbins &

Platz, 1986). We will briefly review Eagly and colleagues most important findings.

   Eagly and Johnson (1990) conducted a meta-analysis of 162 studies investigating sex

differences in leadership style. They hypothesized that there would be fewer differences

between male and female leadership styles in studies conducted in organizations versus in

assessment or laboratory studies. They found that women are more likely to use a democratic or

participative style of leadership, while men are more likely to use an autocratic or directive style.

The effect size was not large but the finding did hold across studies conducted in organizations

and assessment and laboratory studies. Differences in task versus interpersonal styles were small

and were affected by the methodology of the study. Studies conducted in organizations showed

less pronounced sex differences than assessment or laboratory studies. The authors also

investigated whether the context in which the leadership was enacted made a difference. When

acting in gender-congruent roles, both men and women were more task-focused. When women

were in male dominated roles they tended to become less interpersonally and democratically

focused. The authors conclude by suggesting that both the view that men and women lead in

similar ways, and the view that women lead in feminine ways need substantial revision (Eagly &

Johnson, 1990). In situations where there are no long-term role relationships (i.e.

---

disciplines such as marketing: See Fisher and Arnold (1994) for definitions of sex, gender identity and gender role
attitude as well as a discussion of this confusion in the marketing discipline. In this review, we will use the term

laboratory/experimental settings) leadership styles tend to be more gender stereotypic. In organizational settings men and women are more constrained by less diffuse social roles (i.e. role of manager) and they have also self-selected into managerial roles. Hence fewer differences arise. Context likely plays an important role in the style of leadership that is enacted.

Eagly et. al. (1992a) published a meta-analysis of a subset of 50 studies used in Eagly and Johnson (1990) to compare leadership styles specifically for principals of public schools. These findings were fairly consistent with the findings of the larger 1990 meta-analysis. There was a small yet significant tendency for female principals to score higher on task orientation than males. The largest sex difference found was that female principals were more likely to adopt a democratic or participative style and male principals were more likely to display an autocratic or directive style.

Overall these studies show that there are some differences in the way women and men lead according to traditional models of leadership. Women are more likely to use a participative style of leadership and men are more likely to use a directive style. However, the type of study is an important moderator. Women and men in organizations tend to lead using similar styles, whereas women and men in laboratory experiments exhibit more stereotypical leadership styles.

A New Full Range model of Leadership: Transformational and Transactional Leadership

The distinction between transformational and transactional leadership was proposed by Burns in 1978. Prior research and theory had been focused on leadership as an exchange (Avolio & Bass, 1988). Burns (1978) suggested that the difference between these two leadership styles was that transactional leaders attempt to meet followers' current needs and transformational leaders

---

'sex' to refer to the biological categories of male and female and the term 'gender' to refer to the psychologically based categories of feminine and masculine. While potentially overlapping they are not interchangeable.

raise the needs of followers. Bass (1985, 1998) subsequently refined the theory of

transformational leadership and demonstrated that it could be very effective in a variety of

settings. Consequently, it has received a great deal of attention in both academic and business

circles.

    Transformational leadership is part of what has been described as a 'full range model' of

leadership (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1998). The full range model of leadership is composed of

transformational leadership, contingent reward (or constructive transactions), management-by-

exception active, management-by-exception passive and laissez faire (Avolio 1999; Bass, 1998).

These components are ordered according to how effective they are. The more transformational

behaviour a leader exhibits the more effective he/she will tend to be. A fundamental assumption

of this model is that leaders will exhibit each style to some degree. Within this theoretical

framework a leader can exhibit a variety of behaviours from each component but the most

effective leaders will exhibit transformational behaviours the majority of the time (Avolio,

1999).

    Transformational leadership is composed of what are sometimes referred to as the four I's:

idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and intellectual

stimulation (Bass, 1985, 1998). The first two components are grouped together and labelled

'charismatic leadership' in some cases. Idealized influence refers to a leader who does the right

thing because it is the right thing to do. This type of leader is a role model and followers aspire to

be like him/her. A high standard of ethics and morality is part of this component (Avolio, 1999).

A leader who is inspirationally motivating is able to communicate the vision and mission of the

organization to others, and is able to successfully change the vision or mission. This component

refers to a leader who inspires others, is enthusiastic and optimistic and is able to infuse

followers work with meaning and challenge (Avolio, 1999). The intellectual stimulation component refers to a leader who encourages followers to think 'outside the box' and to generate new solutions to old problems. Creativity is encouraged and followers are also encouraged to challenge leaders to reconsider their perspectives and assumptions about issues (Avolio, 1999). Finally, an individually considerate leader spends time coaching and developing each individual follower. They treat each follower as an individual, as a 'whole' person, and get to know them as more that just an employee, a student, a soldier or a customer (Avolio, 1999, p. 48).

Transactional leadership is composed of contingent reward (also called constructive transactions; Avolio, 1999) and management by exception (active and passive) (Bass, 1998). Transactional leaders address the self-interests of followers versus moving them to go beyond self-interest as a transformational leader would. Contingent reward involves the use of transactions (reward or discipline) to gain compliance from followers. Setting clear expectations and making sure that reward or discipline follow adequate or inadequate performance, is the main focus of this component. Contingent reward or constructive transactions have been found to be reasonably effective, but not as effective as transformational behaviours (Bass, 1998). Management-by-exception active refers to actively monitoring followers' deviations from standards and mistakes and taking action immediately when such deviation is suspected. This type of leader is constantly on the look out for possible mistakes (Avolio, 1999). Management-by-exception passive refers to a leader who waits for deviations and mistakes and then takes corrective action. While many situations require management-by-exception (both active and passive) forms of corrective action, these behaviours tend to be ineffective when used in excess (Avolio, 1999).

Laissez faire is the final component in the full range model of leadership and this component refers to an absence of leadership. Avoiding decisions and abdicating responsibility are the main features of this final component (Avolio, 1999). This is, in effect, the absence of leadership.

The Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is the instrument used to measure transformational leadership in most research studies. Items for this scale were drawn from interviews with senior male executives and the leadership literature of the time (Avolio & Bass, 1988). Items were generated through interviews and literature review and were then rated as belonging to either transformational or transactional components. Items that could reliably be categorized were retained and became part of a survey that was given to U.S. Army officers (who would have been predominantly male) to rate their immediate supervisors. Principal components analysis was used to determine the transformational (charisma, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration) and transactional (contingent reward and management-by-exception) components. This theory's components and their operational measurement were developed almost exclusively based on male subjects and it have been assumed to be valid for females. The possibility that "theories and concepts which emerge solely from a male consciousness may be irrelevant for female experience and inadequate for explaining female behaviour" is something that has been explored in other areas within organization studies (Shakeshaft & Nowell, 1984, p.187). For example, Gilligan's (1982) work on female moral development challenges Kohlberg's assumption (this research was based on males) that men and women follow similar stages of moral development. In the area of leadership (including work on the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire [LBDQ] and Fiedler's contingency theory of leadership – Shakeshaft & Nowell, 1984) there has been a focus on male experiences and behaviour and there has been little investigation into the applicability of these to females (Hayes,

1999). The fact that transformational leadership measures have been validated with male

samples may suggest that they tap a more masculine style of leadership (Yammarino, Dubinsky,

Comer & Jolson, 1997). While it has been found that women do exhibit transformational styles

of leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1988). The question of whether this instrument taps a masculine

style is one that requires further investigation. Regardless, the fact that these leadership

instruments have been developed based on male samples is important to bear in mind in

evaluating female leaders.

Effectiveness of Transformational Leadership

Transformational leaders motivate followers to "do more than they originally intended and

often more than they thought possible" (Avolio, 1999, p. 41). They develop their followers into

leaders. Research has shown that transformational leadership results in higher levels of extra

effort, commitment, satisfaction and performance of followers than transactional leadership

alone in a wide variety of settings (Avolio, 1999). Transformational leadership is not uncommon

and is found at all levels of organizations (Avolio & Bass, 1988). It is not a style that is limited

to top management or world-class leaders. There have been an extensive number of studies

investigating the effectiveness of transformational leadership in the last 15 years in many diverse

contexts. Bass (1998) has reviewed the literature showing the effectiveness of transformational

leadership in military, business and educational settings. For this review, we will briefly discuss

key findings in other contexts, and then focus our discussion on studies conducted in military

settings.

In contexts other than the military, strong transformational leadership is positively related to

satisfaction and performance of individuals, teams and organizations (Barling, Weber &

Kelloway, 1996). Transformational leadership also leads to higher levels of organizational

commitment and is associated with business unit performance (Barling et al., 1996). At the

individual level, transformational leadership has positive effects on subordinates' satisfaction

with (Hater & Bass, 1988) and trust in leadership (Podoskoff, MacKenzie & Bommer, 1996).

Safety-specific transformational leadership has been found to impact on occupational safety

(injuries) through its effect on perceived safety climate, safety consciousness and safety related

events (Barling, Loughlin & Kelloway, 2002). At the team level, research has shown that

transformational leadership impacts positively on trust, commitment and team efficacy over and

above the effects accounted for by the presence of strong values and norms within the team (the

iron cage – Arnold, Barling & Kelloway, 2001). In terms of organizations, transformational

leadership can enhance quality improvement and organizational effectiveness (Bass 1998).

Finally, there is research that shows that transformational leadership can be taught (Avolio,

1999) and individuals can be trained in adopting this style of leadership (for examples see

Barling et. al., 1996; Kelloway & Barling, 2000; Kelloway, Barling & Helleur, 2000).

Effectiveness of Transformational Leadership in the Military

Transformational leadership is a style that military officers enact, and officers tend to score

higher on transformational than transactional components (O'Keefe, 1990). Officers in the U.S.

Army who scored higher on transformational leadership were also more satisfied and perceived

themselves as more effective than those using a transactional style (O'Keefe, 1990). As with

other contexts, it has been found that transformational leadership is more positively related to

subordinate extra effort, satisfaction with leadership, and perceptions of leaders' effectiveness

than is either transactional leadership or laissez faire (which is often negatively related). For

example, this was trend was supported in a sample of U.S. Navy Officers, (one female and 185

males; Yammarino & Bass, 1990a; Yammarino & Bass, 1990b). A positive relationship between

transformational leadership and subordinates willingness to exert extra effort has also been found in a U.S. Army Recruiting Command sample (93% of station commanders and 98% of company commanders were male; Masi & Cooke, 2000).

In combat military situations, where risk is high, it has been found that the interpretation of corrective action (management by exception) may be more positive than in a setting where the cost of error is not as great (Avolio, 1999). A study conducted by Avolio & Bass (as cited in Avolio, 1999, p. 49) showed that management by exception positively predicted platoon's readiness. This is contrary to results for other contexts where management by exception would generally be viewed negatively. The transformational and transactional leadership measures also positively predicted readiness in this study.

In terms of the effects on development of followers, Dvir, Eden, Avolio and Shamir (in press) conducted a longitudinal randomized field experiment to test the impact of transformational leadership, enhanced by training, on follower development and performance. The participants were male infantry cadets (cadets for officer rank) in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF). They found that the experimental group (trained in transformational leadership) had a more positive impact on follower development as measured by extra effort (motivation), collectivist orientation (morality), critical independent approach (followers being able to think for themselves) and self-efficacy (empowerment).

The findings using military samples with regards to satisfaction of followers have been similar to those findings in other contexts. Followers report higher satisfaction with transformational leadership than either transactional or laissez faire leadership styles. In a study using leaders at a U.S. military academy, highly transformational leadership was associated with subordinate satisfaction as measured by organizational climate surveys that were completed

semi-annually (Ross, 1990). In a meta-analytic review Gasper (1992) compared military and civilian followers' descriptions of their supervisors. The findings showed that while the correlations of transformational leadership with objective outcomes (performance) and perceived effectiveness were positive in both samples, they were stronger in the military sample. The correlation with satisfaction with leadership was about the same or slightly greater in the civilian sample (Gasper, 1992 as cited in Bass, 1998). While the relationships between transformational leadership and performance are generally positive in the military context (c.f. Clover, 1990; Gasper, 1992 as cited in Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1993), some research has found no relationship with respect to this outcome (c.f. Ross, 1990).

Atwater & Yammarino (1993) conducted a study that looked at the prediction of transformational leadership at a military academy in the U.S. The focal leaders sample consisted of 99 males and 8 females, and the subordinate sample consisted of 1235 freshmen (89% of whom were male). They also included superiors' assessments of the focal leaders. They found that a significant portion of the variance in transformational (28%) and transactional (33%) leadership ratings were accounted for by personal attributes (the best non-redundant predictors were intelligence and athletics). It was also found that different traits and coping styles accounted for variance in superior versus subordinate ratings. Intelligence and emotional coping predicted subordinate ratings of transactional and transformational leadership, while conformity and behavioural coping were related to superiors' assessments of leadership. Similar traits were predictive of both transactional and transformational leadership ratings. This is perhaps not surprising given that theoretically it has been suggested that transformational leadership builds upon transactional leadership (Atwater & Yammarino, 1993). In terms of personality characteristics, Ross (1990) found that transformational leaders had higher levels of self-

confidence, feminine attributes, nurturance, and pragmatism as well as lower levels of

criticalness and aggression.

Even though transactional leadership might seem like a more natural fit with a military

environment due to the fact that "rules, regulations, procedures, and prior training provide the

basis for much leader behaviour in any military organization" (Yammarino and Bass, 1990a, p.

979), the incidence and impacts of transformational leadership in the military appear to be quite

positive. Bass (1998) refers to the distinction made by Gal (1987) between commitment versus

compliance in the military. Compliance and obedience can be achieved through transactional

leadership but this will not provide the same bond or willingness to die for the cause that

transformational leadership will (Bass, 1998). Concern that transformational leadership would

not be effective in a military context could stem from assuming that transformational leadership

must be participatory. In this regard, it should be noted that transformational leadership is not

necessarily aligned with either participatory/democratic or directive/autocratic leadership styles –

transformational leaders may either give followers a chance to have input into decisions

(participative) or they may be directive and autocratic and make the decisions themselves

(Avolio, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1993).

Given the context that the CF are operating in today, and the changes that are occurring in

young workers' attitudes to authority, leadership, work and family (Loughlin & Barling, 2001),

transformational leadership may not only be acceptable and effective within military settings, it

may be pivotal in managing the next generation of soldiers. Abusive hazing rituals and

command and control forms of gaining obedience and control in the CF may have been

acceptable in the past, but it is unlikely they will be in the future given the large changes

underway in society (Winslow, 1999). A study conducted in the Norwegian Army found that

organizations could do much to temper hazing and bullying (Ostvik & Rudmin, 2001). These

findings, coupled with our analysis of the various changes and pressures facing the Canadian

Forces today, suggest that in this context transformational leaders could be especially effective,

and indeed may be necessary, to fulfill the strategic objectives that are discussed in Defence

Strategy 2020.

Defence Strategy 2020 is a strategic framework for Defence planning and decision making

that will lead the Forces into the next century (Department of National Defence, n.d.; Baril,

2000, p. 357). This strategic document consists of five imperatives as well as objectives for the

long and short term. Two long-term strategic objectives are of interest for this review and point

to the potential importance of transformational leadership to the CF's in the future. One of these

objectives is to "develop and sustain a leadership climate that encourages initiative, decisiveness

and trust while improving [the CF's] leaders' abilities to lead and manage effectively". The

second one is that the Forces be considered a "rewarding, flexible and progressive workplace

that builds professional teams of innovative highly skilled men and women dedicated to

accomplishing the mission" (Department of National Defence, n.d.).

If the Canadian military is to attract and retain the most competent men and women they will

need to address the issue of diversity in the workforce as well as women in leadership (Minister's

Advisory Board on Canadian Forces, 2001). The Canadian Forces is currently undertaking a

large change effort extending from its thoughts on effective leadership styles to redefining how

leaders are trained. This will be necessary in order to address the above challenges as well as to

meet the objectives set out in the strategic planning document. Officership 2020 provides the

framework for revising the officer professional development in the CF (Special Advisor to the

CDS for Professional Development, n.d.). While transformational leadership is not the focus of

Officership 2020, as discussed above, it has been found to be a highly effective leadership style in business, educational and military contexts. However, because most of the studies of its effectiveness are based on male samples of leaders, we know little about its effectiveness for women in the military. Given the changes necessary for the military to reach the strategic objectives mentioned above amidst the turbulent environment, a thorough synthesis and evaluation of the academic literature on leadership and transformational leadership in particular, with a specific focus on women in leadership roles would be both useful and timely.

Overall, the evidence is convincing that transformational leadership is a style that is accepted and effective in the military context. Transformational leadership is more positively associated with followers' willingness to exert extra effort, followers' satisfaction with leadership and perceptions of leader effectiveness in military settings. It has also been linked with better individual and group performance in many studies. The main distinction is that in a military combat situation, management-by-exception may be viewed more positively than it is in situations where the consequences of failure are not as severe as life and death.

While none of the studies cited has used the Canadian Forces as a sample, there is no reason to believe that results would be different in the Canadian context. One avenue for future research would be to replicate these findings in the Canadian Forces. Having concluded that transformational leadership is a style that can be effective in a military context we have answered the first question that was posed in the introduction.   In order to address the second question (are women who exhibit transformational leadership in a military setting likely to be perceived as effective as men who exhibit transformational leadership?) we will review the literature on sex role stereotypes and their potential impact on the assessment of leaders and their effectiveness.

<u>Sex Differences in Transformational and Transactional Leadership</u>

There have been fewer studies examining sex differences in transformational and transactional leadership. Only a handful of studies have been published. This is probably due to the fact that transformational leadership is a relatively new theory. The studies that have been published show some interesting yet inconclusive results.

In an influential article, Rosener (1990) described the results of a study that surveyed women who were IWF (International Women's Forum) members as well as a matched sample of men. The survey asked questions with respect to numerous variables including leadership styles. Rosener (1990) termed the style that the women in her sample reported using an "interactive leadership style". Results showed that this style consisted of encouraging participation, sharing power and information, enhancing people's self-worth and energizing followers. The author suggests that the findings showed that women "described themselves in ways that characterize 'transformational' leadership – getting subordinates to transform their own self-interest into the interest of the group through concern for a broader goal" (Rosener, 1990, p.120). Although there is extensive overlap, it should be noted that the components do not correspond exactly with those of transformational leadership.

Burke & Collins (2001) investigated managers' self-perceptions using the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in a sample of female accountants who were members of the American Women's Society of Certified Public Accountants and males who were members of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. This study found that there were small but significant differences between females and males on the self-report measures of transformational leadership, contingent reward and management-by-exception. The data showed females reported that they were more likely than males to use transformational and contingent

reward behaviours and that they were less likely to engage in management-by-exception-active

behaviours.

Komives (1991a) reported on a study of hall directors and their student resident assistant

staff who worked in residences on public university campuses in the U.S. The MLQ was used to

assess follower perception of a focal leaders' transformational leadership and both the sex of the

leader and the follower were taken into account in the analysis. The findings showed no

differences in follower job satisfaction, followers' view of leaders' vision, follower motivation

to extend extra effort, follower satisfaction with the leader, perceived effectiveness of the leader,

or perceived transformational or transactional behaviours of leaders.

A second report by Komives (1991b) also reported on hall directors and their resident

assistant staff. This study reported that there were sex differences in self-perceptions of

transformational leadership and achieving styles (direct, instrumental, and relational) between

male and female hall directors. Male and female hall directors were very similar in their self-

assessments of transformational leadership and both reported higher levels of transformational

than transactional behaviours. Intellectual stimulation was the only component for which there

was a significant difference between men and women – males rated themselves higher on this

component than females. In terms of their achieving styles, both men and women preferred the

relational achieving style. Correlations showed that women associated their relational style

(vicarious, contributory and collaborative) with transformational leadership and men associated

their power-direct style (taking charge, directing, controlling) with transformational leadership.

Followers' assessments of leaders' transformational leadership were also measured and it was

found that only the relational achieving styles were correlated with followers' assessments of

the focal leaders' transformational leadership. Hall directors who were assessed by followers as transformational reported using a relational achieving style.

Druskat (1994) investigated differences between men and women on transformational leadership in both all-male and all-female contexts of the Roman Catholic Church. Male leaders were rated by male followers and female leaders were rated by female followers. Results showed that both male and female leaders were rated as displaying more transformational than transactional behaviours. Female subordinates, however, rated female leaders as exhibiting significantly higher transformational leadership than male subordinates rated their male leaders. Male leaders were also rated as exhibiting significantly more transactional behaviours than female leaders. The study found that all subordinates were more satisfied with transformational leaders. The author suggests that if we presume that women in all female environments will exhibit a feminine leadership style, then "the present research support the theory and research that indicate transformational leadership to be a more 'feminine style' of leading" (Druskat, 1994. p.114). One of the strengths of this study is the comparison of the all male and all female contexts. While this does not allow an examination of different combination of rater/ratee sex effects in assessment it does point to some interesting conclusions about the context of the organization and the potential impacts this has on leadership styles that are enacted. The results of this study are similar to a study conducted with a nursing sample (97% female) (Bycio, Hackett & Allen, 1995).

Bass & Avolio (1994) reported on a study of female and male managers at Fortune 500 companies in the top three levels of management. They found that females were rated significantly higher than males by followers on the components of idealized influence and individualized consideration. Females were also rated higher on the components of inspirational

motivation and intellectual stimulation but these differences were not significant. There were no

differences in the ratings for contingent reward and laissez faire components. Followers rated

the outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction with leader as significantly higher for

female leaders than for males. The authors suggest that stereotypes may be one explanation for

the findings. The expectations of male leaders may have been higher and hence they were

subjected to a higher standard of evaluation. Alternatively, women may have had to be better

leaders than men to achieve this level of success, and hence the quality of women at this level of

leadership may be higher. It was not possible to test these explanations with the data that was

collected (we will return to the issue of evaluation shortly).

Another paper reported on three studies investigating the differences between male and

female leaders on transformational leadership (Bass, Avolio & Atwater, 1996). The first study

was conducted with managers in Fortune 50 companies. The second study's sample came from

forty five organizations in diverse areas such as retailing, health-care, banking, manufacturing,

public service (library), volunteer fire fighting, policing, radio stations, accounting, insurance

and real estate. The third study used a diverse sample from business, manufacturing, health care,

social services, law enforcement, volunteer and religious organizations.

The first study found that women were rated significantly higher by followers on all four

components of transformational leadership. There was no difference found between men and

women on the contingent reward sub-scale. Women and men were perceived as displaying

similar levels of active management by exception and women rated lower on passive

management by exception. Both men and women were rated similarly low on laissez faire.

Women were rated significantly higher on all three outcomes measured by the MLQ: extra

effort, perceived effectiveness and satisfaction with the leader. Female raters evaluated both

male and female leaders higher on each of the sub-scales of transformational leadership as well

as on the contingent reward component. One potential difficulty with interpretation of these

results is that the leaders chose which subordinates they wanted to complete the MLQ ratings.

This non-random selection could bias the results.

The second study's findings reported in this paper only partially confirmed the findings of

study one. In this study the followers who completed the MLQ ratings were randomly chosen.

Women in this sample were rated significantly higher than men on idealized influence

(charisma) and individualized consideration. Female leaders were again rated lower than males

on passive management by exception. However, in this study they also rated higher on active

management by exception than male leaders. The perceived level of contingent reward was the

same for men and women. Unlike study one, female followers did not provide higher ratings of

male and female leaders than male followers.

The findings of study three were similar, but there were fewer significant differences found

between men and women. The followers who rated the leaders in this study were not randomly

chosen. There were rater effects in this study with only women perceiving female leaders as

more effective and satisfying. The only significant difference between men and women was on

the charisma (idealized influence) scale where women were rated higher.

Overall these three studies show that women are "rated no less, and generally more,

transformational than their male counterparts while also being rated less on passive leadership

styles" (Bass et. al. 1996, p. 26). One important suggestion that Bass et. al. (1996) make about

the divergence in findings across the three studies is that the organizational level of the leader

may play an important role in the different ratings obtained. The authors also suggest that while

the differences found in these studies are statistically significant they are small. Therefore, while

they may be theoretically significant they may not be practically significant. Generally female

leaders were not perceived all that differently than their male counterparts. Finally, one

limitation of these studies is that they are all based on self-report data, and there are no

alternative measures of performance outcomes. We have to be careful about using self-reports

of ability because research has demonstrated that females will tend to rate themselves lower on

some measures of ability (e.g., on their IQ scores) than they score when tested objectively (e.g.,

WAIS) whereas males will tend to rate themselves higher than their objective scores (e.g., on

their IQ scores; Reilly & Mulhern, 1995). Because the psychological literature on achievement

has found similar tendencies for women to under-value (and men to over-value) their own

personal accomplishments, self-reports in general can be problematic regarding sex differences.

Another study relevant to this topic was a multi-level investigation of women's

transformational leadership conducted on sales forces of various organizations in the eastern

United States (Yammarino et.al. 1997). Groups with a female sales manager and at least two

sales people (subordinates) were used as the sample. The MLQ was the instrument used to rate

leadership behaviours and outcomes. They found no differences between the ratings of female

and male subordinates (no sex-of-rater effects). The findings also showed that the correlations

between transformational leadership and contingent reward and the outcomes (extra effort,

satisfaction with leadership, effectiveness of leadership) were equally strong. This is in contrast

to findings that transformational leadership is more strongly associated with outcomes than is

contingent reward. The results of the level-of-analysis investigation can perhaps account for this.

They found that the dyad-level was most applicable in this case, which means that women form

unique relationships with each subordinate. These dyadic interpersonal relationships are

independent of one another and also independent of group membership. In this case leadership

is an interpersonal process and perhaps this is more important than the distinction between transformational leadership and contingent reward. The small groups may have affected the results in this case (versus the fact that the leaders were female). Further investigations are necessary to determine whether this result generalizes to larger groups with female leaders.

A study conducted in the Australian banking industry investigated the transformational leadership of both male and female branch managers who were at the same level of the hierarchy (Carless, 1998). This study used three different measures of leadership. We will focus on the results for the MLQ as this is the dominant measure of transformational leadership and the results can be compared with other studies. Manager self ratings on the MLQ showed that women report using more individualized consideration. Ratings by subordinates of focal leaders showed no significant differences between perceived transformational leadership of men and women. The interpretation provided suggests that the results lend support to the structural model of gender differences (Kanter, 1977). The subordinate sample consisted of a majority of females and this may have affected the results.

A final study we will review investigated whether the gender-typing of the organizational context influenced leadership behaviours of men and women (van Engen, van der Leeden & Willemsen, 2001). This quasi experiment was conducted in a single retail chain of department stores (4 different stores are represented in this study) in the Netherlands. This study allowed the gender typing of the department to vary while keeping many other features of the organizational context constant. The hypotheses were that the sex of the leader would have no effect on followers' perception of managers' leadership style but that the gender-typing of the context would have an effect. The authors expected managers in masculine typed departments (such as electronics and sports) to be perceived as exhibiting a masculine leadership style and that within

a feminine typed department (such as women's fashions, cosmetics and lingerie) they would be

perceived as exhibiting a more feminine style. A feminine style was considered to be more

people oriented, empowering and charismatic. Masculine styles were considered to be more

task-focused. They found that neither the sex of the leader nor the gender-typing of the

department had an effect on perceived leadership styles. Unexpectedly, they found that the site

of the department store was a significant influence on leadership style showing that the four

stores differed in the overall perceived levels of people-oriented and transformational leadership

styles of the managers who worked there. The authors suggest that the organizational culture

may be an important determinant of leadership styles that are exhibited – and it seemed that the

culture did differ across the four sites even though the stores were within the same retail chain.

Another important influence that needs to be investigated further is the level of leadership. This

is one particular variable that may explain some of the divergent findings in the differences

between males and females with respect to transformational leadership and one that other

authors have suggested needs to be considered (c.f. Bass et. al. 1996).

In summary, studies investigating followers' perceptions of differences between male and

female leaders in terms of transformational leadership have produced inconclusive findings.

Some studies show no differences (e.g. Carless, 1998; Komives, 1991a; Komives 1991b; van

Engen et. al., 2001). Other studies show differences, but these are not consistent across samples

or across the components of transformational leadership that differ (e.g. Bass & Avolio, 1994;

Bass et. al. 1996; Druskat, 1994). Many studies that do report differences between men and

women find that while these may be statistically significant they are not practically significant

(Bass et. al., 1996). Self-reports of leaders sometimes show that women rate themselves as

more transformational than men (c.f. Burke & Collins, 1995; Rosener, 1990) and sometimes

women and men rate themselves as equally transformational (c.f. Komives, 1991b). Men have

been found in one sample to rate themselves as more likely to engage in intellectual stimulation

(Komives, 1991b). Despite these inconclusive findings, women do seem to engage in

transformational leadership behaviours at least as often as men across a variety of samples. No

study has reported that followers perceive male leaders to engage in significantly more

transformational behaviours than female leaders.

    Two other important considerations emerge from a careful examination of these studies. The

importance of the leader's level in the organization has not been investigated yet, and is a

potentially important consideration. For example, because women must overcome a 'credibility

gap' at first, they may be initially restricted in the leadership styles that they can enact.

However, women at the highest levels of the organization have presumable overcome this

credibility gap and are thus freer to adopt a style that suits them and the context. The overall

organizational culture is also a potentially relevant variable that needs to be explored (van Engen

et. al., 2001).

    Longitudinal studies of female leaders in the military would be especially useful to sort out

the effects of organizational level versus gender/sex in explaining differences (or the lack

thereof) between male and female leadership styles. There are strong arguments and empirical

evidence in both directions (c.f. Gilligan, 1982; Kanter, 1977; Lefkowitz, 1994; Sandelands,

2002; Tannen, 1990). Ideally, longitudinal studies would be conducted in settings that were

male and female dominated as well as equally balanced. The Canadian Forces are in a unique

position to conduct longitudinal studies. Individuals entering the Royal Military College (RMC)

could be tracked over time with respect to leadership ability and actual achievement. We will

now proceed to consider sex role stereotypes of leadership and how these may impact on

leader's assessment and effectiveness. An important question that remains unanswered is whether a transformational style of leadership is perceived as feminine or masculine.

Sex Role Stereotypes and Leadership

Sex role stereotypes are often suggested to differentiate between men and women's ability in certain realms. For example, gender differences in job knowledge have been investigated. Carretta & Doub (1998) found sex based differences on one scale out of those measured, and another study found no gender differences in job knowledge (Pulakos, Schmitt, & Chan, 1996). Recently, Furnham (2001) has pointed out that we must guard against male normative definitions of knowledge or ability. That is, whereby those specific abilities where men have an advantage (e.g., mathematical or spatial knowledge) come to be considered the essence of intelligence or ability, whereas female areas of advantage are discounted (e.g., verbal abilities; MacIntosh, 1998). This is similar to the tendency to focus on physical attributes versus other important characteristics in defining leadership in the CF (as discussed earlier). It should also be pointed out that researchers who suggest that there are sex based differences in ability (favoring men), tend to study primarily male dominated areas (e.g., business, law, chemistry, etc.; e.g., Ackerman, Bowen, Beier, & Kanfer, 2001) as opposed to female dominated disciplines (e.g., nursing or education). This is problematic because as Schmidt, Hunter & Outerbridge (1986) point out, more experience in a domain leads to increased knowledge.

Going beyond general job performance, the question of how sex role stereotypes influence perceptions of leadership is important (Hackman, Furniss, Hills & Paterson, 1992). Stereotyping is the "process of assigning traits to people based on their membership in a social category" (McShane, 2001, p. 161). Sex role stereotypes "refer to the belief that a set of traits and abilities is more likely to be found among one sex than the other" (Schein, 1978, p. 259). The importance

of sex role stereotypes for female leaders in male dominated environments is that they can affect

how individuals perceive and assess leadership behaviour. A woman in a traditionally male

dominated environment may be in somewhat of a 'double bind' due to these stereotypes (c.f.

Delgado, 1990). If she acts in traditionally masculine ways she may have good evaluations from

supervisors but poor evaluations from followers. If, however, she acts in traditionally feminine

ways, followers may be satisfied but superiors will judge her as ineffective.

The concepts of masculinity and femininity are culturally defined categories (Billing &

Alvesson, 2000). Women have generally been expected to be "wives, mothers, community

volunteers, teachers, nurses" and they are "supposed to be cooperative, supportive,

understanding, gentle, and to provide service to others" (Rosener, 1990, p.124). Stereotypes of

femininity (which are associated with the biological category of female) have included

behaviours such as "being emotional, passive, submissive, intuitive, nurturing, and indecisive"

and these attributes have generally been negatively associated with leadership (Hackman et.al.

1992). Women have been seen as more "tactful, gentle and quiet than men" (Schein, 1973, p.

95). Masculine stereotypes have included being expected to be "competitive, strong, tough,

decisive, and in control" (Rosener, 1990, p.124). Men have been perceived as more "aggressive

and independent than women" (Schein, 1973, p.95). These characteristics, which are associated

with being biologically male, are closely correlated with expectations of leader behaviours such

as being "directive, dominant, aggressive, and self-confident" (Hackman et.al. 1992).

Some of these conceptualizations are out of date due to changing norms within society. For

example, young women are now more willing to engage in open competition at earlier ages

(Rimm, 2000), and whereas one in twenty-seven girls participated in high school team sports in

the 1970's, the number was one in three in 1998 (Dafoe-Whitehead, 1998). Women are

becoming more comfortable with male models of competition, and the lines between the sexes is increasingly being blurred in this regard. Nonetheless, there is evidence that sex role stereotypes are still operative. A current laboratory study showed that male leaders received lower effectiveness ratings when expressing sadness compared to neutral emotion, however female leaders received lower effectiveness ratings when expressing either sadness or anger (Lewis, 2000). The author of this study suggests that gender-role stereotypes may explain the results. Lewis (2000, p. 232) states "one might expect that either anger or neutrality expressed by a male leader would lead to high ratings of integrity, confidence, and assertiveness (all associated with strong leadership), while anger from a female leader may lead to perception of instability, aggressiveness, or other negative traits". Finally, an article about self-sacrificial leadership suggested that it is possible that "self-sacrifice would be less 'unconventional' for a female leader than it would for a male leader" (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999, p. 416). Masculine and feminine stereotypes of leaders still exist.

A theme throughout much of the literature on sex differences is that women have a greater focus on, and attach a greater importance to, relationships with others. Chodorow (1978) argued that women are more 'relationship focused' than men. She discussed how this tendency develops from a psychoanalytic point of view. Gilligan (1982) studied the difference between men and women on conceptions of self and morality in the context of conflict and choice. A theme in this research is that women are more concerned with relationships and the responsibility of caring for others than are men. For women, "identity is defined in a context of relationship and judged by a standard of responsibility and care" whereas the male identity is defined in separation (Gilligan, 1982, p.160-161). This tendency to be more relationship-focused may be part of what underlies the finding that women tend to exhibit a more participatory leadership

style. Indeed, any leadership style that focuses on relationships has tended to be viewed as

feminine (c.f. Helgenson, 1990).

Investigating the concept of gender (psychologically based) versus sex (biologically based),

Bem (1974) developed a sex-role inventory to measure masculinity, femininity and androgyny.

This research conceptualized masculinity and femininity as two independent dimensions versus

previous work that had considered these concepts as two ends of a bipolar continuum. An

individual who exhibits both masculine and feminine behaviours, depending on the situational

appropriateness of these various behaviours, would be considered androgynous. Bem (1974,

p.162) suggested that androgyny could define a "more human standard of psychological health".

To construct the scale, qualities that were judged to be more desirable for a man were considered

masculine and those considered more desirable for a woman were considered feminine.

Generally, masculinity has been linked with getting the job done and an instrumental orientation,

and femininity has been associated with an expressive orientation and a concern for the welfare

of others (Bem, 1974). Interestingly, one of the items considered to be masculine was "acts as a

leader" (Bem, 1974, p. 156). The importance of this research was that it began to suggest that it

might be appropriate, and desirable, for both women and men to be able to access a range of

behaviours (be they masculine or feminine). The distinction between gender and sex is also

important. While "feminine gender identity is often associated with biological sex", all females

do not automatically adopt a feminine gender identity (Gainer, 1993, p. 270). This distinction is

an important one as some research has found that leader emergence is more dependent on gender

role than on biological sex. In one study, androgynous and masculine subjects were found to be

most likely to emerge as leaders (Kent & Moss, 1994). In addition, despite the fact that most

individuals have "an unambiguous and stable sense of their own gender identity" (i.e., their sense

of being male or female), it turns out that men and women are actually highly variable in the particular patterns of gender congruent and incongruent attributes they posses and behaviours they display (Spence & Buckner, 1995). This is an important point to bear in mind, as there appears to be more variance within the sexes than between them in this regard.

A limited number of studies have looked at the masculine sex role stereotyping of the military officer (and cadet) role (Eagly et.al., 1995). Arkin & Dobrogsky (1978 as cited in Eagly et. al., 1995, p.138) argued that the military role has been defined in "exceedingly masculine terms". For the meta-analysis they conducted, Eagly et. al. (1995) collected data based on questionnaire ratings of the extent to which roles were congenial to each sex (there is little information about the type or size of sample used). They asked five questions about the extent to which women or men would be interested in each role and also believed that they would be competent to perform it. They found that military roles were judged to be highly congenial for men. Males who responded to this questionnaire rated themselves as more competent and interested in this role and all respondents rated military roles as requiring "less interpersonal ability and more task ability than other leadership roles" (Eagly et. al., 1995, p. 136).

There have been various studies investigating perceptions of effective managers and sex role stereotypes. Studies in the 1970's found that an effective/good manager was consistently described in masculine terms by both male and female managers (Powell & Butterfield, 1979; Schein, 1973; Schein, 1975). This finding was still valid for men in a study in 1989 (Brenner, Tomkiewicz & Schein, 1989). Women, however, no longer sex typed managerial jobs (Brenner et.al., 1989). Women ascribed characteristics of both men and women to successful managers. Norris and Wylie (1995) had similar findings in that male participants (students) continued to stereotype the managerial role in masculine terms while female students did not. This

stereotyping of the managerial role has been confirmed across various countries as well (c.f. Schein, Mueller, Lituchy & Liu, 1996). These findings suggest strongly that effective leaders will be described in masculine terms. Future research might investigate whether an effective military leader is perceived in masculine, feminine or androgynous terms. We would hypothesize that the results would indicate that effectiveness in this role would be perceived in even more strongly stereotypical masculine terms – despite the fact that documents such as Officership 2020 (Special Advisor to the CDS for Professional Development, n.d), Defence Strategy 2020 (Department of National Defence, n.d), and the Debrief the Leaders Project (Bentley, n.d.), suggest that some characteristics of effective military leaders in the future will consist of what have traditionally been considered feminine traits (i.e. support for and communication with subordinates, cultural sensitivity, interpersonal and emotional competencies).

The traditional behavioural dimensions of leadership (i.e., initiating structure and consideration as well as directive versus participative styles) are fairly easy to classify in terms of their association with masculinity and femininity. The consideration and participative styles fall under a more feminine stereotype, and the initiating structure and directive styles fall under a masculine stereotype.

In contrast, transformational leadership is somewhat more difficult to classify based on sex-role stereotypes. It could be masculine as some have suggested (Yammarino et. al., 1997), or it could be considered a feminine style (c.f. Carless, 1998; Helgenson, 1990; Rosener, 1990). Some dimensions suggest it would be more associated with femininity (e.g., individualized consideration), other components are more difficult to categorize. There has been some confusion of the transformational and participative leadership styles (recall that transformational

leaders are not necessarily participative). This question is important given the literature showing

that women acting out of role (in masculine ways) are generally judged more harshly (c.f. Eagly

et.al, 1992b). If transformational leadership is a style that is considered more feminine or

androgynous, it may be that female leaders who are transformational are not going to be

evaluated as acting out of expected sex role. This has important implications for their ability to

lead within the military.

      We found only three studies in the literature that address this question. Of these, only one

has correlated measures of masculinity and femininity with the MLQ. Hackman et.al. (1992)

investigated this question using a sample of 153 Polytechnic students in a first year management

course. Using a survey they asked participants to rate a superior of whom they had vivid

recollections on the Bem (1974) sex role inventory measure (BSRI) and the 1985 Bass model of

transformational leadership. The masculine and feminine scales of the BSRI were correlated

with the components of transformational leadership of charisma, individual consideration, and

intellectual stimulation. Comparisons of the correlations showed that individualized

consideration was significantly more highly correlated with feminine sex roles than masculine

roles (Hackman et.al. 1992). Charisma was more highly correlated with femininity than

masculinity (although not significantly so) and intellectual stimulation was more highly

correlated with masculinity than femininity (again not significantly; Hackman et. al. 1992). The

conclusions reached in this study were that transformational leadership is associated with both

masculine and feminine factors and is perhaps a more androgynous style.

      A second study had undergraduate evening students complete the MLQ Form 5X for their

current supervisors and then for a typical male manager and for a typical female manager

(Maher, 1997). Participants self assigned a code word to these surveys so that they could be

matched. To get stereotypic ratings (ratings of typical male and female managers) they asked

participants to "judge the extent the statement fits your image of a female (or male) leader in

general" (Maher, 1997, p. 215). The ratings were analysed with a 2 (sex) X 2 (stereotype)

repeated measures ANOVA. This analysis showed that ratings of male and female leadership

stereotypes depended on subordinate sex. Female subordinates rated the female stereotype as

more transformational, more transactional (more contingent reward and less management-by-

exception) and less laissez-faire than the male stereotype. Male participants did not perceive

male and female stereotypic leaders differently. This is an interesting finding as it would appear

to be opposite to the findings with respect to the stereotypical view of an effective manager

(males still tend to perceive the effective manager in masculine ways). There was little

congruence between the ratings of actual supervisors and stereotypic ratings. The ratings of

actual superiors showed no differences in transformational or transactional leadership behaviours

between men and women. The findings suggest that the influence of stereotypes in ratings of

transformational leadership may differ depending on the sex of the rater.

Finally, an interview study asked participants in the UK to identify qualities they felt were

important for a manager (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995). In two separate samples the findings were

similar. Women assigned importance to qualities that the authors describe as transformational,

whereas men cited different qualities that at times were almost the opposite. The qualities that

the women cited do overlap with the components of transformational leadership to some extent

(e.g., caring for individual feelings, and understanding different needs). But there are also

components that are not part of transformational leadership that are cited such as "people

oriented, participative" (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995, p. 5). The author concludes by suggesting that

the fact that the identification of the criteria for leadership positions is done by senior leaders

who are mostly male may lead to gender-biased criteria for assessment. We investigate the literature on evaluation of male and female leaders in the following section.

In summary, the findings as to whether transformational leadership is considered a feminine or masculine style are inconclusive. It would seem to depend, in part, on the sex of the rater – which may indicate that implicit leadership theories are of importance when investigating stereotypes associated with transformational leadership. Also the Bem (1974) inventory has not been updated in almost two decades. This is a potential area for future inquiry. At present there is insufficient evidence to conclude whether transformational leadership is a style that is considered more stereotypically masculine, feminine or androgynous.

Assessment and Effectiveness of Leaders

How does a leader's sex impact on evaluations of his or her effectiveness? There have been two meta-analyses investigating this question for task versus interpersonal and directive versus participative styles (Eagly et. al. 1992b; Eagly et. al., 1995). These meta-analyses begin to suggest how women in leadership roles are evaluated and how effective they are, however, they do not explicitly address transformational leadership.

Eagly et. al. (1992b) conducted a meta-analysis of 61 experimental studies looking at the evaluation of leaders. The authors excluded studies where it was not possible to discern if the leaders were equivalent in all aspects other than sex – so if past performance data and style of leadership were not identical the study would not be included. In this way they controlled for the fact that male and female leaders might be evaluated differently due to variables other than sex. They found that female leaders were slightly more likely to be evaluated negatively compared to male leaders. This overall trend was small but in certain cases the bias against female leaders was much larger (i.e. there were moderators). The circumstances under which this bias against

women leaders became stronger were when women were exhibiting masculine leadership styles

(the most bias was found when women enacted autocratic styles), when women were in roles that

were male dominated (athletic, business, manufacturing and education showed the most negative

results), and when men were doing the evaluation (men tended to devalue female leaders more

than women did – women showed no gender bias and did not favour female over male leaders).

The authors argue that with experimental studies there would be a stronger reluctance to appear

prejudiced than in an organizational setting and hence, it could be expected that if anything this

meta-analysis would have produced an under-estimate of perceivers' tendency to devalue female

leaders.

A second meta-analysis (Eagly et.al., 1995) investigated the effectiveness of leaders across

laboratory and organizational studies. Studies were included in the meta-analysis if leader

effectiveness was assessed in terms of self, supervisor or followers' perceptions of effectiveness,

ratings of satisfaction, coding or counting of effective leadership behaviours, or measures of

organizational productivity or group performance. Overall, women and men were rated as being

equally effective. There were, however certain moderating variables that indicated situations

where female leaders were perceived as being less effective. The type of organization was found

to be related to effect sizes. Military studies "deviated strongly from all other classes of studies"

(Eagly et. al., 1995, p. 135). Men did significantly better in military studies and the mean effect

sizes for these studies in comparison with other kinds of organizations and the laboratory studies

were significantly different. The mean effect sizes for studies conducted in business settings

marginally favoured males and those in education, government or social services significantly

favoured females. Male leaders did well in roles that were thought to be congenial to men and

females did well in roles thought to be congenial toward women. Comparisons on leader

effectiveness favoured men when the leadership role was male dominated and the subordinates were male.

There are no studies that investigate sex differences in transformational leadership and also include other measures of performance. This is an area that requires future research.

Evaluating Female Leaders in Male Dominated Contexts

There are competing hypotheses as to how sex role stereotypes impact on leadership ratings specifically for women leaders in male dominated contexts. The first is the 'shifting standards model', which asserts that women are rated according to a more lenient standard than men. This hypothesis has been tested on military samples by Biernat and colleagues (c.f. Biernat, Crandall, Young, Kobrynowicz & Halpin, 1998). The standards that are employed are assumed to be different for men versus women because stereotypes suggest that men are better leaders than women. This type of judgement bias seems to appear only when subjective rating scales are used. While the use of objective rating scales will make stereotypical judgements apparent, their use for making decisions with respect to things such as promotion and training opportunities would indicate that these decisions would be based on stereotypes which are unfair to women. Using subjective ratings would appear to be unfair to men as they would need to be better than women to achieve the same ratings. The authors do not address this practical concern. How are we to assess leaders fairly if both methods of evaluation are problematic? Also the studies investigating this model have mainly been conducted in military settings and the assessment of leadership was made with a single question. Other investigations in different settings as well as using expanded measures of leadership assessment are necessary.

The alternative hypotheses about the impact of sex roles on leaders assessment is postulated by Eagly et. al. (1995) and deals with the gender/sex congruence of leadership roles. This

approach is also in agreement with the overwhelming evidence (both empirical and anecdotal) that women who reach the top say they have had to be better than men to get there (c.f. Griffith, MacBride-King & Townsend, 1997). The influence of stereotypes impacts negatively on women who are acting out of gender role according to this theory. This would imply that regardless of the scale used to measure the outcomes, women acting out of role and specifically "those intrud[ing] on traditionally male domains" are rated more negatively (Eagly et. al., 1992b, p. 17).

Exactly how stereotypes impact on the evaluation of women leaders in the military, and specifically on transformational women, is another question that remains to be answered. It would appear that women would be more negatively evaluated due to the fact that they are acting out of role in a context that is defined in extreme masculine terms (Eagly et. al., 1995). However, the competing hypothesis (and a source of backlash against women) is that they are rated with respect to a more lenient standard than men. One key factor needs to be determined before a test of these two competing hypothesis can be conducted: what are the sex role stereotypes surrounding the enactment of transformational leadership? If transformational leadership is perceived as a feminine style then perhaps males could be rated according to a more lenient standard in studies using this leadership measurement. Some form of experimental manipulation and design would best suit the purpose of testing these competing hypotheses. This test should be conducted with samples in the military and in other contexts. Furthermore, specific investigations of each of these avenues of research with respect to sex role stereotypes and their impact on leader assessment needs to be done with transformational leadership as the focus.

Conclusions and Future Research Directions

This report has highlighted several gaps in our knowledge about female leaders in the CF. We will briefly review our main findings and the research questions suggested by them. First, we found that the Canadian Forces are undergoing a period of significant change and that the qualities needed for future leaders may be quite different from what was required in the past. The CF are a traditionally male dominated organization and female leaders within this organization have had significant challenges to overcome in order to remain. This suggests that the Canadian Forces may be losing many highly competent future leaders. We also noted surprising recent findings that the forces may be in a better position than anticipated to affect change in this regard. The issue of "women in leadership" was placed within the context of the CF's willingness to tolerate heterogeneity among its members in general (e.g., minorities, aboriginals, gays and lesbians). Investigating *how* non-traditional leaders can best move into positions of authority will be the most important area of inquiry necessary in this regard.

Definitions of leadership were the next issue addressed in our review. It was noted that new definitions of leadership are needed, and new qualities associated with leadership, if the CF are to thrive. For example, one of the most pervasive problems is the use of physical achievement as an over-riding indicator of leadership ability, while other skills that women (or other designated groups) may possess are discounted. New definitions of leadership must be sought, and members must accept that the nature of war and peace keeping have changed. We are in a knowledge/technology based era. To base definitions of leadership on outdated standards (e.g., physical strength vs. mental ability) is to sentence the CF to stagnation and decay.

This report noted that women and men in organizations (where culture also influences behaviour) tend to lead is similar ways, whereas in laboratory experiments differences are more likely to be found. We also found that there is more variance within the sexes, in terms of

gender congruent and incongruent attributes and behaviours, than there is between the sexes.

This is the case despite the fact that prevalent sex role stereotypes are still operative. Some

current changes in society that are likely to impact on future stereotypes were also noted. For

example, young women are now more willing to engage in open competition at earlier ages and

are participating in competitive team sports at unprecedented rates. As women become even

more comfortable with male models of competition, the lines drawn between gender-congruent

and incongruent behaviours will become increasingly blurred, and these issues need to be

investigated with the next generation of soldiers.

    Next transformational leadership was introduced. This has been found to be a highly

effective leadership style in business, educational and military contexts. Transformational

leadership is more positively associated with followers' willingness to exert extra effort,

followers' satisfaction with leadership and perceptions of leader effectiveness in military

settings. It has also been linked with better individual and group performance in many studies.

Thus in response to the first question posed in the introduction, there is sufficient evidence to

show that transformational leadership is an effective style of leadership in military settings.

However, there are gaps in the literature. For example, a more thorough assessment of whether

transformational leadership is indeed perceived as a feminine, masculine, or androgynous style is

in order. Studies that have investigated this question were conducted with first year students and

need to be replicated with samples of individuals working in organizations. Ideally this question

should be posed to men and women in both male dominated, female dominated, and 'neutral'

environments in order to assess the impact of context on the results. The level of the leader

within the organization also needs to be investigated together with the organizational context (i.e.

male or female dominated) and organizational culture, in terms of how these variables impact on

the emergence and assessment of female transformational leaders.

We found the second question posed in the introduction more difficult to answer. There are

numerous variables that will impact on the assessment and evaluation of women's leadership

effectiveness (e.g., sex of the rater, whether the leader is acting in or out of sex roles, the level of

the hierarchy in which the leader is located, the culture of the organization, implicit leadership

theories of raters) as well as other potential variables not yet considered (e,g, work experience, or

personality characteristics of the rater). The issues are complex and we suggest that qualitative

and quantitative studies are needed to identify the most important variables in this regard.

In terms of the third question posed in the introduction, we provide some suggestions for

future research questions necessary to test the efficacy of a transformational leadership within

the Canadian military, and specifically for women in leadership roles. For example, we found

that sex role stereotypes affect ratings of leadership effectiveness. Exactly how does this occur?

Are women rated more leniently due to an expectation that they are less competent or are they

subjected to a higher standard due to discrimination? How does the congruence of

transformational leadership with masculine, feminine or androgynous roles affect this

assessment? While there are numerous studies published using samples from the U.S. military,

there are none that we could find using a sample from the Canadian Forces. We assume that

findings from other countries would generalize to the Canadian context but to have some

empirical evidence of this generalization would be a first step. This study would need to

consider both male and female leaders in the CF. Because sex role stereotypes have been found

to have an impact on leadership ratings, an investigation of the sex typing of an effective military

leader using participants from the Canadian Forces would be important. This would give leaders interested in organizational change within the CF a baseline from which to begin.

Longitudinal studies are also necessary in order to disentangle what a female leaders' natural or preferred leadership style would be (if there is such a thing), as opposed to what style is actually exhibited in an organization that is male dominated. Longitudinal research focusing on the development of female leaders would allow a test of Kanter's (1977) assertion that male and female leaders behave in similar ways due to structural influences constraining their behaviour, versus gendered approaches (which suggests that there are differences between men and women). Longitudinal research is rare in the leadership area and is needed to assess questions of causality. For example, there may be fewer opportunities for a female leader to adopt a transformational style in this highly male dominated context when she is first beginning her career. However, after having 'proven' herself she may have greater flexibility in the style of leadership she chooses to adopt. The Canadian Forces provides a unique organizational context within which to study these issues. The investigation could begin tracking participants at the Royal Military College (RMC) and follow these individuals for a number of years, assessing levels of transformational leadership styles, achievements, outside ratings of leadership effectiveness as well as qualitative data to tap into reasons for any changes that occur. This type of longitudinal study would also contribute to our understanding of the development of both male and female transformational leaders in general.

As can be seen from our suggestions for future research opportunities, the area of female transformational leadership both within and outside the Canadian Forces is an area just beginning to attract the attention of researchers. Many important questions remain to be answered, with important practical implications for female leaders, male leaders, and

organizations. The CF has the opportunity to begin cutting edge research on this topic, and to set

the standard for years to come. It's success in this regard could lay the foundation for new

models of leadership within the forces, and for training leaders (of any sex, colour, or sexual

orientation) capable of successfully carrying the forces through the next decade and beyond.

References

Ackerman, P.L., Bowen, K.R., Beier, M.E., & Kanfer, R. (2001). Determinants of individual differences and gender differences in knowledge. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 797-825.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1995). An investigation of female and male constructs of leadership and empowerment. *Women in Management Review, 10* (2), 3-8.

Arnold, K.A., Barling, J. & Kelloway, E.K. (2001). Transformational leadership or the iron cage: Which predicts trust, commitment and team efficacy? *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 22* (7), 315-320.

Atwater, L.E. & Yammarino, F.J. (1993). Personal attributes as predictors of superiors' and subordinates' perceptions of military academy leadership. *Human Relations, 46* (5), 645.

Avolio, B.J. (1999) *Full Leadership Development: Building Vital Forces in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Avolio, B.J. & Bass, B.M. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond. In J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baliga, H.P. Dachler & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging Leadership Vistas* (pp. 29-49). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Baril, M. (2000). Canadian defence force: This institution's future. *Vital Speeches of the Day, 66* (12), 357-360.

Barling, J., Loughlin, C. & Kelloway, E.K. (2002). Development and test of a model linking safety-specific transformational leadership and occupational safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 3*, 488-496.

Barling, J., Weber, T. & Kelloway, E.K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and fiscal outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 827-832.

Basinger, J. (2001). Most female college presidents earn less, face more challenges than male peers, report says. *Chronicle of Higher Education, October 29*.

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* NY: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, Military, and Educational Impact.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions* (pp.49-80). Toronto, ON: Academic Press Inc.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1994). Shatter the glass ceiling: Women may make better managers. *Human Resource Management, 33* (4), 549-560.

Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J. & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *45* (1), 5-34.

Beitz, C.A. & Hook, J.R. (n.d.). *The culture of military organizations: A participant-observer case study of cultural diversity.* Retrieved on April 29, 2002 from: http://www.pamij.com/beitz.html

Belkin, A. & McNichol, J. (2000). *Effects of the 1992 lifting of restrictions on gay and lesbian service in the Canadian Forces: Appraising the evidence.* Centre for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military. Retrieved April 29, 2002 from: http://www.gaymilitary.ucsb.edu/Publications/CanadaPub1.htm

Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42* (2), 155-162.

Bentley, LCol L.W. (n.d.) The Debrief the Leaders Project (Officers). Office of the Special Advisor to the Chief of Defence Staff for Professional Development. Retrieved from Department of National Defence Web site on August 13, 2001: *http://www.dnd.ca/hr/pd/pdf/DebriefLeadres_e.PDF*

Biernat, M., Crandall, C.S., Young, L.V., Kobrynowicz, D. & Halpin, S.M. (1998). All that you can be: Stereotyping of self and others in a military context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75* (2), 301-317.

Billing, Y.D. & Alvesson, M. (2000). Questioning the notion of feminine leadership: A critical perspective on the gender labelling of leadership. *Gender, Work and Organization, 7* (3), 144-157.

Brenner, O.C., Tomkiewicz, J. & Schein, V.E. (1989). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics revisited. *Academy of Management Journal, 32* (3), 662-669.

Burke, S., & Collins, K.M. (2001). Gender differences in leadership styles and management skills. *Women in Management Review, 16* (5), 244-256.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D. & Allen, J.S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 468-478.

Carless, S.A. (1998). Gender differences in transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives. *Sex Roles, 39* (11), 887-902.

Carretta, T.R., & Doub, T.W. (1998). Group differences in the role of g and prior knowledge in the acquisition of subsequent job knowledge. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 585-593.

Chodorow, N. (1978). *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R.R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership: An empirical test. *Leadership Quarterly, 10* (3), 397-421.

Clover, W.H. (1990). Transformational leaders: Team performance, leadership ratings, and firsthand impressions. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership* (pp.171-184). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Dafoe-Whitehead, B. (1998). *The girls of Gen X.* American Enterprise, January/February.

Davis Report. (1997). *Chief Land Staff Gender Integration Study: The Experience of Women Who Have Served in the Combat Arms.* Retrieved August 13, 2001 from: http://www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/cls-gis/sep-sum.htm.

Delgado, J.L. (1990). *The Effect of Organizational Structure and Leader Gender on Expectations of Leadership.* Doctoral Dissertation. University of California, Santa Cruz.

Department of National Defence. (n.d.). *CDS-DM Strategy 2020.* Retrieved August 13, 2001 from http://www.vcds.dnd.ca/cds/strategy2k/fword_e.asp.

Dobbins, G.H. & Platz, S.J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *Academy of Management Review, 11* (1), 118-127.

Druskat, V.U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *Leadership Quarterly, 5* (2), 99-119.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B.J. &Shamir, B. (in press). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal.*

Eagly A.E., & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 223-256.

Eagly, A.E., Karau, S.J. & Johnson, B.T. (1992a). Gender and leadership style among school principals: A meta-analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 28* (1), 76-102.

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

Eagly, A.E., Karau, S.J. & Makhijani, M.G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 117* (1), 125-145.

Fagenson, E.A. (1993). Diversity in management: Introduction and the importance of women in management. In E.A. Fagenson (Ed.) *Women in Management: Trends, Issues and Challenges in Managerial Diversity* (Vol. 4). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Fine, G.A. (1987). One of the boys: Women in male dominated settings. In M.S. Kimiel (Eds.) *Changing New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Fischer, E. & Arnold, S.J. (1994). Sex, gender identity, gender role attitudes, and consumer behaviour. *Psychology & Marketing, 11* (20, 163-182.

Furnham, A. (2001). Self–estimates of intelligence: culture and gender differences in self and other estimates of both general (g) and multiple intelligences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 1381-1405.

Gainer, B. (1993). An empirical investigation of the role of involvement with a gendered product. *Psychology & Marketing, 10* (4), 265-283.

Gardiner, M. & Tiggemann, M. (1999). Gender differences in leadership style, job stress and mental health in male and female dominated industries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72* (3), 301-312.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Griffith, P.G., MacBride-King, J.L. & Townsend, B. (1997). *Closing The Gap: Women's Advancement in Corporate and Professional Canada.* The Conference Board of Canada and Catalyst.

Hackman, M.Z., Furniss, A.H., Hills, M.J. & Paterson, T.J. (1992). Perceptions of gender-role characteristics and transformational and transactional leadership behaviours. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 75*, 311-319.

Hater, J.J. & Bass, B.M. (1988). Supervisors evaluations and subordinates perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*, 695-702.

Hayes, A. (1999). New presence of women leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies, Winter/Spring, 6*: 112-21.

Helgesen, S. (1990). *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership.* Toronto, Ontario: Doubleday Currency.

Ignatieff, M. (2002). Ethics and the new war. *Canadian Military Journal [electronic format]. Winter 2* (4), 5-9. Retrieved March 28, 2002 from: http://www.journal.forces.ca/

Irwin, Brigadier-General S. (2002). A Multi-purpose capability and advanced technology. *Canadian Military Journal [electronic format]. Winter 2* (4), 53-60. Retrieved March 28, 2002 from: http://www.journal.forces.ca/

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Katila, S. & Merilainen, S. (1999). A serious researcher of just another nice girl?: Doing gender in a male-dominated scientific community. *Gender, Work, and Organization, 6*, 3, 163-173.

Kelloway, E.K. & Barling, J. (2000). What we have learned about developing transformational leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21* (7), 355-362.

Kelloway, E.K., Barling, J. & Helleur, J. (2000). Enhancing transformational leadership: The roles of training and feedback. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21* (3), 145-149.

Kent, R.L. & Moss, S.E. (1994). Effects of sex and gender role on leader emergence. *Academy of Management Journal, 37* (5), 1335-1346.

Komives, S.R. (1991a). The relationship of same- and cross-gender work pairs to staff performance and supervisor leadership in residence hall units. *Sex Roles, 24* (5/6), 355-363.

Komives, S.R. (1991b). Gender differences in the relationship of hall directors' transformational and transactional leadership and achieving styles. *Journal of College Student Development, 32* (March), 155-165.

Kraus, V. & Yonay, Y. P. (2000). The effects of occupational sex composition on the gender gap in workplace authority. *Social Sciences Research, 29*, 583-605.

Lefkowitz, J. (1994). Sex-related differences in job attitudes and dispositional variables: Now you see them,…. *Academy of Management Journal, 37* (2), 323-349.

Lewis, K.M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 221-234.

Loughlin, C. & Barling, J. (2001). Young workers' work values, attitudes, and behaviours. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74*, 543-558.

MacIntosh, N. (1998). *IQ and human intelligence.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maher, K.J. (1997). Gender-related stereotypes of transformational and transactional leadership. *Sex Roles, 37* (3/4), 209-225.

Masi, R.J. & Cooke, R.A. (2000). Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms, and organizational productivity. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 8* (1), 16-45.

McKay, S. (1992). Boys' club. *Report on Business, September*, 37-44.

McShane, S.L. (2001). *Canadian Organizational Behaviour* (Fourth Edition). Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Minister's Advisory Board. (2000). *Gender Integration and Employment Equity: Successes and Opportunities [electronic version].* Retrieved March 28, 2002 from: http:www.dnd.ca/eng/min/reports/genderint/cover_e.htm.

Minister's Advisory Board on Canadian Forces. (2001). *Gender Integration and Employment Equity [electronic version].* Retrieved March 28, 2002 from: http://www.forces.ca/menu/press/Reports/CFGIEE/INDEX-E.HTM.

Morris, A. (1996). Gender and ethnic differences in social constraints among a sample of New York city police officers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1* (2). 224-235.

Norris, J.M. & Wylie, A.M. (1995). Gender stereotyping of the managerial role among students in Canada and the United States. *Group & Organization Management, 20* (2), 167-182.

O'Hara, J. (1998). Rape in the military. *MacLean's, 111* (21, May 25), 14.

O'Keefe, M.J. (1990). *The Effects of Leadership Style on the Perceived Effectiveness and Satisfaction of Selected Army Officers*. Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Ostvik, K. & Rudmin, F. (2001). Bullying and hazing among Norwegian army soldiers: Two studies of prevalence, context and cognition. *Military Psychology, 13* (1), 17-39.

Parker, S.K. & Griffin, M.A. (in press). What is so bad about a little name-calling? Gender harassment, over-performance anxiety, and psychological distress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology.*

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. & Bommer, W.H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, 22*, 259-298.

Powell, G.N. & Butterfield, D.A. (1979). The 'good manager': Masculine or androgynous? *Academy of Management Journal, 22* (2), 395-403.

Pulakos,E.D., Schmitt, N., & Chan, D. (1996). Models of job performance ratings: An examination of ratee race, ratee gender, and rater level effects. *Human Performance, 9*, 103-119.

Reilly, J. & Mulhern, G. (1995). Gender differences in self-estimated IQ: the need for care in interpreting group data. *Personality and Individual Differences, 18*, 189-192.

Rimm, S. (2000). *See Jane Win: The Rimm report on how 1,000 girls became successful women.* New York: Three Rivers Press.

Robbins, S.P. & Langton, N. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies, Applications* (Second Canadian Edition). Toronto, ON: Prentice Hall.

Rosener, J.B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, Nov/Dec*, 119-125.

Ross, S.M. (1990). *Transformational Leadership: Measurement of personality attributes and work group performance.* Doctoral dissertation. George Washington University, Washington, DC.

Sandelands, L.E. (2002). Male and female in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 149-165.

Schein, V.E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57* (2), 95-100.

Schein, V.E. (1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60* (3), 340-344.

Schein, V.E. (1978). Sex role stereotyping, ability and performance: Prior research and new directions. *Personnel Psychology, 31*, 259-268.

Schein, V.E., Mueller, R., Lituchy, T., & Liu, J. (1996). Think manager – think male: A global phenomenon? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*, 33-41.

Shakeshaft, C. & Nowell, I. (1984). Research on theories, concepts and models of organizational behaviour: The influence of gender. *Issues in Education, II* (3), 186-203.

Schmidt, F.L., Hunter, J.E., & Outerbridge, A.N. (1986). Impact of job experience and ability on job knowledge, work sample performance, and supervisory ratings of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 432-439.

Special Advisor to the CDS for Professional Development. (n.d.). *Officership 2020*. Retrieved August 13, 2001 from: http://www.dnd.ca/pd/engraph/opd2020_e.asp.

Spence, J.T. & Buckner, C. (1995). Masculinity and Femininity: Defining the undefinable. In P.J. Kalbfleisch & M.J. Cody (Eds.), *Gender, Power, and Communication in Human Relationships*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation.* New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

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

When the victims are men. (1998). *MacLean's, 111* (22, June 1), 19.

Winslow, D. (1999). Rites of passage and group bonding in the Canadian Airborne. *Armed Forces & Society, 25* (3, Spring), 429-457.

Workman, B. (1997). *Masculine military culture needs to change; University of Maryland military expert offers policy recommendations.* Retrieved April 29, 2002 from the University of Maryland, College Park website at: http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Departments/InstAdv/newsdesk/releases/1997/97059rbw.html

Yammarino, F.J. & Bass, B.M. (1990a). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations, 43* (10), 975-995.

Yammarino, F.J. & Bass, B.M. (1990b). Long term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among Naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership* (pp.151-169). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Yammarino, F., Dubinsky, A.J., Comer, L.B. & Jolson, M.A. (1997). Women and transformational and contingent reward leadership: A multiple-levels-of-analysis perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40* (1), 205-222.

Yoder, J.D., Schleicher, T.L. &. McDonald, T.W. (1998). Empowering token women leaders: The importance of organizationally legitimated credibility. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 209-222.