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Catalyst Board of Directors
A WASTE OF VITAL LEADERSHIP TALENT

Corporations across Europe share the same problem—a dramatic gender gap in leadership. Although the size of this gap varies from country to country, the pattern remains the same in each case. Men far outnumber women in senior business leadership. This means that, in many countries across Europe, corporations are failing to utilize a significant proportion of the leadership talent that exists in the labor pool.

When we compare top-50 public companies in countries across Europe, we find that women are significantly underrepresented in the positions with the highest decision-making power. Women’s representation on the senior management teams of top-50 companies averages just 11 percent. As positions become more senior, women’s representation falls even further. On average, only 3 percent of top-50 companies in Europe are led by women.

These figures are puzzling when we consider the fact that women and men have comparable levels of education in many European countries or see the significant participation of women in professional and managerial positions.

What makes the most senior positions in business so inaccessible to women—even in countries where there is considerable government and social support for gender equality? Senior women leaders across Western Europe tell us that gender stereotyping is an important barrier to consider.

In this report, Catalyst and IMD—Institute for Management Development—in Switzerland do just that. And we find strikingly consistent evidence of stereotypes across European countries about the leadership effectiveness of women.

These stereotypes mirror popular portrayals in the media that cast women leaders as “maternal,” nurturing figures. Even though these are often seen as positive images, we believe they are limiting, causing organizations to miss the full range of leadership skills that women possess—all of which are important in business.

---

4 International Labour Office.
5 International Labour Office.
In a climate where global competition is keen and leadership talent is both critical and scarce, organizations cannot afford to overlook any of the leadership talents that women embody. To ensure that vital leadership talent is effectively assessed and deployed, we argue that organizations should heed the advice of women leaders and take steps to address stereotyping.

In this report, we suggest ways in which organizations can do this and provide insight on whether global corporations need locally customized approaches to combat gender bias.
To remain competitive, multinational corporations are increasingly challenged to not only understand cultural differences but to leverage them to achieve organizational goals. In order to meet this challenge, global corporations must adopt more “culture-conscious” approaches in managing their business operations. This cultural sensitivity is especially critical in addressing talent management issues such as the gender gap in leadership.

For this reason, Catalyst set out to better understand whether the experiences of women leaders differed in countries across Europe. Interestingly, Catalyst’s research found that European women—from a number of different countries—made similar attributions about their experiences in business. When asked to identify the barriers that keep them out of the most senior positions in business, women leaders across Europe cited gender stereotypes—with great regularity. And they’ve been doing so consistently for years.

In 1999, Catalyst and Opportunity Now, a British organization that works to transform the workplace by ensuring inclusiveness for women, asked senior women managers in the United Kingdom to identify the barriers that most impeded women’s advancement in business leadership. One of the barriers most frequently mentioned (identified by 85 percent of senior women) was gender stereotyping. A subsequent study suggested that this finding was widely applicable in Europe. In 2002, Catalyst surveyed senior women from large corporations and firms in 20 countries across Europe about the barriers they faced in business leadership. That study found that the leadership barrier most cited by women leaders was gender stereotyping.

Why do women blame stereotyping for the gender gap in leadership and do their experiences with stereotyping vary across cultures in Europe? To find answers, this study investigates how women and men leaders are perceived in European business from a cultural perspective. In collaboration with IMD in Switzerland, Catalyst examines whether managers from ten predominantly Western European countries perceive differences in women’s and men’s effectiveness at key leadership behaviors. To provide context, the study also examines managers’ cultural beliefs, including their attitudes about which behaviors are most essential to overall leadership performance. On the basis of these data, this study:

- Identifies similarities and differences in the ways women and men leaders are perceived across European cultures.
- Addresses whether the consequences of stereotyping varies for women leaders in different European cultures.

---

The highlights of the study are summarized below. Each is discussed in further detail with supporting data in the body of the report.

**KEY LEARNINGS**

- **Regardless of their cultural background, managers agreed on the behaviors that most set women and men leaders apart.**
  - “Care-taking” was perceived as the defining quality of women’s leadership.
    - All respondents perceived that women leaders outperformed men most at supporting others.
  - “Taking charge” was perceived as the defining quality of men’s leadership.
    - Men respondents from almost all cultural groups perceived that men leaders outperformed women most at problem-solving.
    - Women respondents from all cultural groups perceived that men leaders outperformed women most at influencing superiors.

- **Managers’ stereotypic perceptions misrepresent both women’s and men’s leadership.**
  - Managers’ perceptions do not match objective studies of women’s and men’s leadership.

- **Managers’ stereotypic perceptions were highly consensual.**
  - Because managers’ perceptions were so widely shared, they are more likely to be sources of bias in the workplace.

- **Ironically, stereotypic perceptions were more pervasive in countries with higher levels of gender equality.**

- **Culture can affect how women leaders are impacted by gender stereotypes.**
A LINK BETWEEN CULTURE AND GENDER STEREOTYPES

As noted earlier, this study examines perceptions of women’s and men’s leadership with a cultural lens. There are very specific reasons why this culture-oriented approach is especially critical to understanding issues of gender as well as leadership. We know from cross-cultural research that European countries differ on a number of cultural dimensions—including values and practices relating to gender equality. For example, studies suggest that people from Denmark are more likely to believe that each gender should play an equal role in society than people from France.\(^\text{10}\)

Furthermore, research tells us that gender egalitarianism, that is, the value societies place on gender equality, is linked to gender stereotypes\(^\text{11}\)—and not all in the ways one might expect. Although there are striking cross-cultural similarities in the content of gender stereotypes,\(^\text{12}\) cultures have different views about the *desirability* of feminine and masculine stereotypic traits. Furthermore, cultures vary in the *degree* to which they associate these feminine and masculine stereotypic traits with women and men, respectively. This means that, in some cultures, people are more likely to describe women with feminine stereotypic traits and men with masculine stereotypic traits than in other cultures. In other words, gender stereotypes are stronger in some cultures than in others. All of these cultural differences in stereotyping link to beliefs about gender equality. Specifically, previous research shows that:

- Societies with more gender egalitarian values, that is, societies that hold gender equality as an ideal, also have a higher regard for feminine stereotypic traits than societies with less egalitarian values.\(^\text{13}\)
- Interestingly, gender stereotypes are often stronger in more egalitarian societies than they are in societies that do not value gender equality.\(^\text{14}\)

These findings provide a solid rationale for studying stereotypes of women and men leaders from a cultural perspective. Even though women across Europe tell us they experience stereotyping as a barrier to business advancement,\(^\text{15}\) the nature of their experiences is likely to vary significantly depending on the cultural context in which they work.

---


\(^{11}\) Emrich et al., p. 377-379.


\(^{13}\) Emrich et al., p. 375.

\(^{14}\) Emrich et al., p. 377.

CULTURE PREDICTS ATTITUDES TOWARD LEADERSHIP

We also take a cultural perspective in this study because of the connection between culture and beliefs about leadership. Leadership research shows that cultures often have very different notions about what behaviors contribute to outstanding leadership. With these different cultural leadership ideals in mind, we can better understand how women leaders are likely to be affected by gender stereotyping. Specifically, we can examine, in different cultural contexts, whether stereotypes of women leaders portray them as a poor or good fit for leadership roles relative to men. If we know which behaviors are valued in leaders, we can judge the degree to which existing stereotypes do or do not ascribe these valued leadership attributes to women and men. For example, studies show that in Austria and East Germany, performance-oriented behaviors, such as setting ambitious goals and challenging subordinates, are considered more important to effective leadership than in Finland and Denmark. This finding suggests that if women leaders are stereotyped as less performance-oriented than men, this stereotype could be damaging to women leaders in Austria. However, if that same stereotype also exists in Finland, it would likely be less damaging to women leaders who work in that culture. The fact that culture is a predictor of what leadership behaviors are valued also makes it important to examine stereotypes and their effects on women leaders through a cultural lens.

HOW WE MEASURE CULTURE IN THIS STUDY

To do this, we grouped study participants based on whether their backgrounds were culturally similar. Analyses included 935 respondents, more than 90 percent of whom self-identified as managers, from IMD’s alumni database (see Chapter 9 for methodology and respondent profiles). They completed two components of the Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire (CPQ), to assess individuals’ beliefs and preferences about how people should relate to: 1) each other; and 2) the environment—dimensions of culture that we know from previous research are important in distinguishing cultures.

Relating to people. The CPQ measures three different kinds of beliefs about how people should relate to one another. Each set of beliefs is described below.

- Individualism—Emphasizes individual or personal interests and responsibilities (e.g., Our main responsibility is to and for ourselves and immediate family.)
- Collectivism—Emphasizes group/social interests and responsibilities (e.g., Our main responsibility is to and for a larger extended group of people.)
- Hierarchy—Emphasizes the idea that power and responsibility should not be distributed equally in society; individuals who are higher in the hierarchy should have power over and responsibility for those below them (e.g., It is normal and good that power and responsibility are unequally distributed throughout society.)

19 The full CPQ includes five distinct cultural components or orientations.
**Relating to the environment.** The CPQ also measures cultural beliefs about how people should relate to their environment, where the environment refers to an individual’s physical and social surroundings. The survey measures three different categories of beliefs that characterize ways of reacting to problems and or thinking about changes in the environment. They are:

- **Mastery**—Emphasizes controlling, directing, and changing the environment (e.g., Our purpose and natural role is to control nature and the environment around us.)
- **Harmony**—Emphasizes taking care of and maintaining balance with the environment (e.g., Our purpose and natural role is to maintain balance among the elements of the environment, including ourselves.)
- **Subjugation**—Emphasizes being subject to and influenced by the environment (e.g., Our purpose and natural role is to understand and subjugate ourselves to the plan determined by a larger natural or supernatural element.)

**Figure 1: Clusters of Culturally Similar Countries**

Based on their responses to the CPQ, we statistically analyzed similarities in the cultural preferences of respondents from Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom (UK), and the United States (US). Although there were certainly country differences within each grouping, Figure 1 above shows that, based on the dimensions we measured, there were four distinct clusters of countries with similar cultural profiles. They include a Latin cluster that groups Italy, France, and Spain; a Germanic cluster that groups Germany and The Netherlands; an Anglo cluster that groups the United Kingdom and the United States; and finally a Nordic cluster that groups Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Previous research, using measures of culture other than the CPQ, have also shown these clusters of countries to be culturally similar.

---

21 Participants’ CPQ scores were not adjusted for any cluster differences in response bias.

22 Using multidimensional scaling, we identified four clusters of countries based on similarities in their average CPQ scores on each of the six dimensions: harmony, mastery, subjugation, individualism, collectivism, and hierarchy. A two-dimensional solution fit the observed similarities (stress=.15); we also performed a discriminant analysis, predicting country assignments to each of the four clusters (identified in the multidimensional scaling analysis) from average country CPQ scores. Results showed that based on the CPQ scores, 100 percent of countries were correctly assigned to the identified clusters.

23 The Anglo cluster is predominantly from the United Kingdom, with only 29 U.S.-born managers (working in Europe) of a total of 159 managers.

In the present study, we found that collectivism (i.e., an emphasis on group rather than personal interests) and harmony (i.e., a preference for living in balance with the environment) were the dimensions on the CPQ that best described the differences between the clusters and, therefore, only these dimensions are shown in Figure 1. Managers from countries in the Anglo and Latin clusters were more collectivist than those from countries in the Nordic and Germanic clusters;\(^{25}\) and managers from countries in the Anglo and Nordic clusters had lower preferences for harmony than those from countries in the Germanic and Latin clusters.\(^{26}\) In Chapter 4, we describe how women and men leaders are perceived in each of the four cultural clusters.

\(^{25}\) Based on post-hoc multiple comparisons (p<.001).
\(^{26}\) Based on post-hoc multiple comparisons (p<.001).
A SHORT PRIMER ON STEREOTYPES

What are stereotypes? Stereotypes can be defined as perceptions about the qualities that distinguish groups or categories of people. They can apply to any category that a society considers important—from gender to caste to religious affiliation. Psychologists believe that people use stereotypes as a short-cut to help them anticipate the motives, abilities, and behaviors of others. Rather than having to “figure out” each person they meet, people routinely use stereotypes for the sake of expediency.

This efficiency often comes at a price, however. Whether the stereotypes are positive or negative, research shows that they can cause us to unknowingly miss information about others. If we then act on the incomplete information that stereotypes can lead us to, we can wind up making poor or unjustified decisions—without even realizing it. This chain of events—stereotyping leading to flawed information and then to bad decisions—is especially likely to occur in certain conditions, such as when our attention is spread thin and when we have to process a lot of complex information. Senior women leaders suggest to us that this chain of events routinely occurs in organizations: Stereotypes create flawed impressions about their skills and abilities to lead, which then result in decisions that pass them over for top leadership positions.

CAN STEREOTYPES REALLY CONTRIBUTE TO THE GENDER GAP IN BUSINESS LEADERSHIP?

When the issue of stereotyping is raised in organizations, some doubt that it is as pervasive and harmful as women leaders in Europe suggest to us. Others argue that stereotypes must reflect real differences in the behavior of women and men or they wouldn’t exist. They therefore believe that it is the behavioral differences alone, not baseless stereotyping, that really accounts for the gender disparities in management. To change the gender mix, some claim, the focus should be on women’s behavior, not on stereotyping. Below we review some reasons why such thinking is misguided. Organizations should not discount stereotypes as a contributor to the leadership gender gap.

1. The bias blind spot—one reason why people underestimate stereotypes. Many people doubt that they engage in stereotyping. Yet social psychologists have documented repeatedly that we all do it and that stereotypes can and do “dupe” us into perceiving that they are true. Their distorting effects on our perceptions can occur in a number of ways, including channeling our attention to observe and recall more events that confirm rather than disconfirm our stereotypes. To make matters worse, individuals are often especially blind to the fact that they, too—not just other people—are vulnerable to such perceptual errors. Individuals have a blind spot when it comes to their own biases and this contributes to the strong conviction that what they perceive is real. This blind spot likely explains why many business leaders insist that there are sharp differences between women and men leaders in their organizations—even when empirical evidence suggests otherwise. We believe that this bias blind spot is also one reason why the impact of stereotyping is commonly underestimated in organizations.

2. Stereotypes don’t have to be true to exist. Although stereotypes are very difficult to “prove” accurate with scientific evidence, many people generally accept them to be true. This begs the question of where stereotypes come from in the first place. Many experts on stereotypes believe that they develop as justifications for the different social roles and statuses that groups occupy in a society. One fact that supports this belief is that similar stereotypes exist about low-status groups everywhere in the world. For example, groups that occupy subordinate statuses—such as women, ethnic minorities, and the poor—are all stereotyped in common ways. Relative to high status groups such as men and the wealthy, these low status groups are commonly described as incompetent, dependent, and lacking ambition. Researchers believe that these characterizations develop and persist because they justify the standing that these groups have been assigned in society—not because they’ve been shown to be true over time. This reasoning likely applies in business, too: Stereotypical characterizations of women leaders may justify why women are excluded from the highest positions of leadership in organizations and do not necessarily represent undisputable truths about women’s competence or interests.

References:
36 Schneider, p. 331.
37 Schneider, p. 224.
3. **Stereotypes undermine the perceived need for change.** More important than the issue of whether stereotypes are true or not is how they can change our behavior once we are exposed to them. For example, researchers have shown that we can influence others to act in ways that confirm our stereotypes of them. But perhaps the more lasting and damaging effect of stereotypes is that they cause us to accept the status quo. Research suggests that when women and men are exposed to gender stereotypes, they also become more accepting of existing gender inequalities. This means that, in organizations where gender stereotyping is pervasive, there isn’t likely to be much support for changing the gender mix in leadership.

4. **A little bias can have a big impact.** Just how big of an impact can stereotypes really have? Can they really account for the gender gap in leadership? Research modeling the effect of stereotypic bias suggests they can. Imagine that negative stereotypes of women leaders have a small biasing effect of 7 percent on promotion decisions. In other words, women get 7 percent fewer promotions than men. Even with an initial candidate pool that is equally split between women and men, this small biasing effect could cause the representation of women could drop from 50 percent to 42 percent after only four promotion cycles (see page 51 for calculation model). It is easy to see then how, over the course of their careers, stereotypic bias can place women at a significant cumulative disadvantage. These findings make a strong case for sitting up and paying attention to the issue of stereotypic bias.

**DO STEREOTYPIC PERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN AND MEN CONTRIBUTE TO THE LEADERSHIP GENDER GAP IN EUROPEAN BUSINESS?**

This is the central question we examine in this report. To demonstrate that stereotyping is indeed a factor in the leadership gender gap (as women leaders claim), it is necessary to first substantiate that stereotype-based perceptions of women’s and men’s leadership do in fact exist among European managers. In Chapters 4 and 5, we present convincing evidence that they do, in all cultures that were studied.

Then in Chapter 6, we examine the effects of these stereotypic perceptions on women leaders and how they may vary in different cultural contexts. We find that in some cultural contexts in particular, stereotypic views of women leaders may portray them as lacking some of the most valued leadership attributes. We end in Chapter 8 with recommendations on how stereotyping might be addressed in organizations in different cultural contexts.

---

40 Schneider, p. 217.
KEY LEARNINGS

- Regardless of their cultural background, managers agreed on the behaviors that most set women and men leaders apart.
  - “Taking care” of others was perceived to be the defining quality of women leaders.
  - Both women and men respondents from all cultural clusters perceived that women leaders outperformed men most at supporting others.
  - “Taking charge” of people and situations was perceived to be the defining quality of men leaders.
  - Men respondents from almost all cultural clusters perceived that men leaders outperformed women most at problem-solving.
  - Women respondents from all cultural clusters perceived that men leaders outperformed women most at influencing upward.

- Managers’ stereotypic perceptions misrepresent both women’s and men’s leadership.
  - Cross-cultural stereotypes about women’s and men’s traits—not objective observation—predicted men’s perceptions of the largest differences between women and men leaders.

- Within each cultural cluster, managers’ stereotypic perceptions were highly consensual.
  - Because managers’ perceptions were so widely shared, they are more likely to be sources of bias in the workplace.

DIFFERENT CULTURES, SIMILAR PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE LARGEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN LEADERS

To examine whether stereotypic perceptions of women and men leaders exist in Europe, Catalyst and IMD surveyed 935 IMD alumni. As noted previously, more than 90 percent of the respondents we surveyed self-identified as managers (see Chapter 9 for detailed respondent profiles). We asked them to judge women’s and men’s effectiveness at 14 leadership behaviors. These behaviors, listed in Table 1, were identified from previous research as key components of leadership.

---

43 The responses of 230 additional respondents were excluded from analyses due to missing data to remove outliers. This figure also includes respondents who were excluded because their countries of origin were not adequately represented in the participant sample and therefore could not be included in cluster analysis.

44 IMD alumni include individuals who completed either degree-granting programs or more than 20 non-degree open-enrollment programs. English is the working language at IMD.

45 The survey was adapted from previous research: Richard F. Martell and Aaron L. DeSmet, “A Diagnostic-Ratio Approach to Measuring Beliefs about the Leadership Abilities of Women and Men,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 86, no. 6 (December 2001): p. 1223-1231.

Table 1: Key Leadership Behaviors from Previous Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consulting</th>
<th>Networking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking with others before making plans or decisions that affect them and inviting participation in decision-making.</td>
<td>Developing and maintaining relationships with others who may be resources for information or support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegating</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorizing others to have substantial responsibility and discretion in making decisions and carrying out work activities.</td>
<td>Designing objectives, strategies, and procedures for accomplishing goals and coordinating with other parts of the organization in the most efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencing Upward</th>
<th>Problem-Solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affecting others in positions of higher rank.</td>
<td>Identifying, analyzing, and acting decisively to eliminate impediments to work performance in a timely and systematic manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspiring Others</th>
<th>Rewarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivating others toward greater enthusiasm for and commitment to work by appealing to emotion, values, logic, and personal example.</td>
<td>Providing praise, recognition, financial remuneration, or promotions when appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectually Stimulating</th>
<th>Role Modeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exciting the abilities of others to learn, perceive, understand, or reason.</td>
<td>Serving as a pattern or standard of excellence to be imitated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the skill development and career advancement of subordinates.</td>
<td>Encouraging, assisting, and providing resources for others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Team-Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the performance of subordinates and the organizational unit for progress and quality and detecting potential threats and opportunities.</td>
<td>Encouraging positive identification with the organizational unit, encouraging cooperation and constructive conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We asked all respondents, both women and men, to estimate from their experience the percentage of women leaders who were effective at each of the leader behaviors listed in Table 1. Subsequently, we asked the same respondents to estimate the percentage of men leaders that were effective at these same leadership behaviors. We then compared the estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness to determine if there were any statistically meaningful differences in their perceptions of each gender. This approach allowed us to deduce whether respondents perceived gender differences without asking them to compare women and men leaders outright. It was important to take this approach because a direct comparison could make respondents self-conscious about whether they might appear to be sexist, and in turn, elicit responses that did not accurately reflect their true beliefs.

---

47 Yukl; Bass.
48 Estimates that were three or more standard deviations away from the mean were excluded from analyses.

Different Cultures, Similar Perceptions: Stereotyping of Western European Business Leaders
We found evidence consistent with what women leaders have been telling Catalyst all along. Our results showed that managers from every cultural group perceived distinct differences between women and men leaders—even though previous research does not support their beliefs. Interestingly, there was also substantial agreement among respondents in every cultural group about how women and men leaders were different. We discuss the aspects of leadership where respondents perceived the largest, most extreme differences in this chapter. We conclude that stereotypes about the personality traits of women and men—not experience—were the likely source of these extreme perceptions of women’s and men’s leadership.

WHEN IT COMES TO PERCEPTIONS ABOUT WHAT MOST SETS WOMEN AND MEN LEADERS APART, CULTURE DOESN’T SEEM TO MATTER

Supporting—most polar perceptions of women outperforming men. Managers from all clusters studied perceived that women leaders outperformed men most at supporting others. We found that in each culture, women and men respondents shared this view. Our findings suggested that “taking care” of others was the defining stereotypic view of women leaders.

“Taking care:” Perceptions of women respondents. Figure 2 shows that, in each cultural group, women respondents perceived that more women than men leaders were effective at supporting. Women respondents from Nordic Europe said, on average, that 86 percent of women leaders were effective at supporting others; but they said that fewer men leaders, about 61 percent, were effective at this behavior. Latin women had a similar view. While they said that 81 percent of women leaders were effective at supporting, they perceived, on average, that only 60 percent of men leaders were effective at this behavior. Figure 2 also shows a similar pattern among Germanic and Anglo women respondents. Germanic and Anglo women said that 85 percent and 77 percent of women leaders, respectively, were effective at supporting. Women from both cultural clusters also perceived that relatively fewer men leaders were effective at the same behavior. Germanic women estimated that just 59 percent of men leaders supported others effectively. Anglo women judged that 55 percent, just more than one-half of men leaders, did the same.

One respondent described her views about why women leaders are more effective than men at supporting:

“Women want to succeed and make others happy … They listen better to signals and atmosphere.”

—Dutch Woman

---


Based on mean differences and effect sizes.

T-tests showed that estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at supporting were significantly different, which means the differences in estimates we observed in each cluster were not due to chance. We used a conservative (bonferroni adjusted p. values) significance criterion of p=.004 to analyze all respondents’ estimates except those of Latin women. Because of the smaller sample of Latin women (see Chapter 9), a slightly less conservative (bonferroni adjusted p. value) significance criterion of p=.007 was used.
As noted earlier, the perceptions of men respondents were quite similar to women’s. As was the case with women respondents, men perceived that supporting was the behavior at which women leaders most outperformed men, though men respondents tended to report a smaller gender gap than women did.52 This finding held true regardless of respondents’ cultural background. Nordic and Latin men perceived that 77 percent and 70 percent of women leaders, respectively, were effective at supporting others. Men from both clusters, Nordic and Latin, similarly reported that fewer men leaders, 63 percent and 64 percent, respectively, were effective at the same behavior. The views of Germanic and Anglo men were no different from that of Nordic and Latin respondents. Figure 3 shows that Germanic and Anglo men both estimated that about 75 percent of women leaders supported others effectively. Men from both cultural backgrounds also reported that a smaller percentage of men leaders were effective at this behavior. Germanic men said, on average, that 63 percent of men were effective at supporting; Anglo men said that 56 percent of men leaders were effective at this behavior.

52 T-tests showed that men respondents’ estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at supporting were significantly different which means that the observed differences in estimates were not due to chance. We used a conservative significance criterion (bonferonni adjusted) of p<.004.

Different Cultures, Similar Perceptions: Stereotyping of Western European Business Leaders
The quotation below elaborates on men’s perceptions of women’s higher effectiveness at supporting others:

“[Women are able to] motivate people by coaching and supporting them, and give direct feedback about expectations, achievements, and performance. They don’t avoid tackling critical personal issues.”

—German Man

Influencing upward and problem-solving—most polar perceptions of men outperforming women. There was also considerable agreement about the aspects of leadership at which men most outperformed women leaders.53 Again, culture was not a factor in respondents’ judgments. But this time, respondents’ gender did matter. In almost every cultural cluster, women and men respondents had different views about the behavior at which men leaders most outperformed women. Even so, both men’s and women’s perceptions had one theme in common—their perceptions defined men as action-oriented, “take charge” leaders with the capacity to influence people and manipulate their environment. We describe the perceptions of women respondents first.

---

53 Based on mean differences and effect sizes.
“Taking charge:” Perceptions of women respondents. As shown in Figure 4, women from each cultural cluster believed that a larger percentage of men than women leaders were effective at influencing superiors.\(^{54}\) Nordic women perceived the largest gender gap. They estimated that while 85 percent of men leaders were effective at influencing upward, only 66 percent of women leaders were effective at the same behavior. Germanic women perceived the second largest gender gap. They perceived that 81 percent of men leaders were effective at influencing upward but judged that fewer women, 67 percent, were effective at influencing. Latin women reported a slightly smaller difference between women and men leaders than Germanic women did. Latin women said that 81 percent of men leaders effectively influenced their superiors, but perceived that men’s performance was matched by only 68 percent of women leaders. Of all cultural clusters, Anglo women perceived the smallest gap in the effectiveness of women and men leaders at influencing upward. Like women from the other cultural clusters, they nonetheless reported that more men than women leaders excelled at influencing superiors. While Anglo women estimated that 80 percent of men leaders were effective at influencing upward, they said that a smaller percentage of women leaders, 69 percent, were effective at this behavior.

![Figure 4: Influencing Upward: Women Respondents’ Perceptions of Women and Men Leaders, by Culture](image)

\(^{54}\) T-tests showed that women’s estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at influencing upward were significantly different, which means that the observed differences in estimates were not due to chance. We used a conservative (bonferroni adjusted p. value) significance criterion of \(p=.004\) criterion to analyze all respondents’ estimates except those of Latin women. Because of the smaller sample of Latin women (see Chapter 9), a less conservative (bonferroni adjusted p. value) significance criterion of \(p=.007\) was used.
One woman attributed the differences between women and men leaders’ performance at influencing upward to a difference in motives. She suggested that women leaders want to be recognized for their abilities rather than their political skill:

“Male leaders are, relative to the females, better at ‘corporate life’—better at networking and influencing upward—than women, who (generally) find these elements less important (they want to be recognized for abilities—and do not flag them themselves)...”

—Danish Woman

“Taking charge:” Perceptions of men respondents. Just as we saw among women respondents, there was considerable cross-cultural agreement among men respondents. In almost every cultural cluster, men respondents perceived that men leaders’ higher effectiveness at problem-solving was their greatest performance advantage over women leaders. As shown in Figure 5, Latin, Germanic, and Anglo men said that 75 percent, 80 percent, and 77 percent of men leaders, respectively, were effective at solving problems. Men from each cultural background said that smaller percentages of women leaders were effective at problem-solving than men. Men from the Latin, Germanic, and Anglo clusters perceived that only 68 percent, 70 percent, and 66 percent of women leaders, respectively, were effective at problem-solving.

The comment below exemplifies one male respondent’s beliefs about why women were less effective than men at problem-solving:

“Women are often less flexible and less able to see problems from ‘out of the box.’”

—Italian Man

55 Based on magnitude of mean differences and effect sizes.
56 T-tests showed that men respondents’ estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at problem-solving were significantly different, which means that the observed differences in their estimates were not due to chance. We used a conservative (bonferroni adjusted) significance criterion of p=.004.
For the most part, Nordic men agreed with their counterparts from the other cultural clusters. They also perceived that problem-solving was an aspect of leadership associated with relatively large gender differences in leadership performance, with men leaders outshining women. However, they perceived that men leaders outperformed women leaders at influencing upward almost as much as they outperformed them at problem-solving. For Nordic men, problem-solving and influencing upward were the behaviors at which men leaders’ performance most exceeded women’s. Figure 6 shows that Nordic men perceived similar sized gaps in the performance of women and men leaders at problem-solving and influencing upward. They estimated that while 78 percent of men leaders were effective at problem-solving, only 68 percent of women leaders were effective at this behavior. And they estimated that while 79 percent of men leaders were effective at influencing upward, only 66 percent of women leaders were effective at this behavior. Comparing Figures 5 and 6, we also see that the sizes of perceived gender gaps at influencing and problem-solving were similar across cultural clusters.

Figure 5: Problem-Solving: Men Respondents’ Perceptions of Women and Men Leaders, by Culture

Figure 6: Problem-Solving and Influencing Upward: Nordic Men Respondents’ Perceptions of Women and Men Leaders

*T-tests showed that Nordic men respondents’ estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at influencing upward and problem-solving were significantly different, which means that the observed differences in estimates were not due to chance. We used a conservative (bonferroni adjusted) significance criterion of p=.004.

Different Cultures, Similar Perceptions: Stereotyping of Western European Business Leaders
WHY ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD CARE ABOUT THESE MOST POLAR PERCEPTIONS

These most polar perceptions of gender differences are worth paying attention to. As we argue below, these perceptions are not only misleading, but, if left unchecked, they also have considerable potential to influence how women and men leaders are judged and treated in organizations.

1. Perceptions and reality don’t converge. Managers’ most polar perceptions don’t converge well with what leadership research tells us about women and men leaders. In organizations, women and men lead in very similar ways. This was the conclusion of a meta-analysis of more than 40 studies on women and men leaders.\(^\text{58}\) After considering a number of leadership behaviors, the study indicated that the most notable point of difference was the greater preference among women leaders for democratic decision-making. Still, this difference was small, suggesting that there are many women who do not make decisions in a democratic way, and also that there are many men who do in fact practice a democratic decision-making style. Another meta-analysis of 45 studies measuring different kinds of leadership behaviors that also included samples of leaders from Europe and North America found only slight differences between the leadership styles of women and men leaders. Due to the great degree of similarity in the behaviors of women and men leaders, that study concluded that “knowing that a particular individual is female or male would not be a reliable indicator of that person’s leadership style.”\(^\text{59}\) In short, empirical evidence does not indicate many gender differences in leadership—and certainly not of the magnitude that the respondents’ perceptions in this study might suggest. Managers’ stereotypic perceptions misrepresent both women’s and men’s leadership.

\(^{58}\) Eagly and Johnson, “Gender and Leadership Style.” This study measured task-oriented, people-oriented, autocratic, and democratic leadership styles.

\(^{59}\) Eagly et al., “Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles,” p. 586. This study measured transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. A description of these styles is beyond the scope of this report.
2. Managers’ perceptions map to cross-cultural gender stereotypes. Where do managers’ perceptions come from if, as noted previously, they do not reflect objective differences between women and men leaders? We found evidence that cross-cultural stereotypes of women’s and men’s traits were a likely source of managers’ most polar perceptions of women and men. In a separate study, we found that people tend to associate some of the 14 leader behaviors (from Table 1) more strongly with feminine stereotypic traits, such as being sensitive; and associate other leader behaviors with masculine stereotypic traits, such as being logical. The results, of that study predicted, almost exactly, what managers in the present study perceived. The behavior shown in our previous study to be most related to feminine traits was supporting others; and, as we saw earlier, this was exactly the behavior identified by all managers in the present study as the aspect of leadership at which women leaders most outperformed men. Similarly, the behavior shown in our previous study to be most related to masculine traits was problem-solving; this was exactly the behavior which was identified by almost all of the men managers in the present study as the single aspect of leadership at which men leaders most outperformed women. For men respondents, we saw that cross-cultural stereotypes about women’s and men’s traits perfectly predicted their perceptions of what the largest differences between women and men leaders were. If these stereotype-based perceptions are applied in organizations, they could cause the talent of women and men leaders to be misjudged.

3. Consensus increases the likelihood of bias. If everyone believes it, it must be true. This line of reasoning can give a great deal of power to managers’ stereotypic views of women and men leaders. We found considerable consensus in each cultural group about the largest differences between women and men leaders. For example, a significant majority of women respondents from each cultural group, ranging from approximately 85 percent to 96 percent, agreed that women leaders’ effectiveness at supporting was higher than men’s average effectiveness at supporting. And across cultural groups, approximately 62 percent to 71 percent of men respondents perceived that men’s effectiveness at problem-solving was higher than that of women’s average effectiveness at problem-solving. Research suggests that when stereotypic beliefs are widely shared, they gain more credibility, making individuals more likely to apply them in making judgments. The stereotypic reputations that women and men leaders have at supporting others, solving problems, and influencing superiors are thus likely sources of bias in the workplace.

60 See Appendix on page 50.
61 Nordic men perceived that men leaders most outperformed women leaders at influencing upward, closely followed by problem-solving; and women respondents perceived that men leaders most outperformed women at influencing upward alone—not problem-solving.
63 Schneider, p. 238.
KEY LEARNINGS

- Ironically, stereotypic perceptions were more pervasive in cultural clusters with higher levels of gender equality.
  - Nordic and Germanic managers perceived gender differences at more aspects of leadership than managers from Latin and Anglo clusters.
  - Relative to other cultural clusters, stereotypic perceptions of women and men leaders were more widely shared among Nordic managers.

CULTURAL VARIATIONS IN PERCEPTIONS OF WOMEN AND MEN LEADERS

In Chapter 4, we noted striking cross-cultural similarities in managers’ perceptions about the largest, most polar differences between women and men leaders. However, there were also some differences across cultural clusters in the ways in which women and men leaders were perceived. These cluster differences concerned: 1) the number of leader behaviors at which respondents perceived gender differences and 2) the degree of consensus or agreement within each cluster about these perceived differences. For example, in the Nordic clusters, we found more evidence of stereotypic perceptions than in other groups—especially among women respondents. In this cultural cluster, we also found that stereotypic perceptions of women and men leaders were generally more consensual (i.e., more widely shared or agreed upon). Below we summarize the differences between clusters in perceptions of women and men leaders.

STEREOTYPIC PERCEPTIONS FAVORING WOMEN LEADERS

The check marks in Table 2 indicate behaviors at which women’s effectiveness was perceived to exceed men’s, in each cultural cluster. Only the behaviors where respondents’ perceptions of women and men leaders were significantly different are shown. Table 2 shows that Nordic women had more favorable stereotypic perceptions of women leaders than any other group of women respondents. Nordic women perceived that women leaders outperformed men at 10 of the 14 leader behaviors; they were also the only group of women to judge men less effective than women leaders at providing intellectual stimulation. Germanic women perceived that women leaders were more successful than men at nine of the leader behaviors. Anglo and Latin women attributed higher performance to women leaders at six leader behaviors—fewer than the other cultural clusters.
Table 2 shows a similar pattern among Anglo and Latin men. Compared to men respondents from other cultural clusters, they perceived that women outperformed men leaders at fewer aspects of leadership. Latin men had only one positive judgment about women leaders: They were more effective than men leaders at supporting others. Anglo men perceived that women leaders were more successful at two leader behaviors. In contrast, Nordic and Germanic men perceived that women outperformed men leaders at four of the 14 leader behaviors.

Table 2: Leader Behaviors at Which Respondents Considered Women Better Than Men, by Cultural Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviors</th>
<th>Nordic Cluster</th>
<th>Germanic Cluster</th>
<th>Anglo Cluster</th>
<th>Latin Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectually Stimulating</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Modeling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Building</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STEREOTYPIC PERCEPTIONS FAVORING MEN LEADERS

Table 3 shows that women respondents perceived that there were few behaviors at which men leaders exceeded women. In most cultural clusters, women identified one leader behavior at which men leaders outperformed women: influencing upward. Germanic women attributed higher effectiveness to men leaders at one additional behavior: delegating.

Compared to women respondents, men respondents perceived that men leaders performed better than women leaders at a larger number of behaviors. However, Nordic and Germanic men indicated that there were more aspects of leadership compared to Anglo and Latin men, at which men leaders were more effective than women. Nordic and Germanic men perceived that men leaders were more effective than women at four and three leader behaviors, respectively. But Anglo and Latin men judged that there were only two leader behaviors at which men leaders outperformed women.

We performed t-tests to judge if there were significant differences in respondents’ average estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at 14 leader behaviors. Differences found to be statistically significant cannot be attributed to chance. We used a conservative (bonferroni adjusted) significance criterion of p=.004 to analyze estimates of women and men respondents from all cultural clusters except those of Latin women. Due to the relatively smaller sample of Latin women (see Chapter 9), we used a less conservative (bonferroni adjusted p. value) significance criterion of p=.007. Table 2 only shows those behaviors where respondents’ estimates of the effectiveness of women and men leaders were significantly different.
Table 3 also shows that Nordic men were the only group to perceive that men leaders were more intellectually stimulating than women. Anglo men were also unique in that they were the only group to identify inspiring followers as the forte of men leaders. Latin men were the only group to identify role-modeling as a strength of men.

**Table 3: Leader Behaviors at Which Respondents Considered Men Better Than Women, by Cultural Cluster**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviors</th>
<th>Nordic Cluster</th>
<th>Germanic Cluster</th>
<th>Anglo Cluster</th>
<th>Latin Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing Upward</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectually Stimulating</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Modeling</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARE WOMEN RESPONDENTS SHOWING FAVORITISM?

It is clear from Tables 2 and 3 that women from all cultural clusters had more favorable perceptions of women leaders than men respondents did. As noted earlier, women respondents in each group judged that women outperformed men leaders at more of the leader behaviors than men respondents did; and they judged that men leaders outperformed women leaders at fewer of the leader behaviors than men respondents did. Women respondents also attributed higher effectiveness to women leaders at more behaviors than men respondents attributed higher effectiveness to men leaders. For example, Latin women said women leaders outperformed men at six behaviors and Latin men judged that men leaders were more effective than women leaders at only two leader behaviors. In each cultural cluster, women respondents showed some degree of favoritism to women leaders.

But we also noted that there was some variation between clusters in the magnitude of these favoritism trends. In particular, we noted in Table 2 that Nordic and Germanic women tended to have more positive perceptions of women leaders than any other group. Especially considering the number of behaviors at which women respondents judged women leaders superior to men, we saw (in Table 2) that Nordic women indicated the largest number of behaviors (10 of the 14 leader behaviors), closely followed by Germanic women (9 of the 14 leader behaviors) and then Anglo and Latin women. Why do women have such glowing perceptions of women leaders—and why is this pattern more marked among respondents from Nordic and Germanic countries than among Latin and Anglo respondents?

---

45We performed t-tests to judge if there were significant differences in respondents’ average estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at 14 leader behaviors. Differences found to be statistically significant cannot be attributed to chance. We used a conservative (bonferonni adjusted) significance criterion of $p=.004$ to analyze estimates of women and men respondents from all cultural clusters except those of Latin women. Due to the relatively smaller sample of Latin women (see Chapter 9), we used a less conservative (bonferonni adjusted p. value) significance criterion of $p=.007$. Table 3 only shows those behaviors where respondents’ estimates of the effectiveness of women and men leaders were significantly different.
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Women’s beliefs about their own leadership capabilities can increase favoritism. The women respondents we surveyed likely had high leadership self-efficacy, that is, a strong belief in their own leadership competence. Psychological research suggests that this high leadership self-efficacy is a likely cause of the favoritism trends we observed.66

Why? People do not always buy into stereotypic beliefs about the groups to which they belong. Studies suggest that this sort of reaction is especially likely when stereotypic attitudes devalue individuals’ competence in activities in which they already have high self-efficacy. This research shows that high self-efficacy can not only cause people to disregard negative stereotypes about their groups but also can cause them to try to negate or disprove these stereotypes.67

Why would women respondents have high leadership efficacy? Many of the women respondents we surveyed had already attained leadership positions and were likely selected by their organizations for participation in management development programs at IMD. Research on self-efficacy suggests that the experience of having already excelled at leadership tasks in their careers and of having the support of their employers to receive management training would enhance the leadership self-efficacy of the women respondents we surveyed68 (compared to women who might not have had these confidence-building experiences).

Given that men often make up a majority of women’s colleagues in the management ranks,69 the women we surveyed—many of whom had leadership roles themselves—were likely to have been exposed to the negative perceptions expressed by men respondents in our study. These experiences, coupled with their high self-efficacy, likely encouraged them to refute men’s negative stereotypic perceptions of women’s competence. Indeed, we found that women judged women leaders to be more effective than men at problem-solving—the behavior considered to be most associated with masculine stereotypic traits70 and the behavior at which men respondents judged women leaders to be most inferior to men.

---

67 Kray et al.; Hoyt.
70 See Appendix on page 50.
Cross-cultural differences in favoritism. The cross-cultural differences we observed in women’s favoritism can also be explained by self-efficacy. Psychologists find that exposure to role models can boost individuals’ perceptions of their own capabilities. This influence is especially powerful when individuals share attributes with these role models, such as gender identity.71 Statistics published by the International Labour Office (ILO) suggest that women in many of the Nordic and Germanic countries are better represented in positions of power, especially in the public sector.72 Quite likely the greater visibility of women leaders in Nordic and Germanic countries would cause women from these countries to have higher self-efficacy than women from countries where women leaders aren’t so visible—as in some of the Latin countries. These differences in self-efficacy can explain why women respondents from Latin countries said that there were fewer aspects of leadership, compared to Nordic, Germanic, and also Anglo women, at which women leaders outperformed men.

STEREOTYPIC PERCEPTIONS WERE MORE CONSENSUAL IN COUNTRIES THAT VALUE EQUALITY

As we noted earlier, stereotypic perceptions were more consensual (i.e., more widely shared or agreed upon) in some cultural clusters than in others. In Chapter 4, we noted that perceptions of gender differences at supporting others, problem-solving, and influencing upward were shared by a majority of respondents in each cultural group we studied. However, we found that in most cases, the degree of consensus within the Nordic cluster—especially among Nordic women—was among the highest relative to other clusters. For example:

- Compared to 90 percent of Germanic, 86 percent of Latin, and 85 percent of Anglo women, as many as 96 percent of Nordic women judged that more women leaders were effective at supporting others than men.
- Compared to 69 percent of Germanic and 60 percent of Latin men, more Anglo (80 percent) and Nordic (75 percent) men perceived that more women leaders were effective at supporting others than men.
- Compared to 69 percent of Germanic and Latin women and 66 percent of Anglo women, 83 percent of Nordic women perceived that more men leaders were effective at influencing upward than women.
- Compared to 68 percent of Germanic and 62 percent of Latin men, a slightly larger percentage (71 percent) of Nordic and Anglo men perceived that more men leaders were effective at problem-solving than women.73

72 International Labour Office.
The finding that stereotypic perceptions tended to be more consensual among Nordic respondents is noteworthy. A number of indicators suggest that, relative to other European countries, women’s status in the workplace in many Nordic countries is closer to that of men’s. In addition to the ILO statistics already described, standardized measures of gender inequality for international comparison, such as the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM), suggest that women in Nordic countries have more economic and political power on average than they do in the Germanic, Latin, and Anglo countries. Indeed, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden are the three top-ranked countries on this measure of gender equality.

WHAT’S BEHIND THE NORDIC PUZZLE?

Why would we find more pervasive gender stereotypes in the Nordic countries? Psychological research suggests that trying to actively suppress our stereotypes often paradoxically increases stereotypic thinking. This finding is one likely explanation for why we found stereotypic views to be more widespread in the most egalitarian countries that we studied. In countries where gender equality is valued, more individuals are likely to be motivated, due to cultural pressures, to appear unbiased and avoid stereotypic thinking. Putting greater effort into suppressing stereotypic beliefs (relative to respondents from other clusters) is one likely cause of the greater prevalence of gender-stereotypic perceptions among Nordic respondents.

Although this explanation can account for why stereotypic perceptions were so pervasive in the Nordic context, it is inconsistent with the relatively higher levels of gender equality that exist in Nordic countries. In Chapter 4, we noted that when stereotypic attitudes are widely shared they are more likely to lead to bias and discriminatory behavior. Therefore, given the pervasiveness of stereotypes in Nordic countries, it is unexpected that there would also be higher levels of gender equality in those countries.

Several factors can explain this contradiction. First, in countries where gender egalitarianism is deemed important, strict interventions may be taken to override any negative effects of stereotypes. For example, in Norway, quota policies requiring diverse election candidate slates have successfully increased women’s participation in government. Similar policies are now being applied in business, too. In fact, the Norwegian government has recently introduced federal legislation requiring representation of 40 percent women and 40 percent men on boards of publicly owned companies by 2008. Such measures leave little room for subtle biases to be expressed and likely contribute to the relative success that many of the Nordic countries have had in achieving gender equality—despite the pervasiveness of stereotypic beliefs about women and men leaders. The Nordic example indicates that stereotyping does not always have to end in bias and discrimination if precautions are taken.

75 Norway, Denmark, and Sweden rank 1, 2, and 3 in the world on the GEM index, Germany and The Netherlands rank 8 and 9, the United Kingdom ranks 18, and Italy and Spain rank 37 and 15, respectively.
77 International Labour Office.
Second, research suggests that respondents from countries with more gender egalitarian values also tend to consider feminine stereotypic traits to be more desirable. This point suggests that although stereotypic perceptions of women and men leaders were more prevalent in Nordic countries, they may portray women in a more favorable light than in less egalitarian contexts.

Notwithstanding these points, it should also be noted that occupational segregation by gender—the tendency for women and men to be employed in different kinds of occupations—is more marked in Nordic countries than in other European countries. Researchers attribute this segregation in part to gender stereotyping, since the most female-dominated occupations correspond closely to feminine stereotypic traits and the most male-dominated occupations correspond to masculine stereotypic traits. For example, women dominate (in terms of numerical representation) in “care-taking” occupations, such as nursing and social work. These are occupations for which women are seen as being uniquely qualified because of stereotypic beliefs that women are more caring than men. Similarly, men dominate in occupations such as managers and engineers. These are occupations for which men are seen as being uniquely qualified because of stereotypic beliefs that men are more authoritative and analytical than women. Occupational segregation is an indicator that even in Nordic countries, gender stereotyping is not insignificant. In the following chapter, we address, in-depth, how stereotypes could impact women and men leaders in each of the cultural clusters.

79 Emrich et al., p. 375.
80 Comparison based on other European countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). “Ratification on the Convention of the OECD,” Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, http://www.oecd.org/document/1/0,2340,en_2649_201185_1889402_1_1_1_1,00.html (accessed March 2006). OECD member countries include Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States.
KEY LEARNINGS
- Culture can affect how women leaders are impacted by gender stereotypes.
  - The most valued leadership attributes varied by culture.
  - In some cultures, stereotypic perceptions of women discredited their effectiveness at highly valued aspects of leadership—with potentially damaging effects.

EXAMINING THE POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF STEREOTYPING
As we noted in Chapter 2, understanding the impact of stereotyping on women and men leaders in each culture requires that we also understand which leadership behaviors are considered important in each cultural context.

To do this, we asked respondents to consider the 14 leadership behaviors and to identify the four most important. Respondents ranked these behaviors in order of importance 1 through 4, with lower rankings indicating higher importance.

We found that when respondents from each cultural cluster thought about “star” leadership behaviors, some common behaviors came to mind. In this chapter, we describe these leadership behaviors and examine whether women are seen as “measuring up” to men at these behaviors. We find that in some cultural contexts, women are perceived as being less effective than men at the most valued leadership attributes.

MOST VALUED LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS—INSPIRING, TEAM-BUILDING, AND DELEGATING
Collectively, the largest percentages of respondents from each cluster assigned top rankings (1, 2, 3, or 4) to the following “star” behaviors: inspiring, team-building, and delegating. In every culture we studied, more respondents assigned a top ranking to inspiring followers than to any other leadership behavior. Figure 7 shows that a very large proportion—significantly more than 60 percent in each cluster—a ranked inspiring followers as most important to overall leadership effectiveness.\(^a\)

---
\(^a\) Binomial tests showed that significantly more than 60 percent of respondents in each cluster assigned top rankings to inspiring (p < .05; test value .6)

\(^a\) This is consistent with previous research by Dorfman et al., p. 677.
Figure 7 also shows that after inspiring, team-building received the largest proportion of top rankings among Anglo, Latin, and Germanic respondents. Team-building was top-ranked by 68 percent, 57 percent, and 56 percent of Anglo, Latin, and Germanic respondents, respectively.

Delegating received the second highest proportion of top rankings from Nordic respondents. And this behavior was associated with the third highest percentage of top-4 rankings among Latin and Germanic respondents. As shown in Figure 7, 51 percent and 50 percent of Latin and Germanic respondents, respectively, assigned a top ranking to delegating.

WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN FOR WOMEN LEADERS?

Are women leaders correct in believing they are disadvantaged by gender stereotypes in business? In at least two cultural clusters—Nordic and Anglo—we found that men’s stereotypic perceptions could directly discredit women’s competence at behaviors that were considered vital to outstanding leadership. Anglo men were the only group who perceived that women were relatively ineffective at inspiring others—the most valued leadership behavior in that cluster. And Nordic men perceived that women were relatively ineffective at delegating, a behavior that was top-ranked by 77 percent of respondents from that cultural cluster.

Since Nordic and Anglo women did not share men’s views, our findings may have more significance for women who work in industries or occupation fields that are dominated by men. For example, in fields such as general business management, where men outnumber women in Nordic and Anglo countries, it is men’s perceptions that are most likely to be influential. In such fields, where women are likely to be evaluated by men, men’s beliefs that women leaders were less effective at behaviors that were highly valued in the Nordic and Anglo clusters could be damaging. However, in fields that are dominated by women, such as human resources, men’s perceptions may be less influential. So at least in male-dominated fields, we found some evidence in the Nordic and Anglo cluster that support women leaders’ claims about the negative effects of gender stereotyping.
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In the Germanic and Latin clusters, the evidence was less clear. Specifically, we found that women were judged *more* effective than men at team-building—a top-ranked leader behavior. Among Germanic respondents, this view was held by both women and men respondents. In the Latin cluster, only women respondents agreed with this judgment. These findings suggest that women’s team-building reputation could offer some advantages to women leaders in these clusters.

However, even in these cultural contexts, there are several reasons why these potential advantages should not cause us to dismiss women’s claims about the harmful effects of gender stereotypes. These reasons include:

1. **Prescriptive stereotypes.** Research suggests that stereotypes have both a descriptive and prescriptive component. Our study measured the descriptive component of stereotypes, which characterizes what different groups are like. That is, our findings revealed perceived *characteristics* of women and men leaders. However, what they did not reveal was the *prescriptive component of stereotypes*—beliefs about the roles that different groups *should* play. In cultural contexts where gender egalitarianism is less valued, as in some Latin countries (i.e., relative to some Nordic countries), prescriptive stereotypes may also play a role in limiting women’s advancement. For example, in some cultures, prescriptive gender stereotypes may dictate that women *should not* occupy leadership roles. Research suggests that such prescriptive stereotypes can have adverse effects on women—especially when women display competence in a domain that these prescriptive stereotypes deem inappropriate for women. Psychologists have found that when women display competence as leaders, they are often disliked for violating prescriptive stereotypes about their roles. Research shows that being disliked for violating prescriptive stereotypes can cause women to be excluded from informal networks, which in turn can limit their access to resources and rewards. These findings suggest that even though women leaders were attributed with higher effectiveness than men at team-building—a much valued leadership value in Germanic and Latin cultures—we should not glibly conclude that women leaders in those cultures are not disadvantaged by gender stereotypes. Even though descriptive stereotypes portray women as being competent at valued aspects of leadership such as team-building, they may experience negative effects due to prescriptive stereotypes that deem leadership roles as inappropriate for women. Such prescriptive stereotypes could be especially prevalent in less egalitarian countries where individuals place a relatively low value on gender equality.

---
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2. Positive stereotypes may not help women that much. In many organizations, women have significant disadvantages in terms of their hierarchical status, access to powerful networks, and low numerical representation. These disadvantages not only make women leaders more vulnerable to negative stereotypes of their group but can “cancel out” benefits of positive stereotypes. On the other hand, because men often rank higher than women in hierarchical status, and have greater access to powerful networks and higher numerical representation, they may be more insulated than women from negative perceptions about their gender and can benefit more than women from positive stereotypes of their group. For example, although men may not be considered as adept at team-building as women, they can often “get the benefit of the doubt” because of their more privileged positions in organizations. This means that even though women leaders may be stereotyped as better team-builders than men, this positive perception would not necessarily give women a competitive advantage relative to men. Negative perceptions about men’s competence (i.e., perceptions that men’s competence is inferior to women’s) are less harmful to men and, as such, less beneficial to women because of this “benefit-of-the-doubt” factor. Women’s lower status in business may mean that even positive perceptions of their competence do not offer much of a competitive boost.

WHAT ABOUT THE MOST POLAR PERCEPTIONS?

Interestingly, none of the top-ranked behaviors in each cluster were the behaviors at which respondents perceived the greatest differences in women and men leaders’ effectiveness—supporting others, problem-solving, and influencing upward. Can these stereotypic perceptions still have any real significance for women leaders?

Although supporting, problem-solving, and influencing upward were not among the top-ranked behaviors, we cannot assume that respondents considered them unimportant. In fact, two of these behaviors were often connected in respondents’ minds to the top-ranked leader behaviors.

In other words, we found that respondents’ perceptions about women and men leaders’ effectiveness at supporting others and problem-solving could have spillover effects—potentially influencing their perceived effectiveness at top-ranked leader behaviors. For example, in each cluster, the more effective respondents judged women or men leaders to be at supporting, the more effective they also judged them to be at team-building. Similarly, in many clusters, the more effective respondents perceived that women or men leaders were at problem-solving, the more effective they also perceived them to be at inspiring others—the behavior considered most important in every culture. These relationships suggest that although behaviors such as supporting others and problem-solving were not what respondents considered to be “star” leadership behaviors, they were not insignificant in respondents’ minds, and might be considered building blocks of effective leadership. Women’s and men’s reputations at problem-solving could have an adverse effect on their perceived effectiveness at inspiring others—a most valued leadership behavior.

---
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91 Pearson correlations revealed that there were statistical significant relationships between respondents’ estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at supporting others and team-building (two-tailed p<.01) ranging across clusters from r = .47 to r = .65.
92 Pearson correlations revealed that there were statistical significant relationships between respondents’ estimates of women and men leaders’ effectiveness at problem-solving and inspiring (two-tailed p<.01) ranging across clusters from r = .27 to r = .47.
CONFIRMING EVIDENCE OF WOMEN’S SUSPICIONS

Catalyst and IMD set out to find whether there was any evidence to support the claims of European women managers that gender stereotyping limits women’s advancement in business management. In this report, we have begun to uncover evidence that affirms women’s suspicions. First, we found the necessary evidence that stereotypic perceptions of women’s and men’s leadership do in fact exist—even though these perceptions are not supported by objective evidence.

We found that the most significant of these included the stereotypic view, held by both women and men respondents, that women leaders outperformed men at supporting others. Also marked was the perception held by women that men were more effective than women leaders at influencing upward and men’s perceptions that men outperformed women leaders at problem-solving. These—the strongest stereotypic beliefs we measured—define women leaders as people-oriented “care-takers” and define men leaders as action-oriented leaders who “take charge” of people and situations.

Further, we found that, when it comes to these strongest stereotypic perceptions, culture does not matter. In every culture, respondents perceived the largest differences between women and men at supporting others, problem-solving, and influencing upward. One reason for this consistency in the signature stereotypic “take care” and “take charge” perceptions of women and men is that they appear to come from a common source—broad gender stereotypes about women’s and men’s traits that were shared across cultures. Supporting others was found, in a separate study, to be the behavior that individuals perceived to be most related to feminine stereotypic traits, and problem-solving was the behavior that the same individuals perceived to be most related to masculine stereotypic traits. The findings, coupled with meta-analytic research that demonstrates limited leadership gender differences in organizational contexts, suggest that, to a large extent, managers were basing their judgments about women and men leaders on gender stereotypic traits.

Finally, we found some cultural variations in managers’ stereotypic judgments about women and men leaders. In some cultures, managers perceived gender differences at more aspects of leadership and within some cultures, stereotypic perceptions were more consensual or more widely agreed upon. Taking these nuances into account, as well as cultural differences in what leadership attributes were valued, we gained insights into the challenges that stereotypes might create for women leaders—especially in male-dominated domains. Specifically, we found some support for women’s beliefs that gender stereotypes might be discrediting women’s leadership competence at highly valued aspects of leadership. For example, in the Nordic context, we found that men’s perceptions that women leaders were relatively ineffective at delegating could be damaging to women leaders because of the high cultural value placed on this leadership attribute.
In cultures where perceptions of gender differences in leadership are not as prevalent, as we found in the Latin cluster, a question for future research is whether prescriptive stereotypes—beliefs about the roles that women and men should play—represent a more significant barrier to women’s leadership advancement. In the next chapter, we make recommendations about steps that organizations can take to minimize stereotyping and its effects in different cultural contexts.
By combating gender stereotypes, organizations can better leverage the full array of leadership talents that reside in women and men. But what can organizations really do to effectively minimize stereotypic bias and its effects on behavior? There is no easy answer to this question. The processes by which stereotypes influence perceptions, judgment, and behavior are very complex. To be successful at counteracting the effects of stereotypes, organizations must understand how and when these effects are likely to occur. Based on insights from previous psychological research, we provide some guidance for action in this chapter.

**GETTING AT THE SOURCE OF BIAS—STRATEGIES FOR ELIMINATING STEREOTYPIC THINKING.**

One way to avoid bias in judgment and behavior is to eliminate the stereotypic beliefs that precede them. The logic of this strategy is simple: Individuals cannot act on stereotypes they don’t have. One technique for reducing stereotypic perceptions is to engage men as advocates for women in leadership.

**Changing Stereotypic Perceptions by Engaging Men**

Research shows that people are more likely to change their stereotypic beliefs if they realize these beliefs are not shared by people with whom they identify.\(^9\) For example, if a man recognizes that his stereotypic views of women leaders are not shared by other men, he may be more inclined to change those beliefs (than if he learned that women disagreed with his views). When people perceive that their stereotypic beliefs are shared, these beliefs can become stronger; however, when people perceive a lack of consensus—especially within their own social groups—their stereotypes can become weaker.

Organizations can use this knowledge to minimize bias in the workplace. When employees are exposed to peers who are advocates for women leaders, this exposure can influence their own attitudes to women’s leadership. In this report, we showed that men’s perceptions of women leaders were less positive than women’s—and often discredited women’s effectiveness at valued leadership behaviors. This finding suggests that leveraging men as advocates may be particularly important in combating the negative effects of stereotypic bias. Exposure to male advocates can be especially effective in weakening the stereotypic perceptions of men. By their involvement in efforts to close the gender gap in leadership, men can signal to their male peers that they have different, more positive perceptions of women’s leadership competence. Organizations that fail to engage male employees—at all levels—in their diversity efforts may be missing out on an important opportunity for change. Some ways to engage men employees in advocacy roles that can influence the attitudes of their male peers include:

- As a formal employee resource group with specific objectives for advancing the organization’s gender diversity strategy
- As facilitators of discussion forums to encourage dialogue among men employees about issues of gender inequality in the workplace
- As coaches for women in the pipeline

---
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Important Points to Consider

Although getting rid of stereotypes may seem like the ultimate solution, it can be very difficult to do so in practice—especially in cultural contexts where gender stereotypes are strong. Perceptions of gender difference are often deeply engrained and are challenging to eradicate.\textsuperscript{94} For this reason, stereotype-elimination strategies should not be an organization’s only defense against bias. Alternatively, it is better to use stereotype-elimination strategies in conjunction with other courses of action. As a decision-making aid, we list some advantages and disadvantages associated with stereotype-elimination strategies.

**Advantages of Stereotype-Elimination Strategies**

- Effects may be more long-lasting as they address root causes of gender bias in the workplace

**Disadvantages of Stereotype-Elimination Strategies**

- Gender stereotypes can be very difficult to change
- May not be as effective in cultures where gender stereotypes are strong
- Impact is not immediate, so may not offer short-term protection against bias

INTERCEPTING STEREOTYPES—STRATEGIES TO PREVENT STEREOTYPES FROM INFLUENCING JUDGMENT AND BEHAVIOR.

Although it can be hard to eradicate gender stereotypes, research suggests that there are several effective ways to reduce or intercept their influence on our judgments and behaviors. One strategy is education. Key elements of effective education programs are described below—including a related company practice from one of Catalyst’s 2006 Award Winners, BP p.l.c.

Motivating Individuals to Avoid Gender Bias Through Education

Individuals may not always be successful, even when motivated, in eliminating their stereotypic perceptions. However, when motivated, people can be successful at monitoring and controlling the impact of these stereotypes on their judgments and behaviors. This motivation can come from an individual’s values.15

However, because people are not always aware of how they are affected by stereotypes, they can still be prone to bias—even though they have the desire to avoid it. For individuals with gender egalitarian values, diversity education can increase individuals’ awareness of stereotypes and also their motivation to be unbiased. In so doing, diversity education can improve employees’ success at controlling the effects of stereotypes on their behavior.

By teaching employees to recognize discrepancies between their egalitarian ideals and their own gender-biased behaviors, organizations can motivate them to expend the effort needed to recognize and block the influences of stereotypes. To achieve these results, training programs should include some key participant learning objectives, such as:

- Increasing awareness and ability to recognize bias—including personal biases
- Recognizing inconsistencies between values (e.g., gender egalitarianism) and actual behavior
- Understanding causes and effects of gender inequality in the workplace

---
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Company Practice—Avoiding Gender Bias Through Education: Gender Dialogue Workshops at BP p.l.c.

A winner of the 2006 Catalyst Award for their outstanding diversity and inclusion initiatives, BP sponsors numerous programs that aim to combat barriers to gender advancement. An essential component of BP’s strategy is employee education. Gender—a dialogue is an interactive DVD program that educates employees about gender bias within the workplace. Interviews with BP employees featured on the DVD serve as discussion starters to foster open and frank dialogue about gender issues in corporate leadership. The DVD provides managers with facilitation guidance including key questions to be addressed in their team discussions. Examples of these include:

- What are the challenges faced by men and women in BP?
- What do you do as an individual to address barriers?
- What one thing could BP do to help men and women work together more productively?

Through using this innovative educational strategy, employees gain:

- First-hand knowledge of peers’ negative experiences of bias, which can be a powerful motivator for employees to monitor and control their own biases
- Increased sense of personal responsibility for addressing bias as a result of their involvement in developing individual and company-level solutions—also a powerful motivator for employees to monitor and control their own biases

Description of company practice provided by Marcelo Cardoso, Strategic Communications Manager, Global Diversity and Inclusion, BP p.l.c.

Important Points to Consider

Although education can help to curb gender bias, its effectiveness can be seriously undermined by employee resistance.

Furthermore, this threat can be increased by mandatory enrollment policies. Such policies can create backlash (e.g., more negative attitudes and bias against women) because employees perceive that their rights to freedom of thought are being threatened or because they feel they are being “accused” by their employers of being prejudiced. One way to avoid backlash is to have employees self-select into diversity training programs and use rewards as a way to encourage enrollment. Organizations will likely gain a higher return when their education investments are made on employees who are already receptive to change.

Advantages of Diversity Education

- Can motivate employees to be more vigilant in curbing their own biases
- May be particularly effective in countries that value gender equality
- Extended exposure and interactions with other enrolled employees who are committed to reducing their biases can help to reinforce commitment of individual employees
- Can help to establish employee network groups that extend learning experiences and access to support systems beyond the duration of the formal education program
- Can help identify and develop employee advocates

---
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Schneider, p. 417-418; Klonis et al., p. 1246.
Disadvantages of Diversity Education

- May be ineffective with employees who do not value gender equality
- May require extended time commitments on the part of enrollees
- Can produce backlash if mandatory

Another way to intercept stereotypes is to hold individuals accountable for bias. External pressure can motivate individuals to make judgments in a more deliberative and objective manner.

Motivating Individuals to Avoid Bias Through Accountability

If employees have an internal, value-driven desire to be unbiased, education can help them bring their behaviors in line with their values. However, for employees who do not have an internal desire to avoid gender bias, education may be less effective. Instead, employees with less gender egalitarian values may be more effectively motivated to curb their biases by external pressures. Studies show that individuals who might otherwise act out their gender biases can respond without prejudice to avoid negative reactions from others. These findings suggest that if organizations set norms that discourage gender bias, these standards can create external pressures which can, in turn, motivate employees to avoid bias.

To make these external pressures real, organizations should hold managers accountable for equitable treatment of women and men. This strategy requires that organizations “define” gender equity in measurable terms and evaluate managers’ performance against these metrics. Key indices to monitor include:

- Gender diversity of new hire candidate slates
- Gender diversity of selection committees/hiring managers
- Gender differences in promotion rates and compensation (including variable pay)
- Gender differences in access to stretch assignments or other developmental opportunities
- Gender differences in representation by job level
- Gender differences in performance appraisal ratings
- Gender differences in promotion rates into line positions
- Gender differences in retention
- Qualitative differences in women’s and men’s perceptions of fairness in the workplace
- Gender segregation by job type

---
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**Important Points to Consider**

By using metrics, organizations can hold managers accountable for gender disparities in the workplace and help to drive unbiased behaviors. However, choosing the right metrics is important. There are some common pitfalls. For example, if metrics only compare the aggregated outcomes of women and men across an organization, gender disparities that exist within smaller organizational units (e.g., departmental/functional unit) can easily be overlooked. Alternatively, organizations may use metrics that are too “generic”—designed without an understanding of “trouble spots” where bias is most likely to show up and/or to contribute to cumulative disadvantages for women. For example, in early career stages, disparities in access to development opportunities might be more marked than disparities in salary and can create greater setbacks for women over time. However, disparities in access are seldom tracked. To be an effective gauge of gender bias, metrics must capture the outcomes that are most likely to be affected by it.

It is also important to ensure that accountability strategies are backed by good human resources practices that limit bias. In this way, organizations can support managers in meeting organizational standards for gender equity. For example, managers should be trained in the use of bias-reducing practices, such as structured interviewing, which help to ensure that all candidates—women and men—are evaluated by the same selection criteria. Also important is the use of statistically weighted performance criteria, which can ensure that women and men are judged by the same standards. If managers are trained in performance appraisal practices that increase objectivity, they will be better able to meet organizational standards for gender equity.

**Advantages of Accountability Strategies**

- Can be effective in getting employees to avoid bias even though they may not be personally motivated to do so
- Establishes clear gender equity norms or standards that can be easily communicated to employees

**Disadvantages of Accountability Strategies**

- Can be ineffective if leadership does not take action to address “missed” expectations/standards
REGIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

When it comes to combating the effects of gender stereotypes, there is no “one-size-fits-all” solution. Organizations can combat stereotyping and its effects in a number of ways. In global organizations, taking a multi-pronged approach is advisable. A combination of stereotype-elimination strategies as well as strategies that intercept the effects of stereotypes will likely work best to address cultural differences in the prevalence of gender stereotypes as well as differences in values related to gender equality.

For example, when implementing education programs, cultural beliefs can be an important consideration. Education may be especially effective in cultures where individuals uphold gender egalitarian beliefs and are internally motivated to live up to these ideals. However, education programs can be more likely to inspire resistance in cultures that are less egalitarian, making them ineffective in those cultural contexts—especially when participation is mandatory.

In cultures where stereotypes are strong, multiple courses of defense are necessary. In addition to implementing strategies to reduce stereotyping, such as engaging employee advocates, it may be wise to introduce accountability measures that are stringently monitored and acted upon. As we noted earlier, this is one likely reason for the relatively strong progress that countries such as Norway have made in achieving gender equality. Although we found in this study that gender stereotypes were strong in the Nordic cluster, accountability approaches in the form of quotas, as practiced in countries such as Norway, can be an effective way to over-ride them. The success of quota policies in increasing the representation of women in leadership in the public sector may suggest that similar approaches might also be successful in business.
RESPONDENTS’ PROFILES

Management Status. Analyses included the responses of 935 alumni of the IMD. Two hundred eighty-two (30.2 percent) were women and 653 (69.8 percent) were men. Table 4 (based on the 933 respondents who provided both managerial status and gender information) shows the percentages of respondents in each cultural cluster by management status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Status</th>
<th>Women Respondents</th>
<th>Men Respondents</th>
<th>Cluster Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORDIC CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>29% (17)</td>
<td>53% (105)</td>
<td>48% (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Mid</td>
<td>62% (36)</td>
<td>40% (79)</td>
<td>45% (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>9% (5)</td>
<td>7% (13)</td>
<td>7% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>100% (58)</td>
<td>100% (197)</td>
<td>100% (255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATIN CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>28% (11)</td>
<td>55% (72)</td>
<td>49% (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Mid</td>
<td>62% (24)</td>
<td>45% (59)</td>
<td>49% (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>10% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>100% (39)</td>
<td>100% (131)</td>
<td>100% (170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GERMANIC CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>15% (19)</td>
<td>42% (95)</td>
<td>33% (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Mid</td>
<td>60% (75)</td>
<td>54% (120)</td>
<td>56% (195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>25% (31)</td>
<td>4% (9)</td>
<td>12% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>100% (125)</td>
<td>100% (224)</td>
<td>100% (349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGLO CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>30% (18)</td>
<td>52% (51)</td>
<td>43% (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Mid</td>
<td>62% (37)</td>
<td>47% (46)</td>
<td>52% (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
<td>2% (2)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>100% (60)</td>
<td>100% (99)</td>
<td>100% (159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL CLUSTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>23% (65)</td>
<td>50% (323)</td>
<td>42% (388)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Mid</td>
<td>61% (172)</td>
<td>47% (304)</td>
<td>51% (476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>16% (45)</td>
<td>4% (24)</td>
<td>7% (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100% (282)</td>
<td>100% (651)</td>
<td>100% (933)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In each cluster, a majority of women and men respondents, 93 percent, 89 percent, 98 percent, and 96 percent of all Nordic, Germanic, Latin, and Anglo respondents, respectively, said they were in managerial positions. With a sample of this nature, the study allows us better insight into how women are perceived within the management ranks in European business.

It can also be seen that, overall, women were more likely than men to be non-managers and low-to-mid managers. Not surprisingly, men respondents were more likely to be top managers than were women.\(^98\)

Other Work-Related Demographics. Across cultural clusters, the occupational fields with the highest representation were similar. Table 5 shows that, in every cluster, Sales/Marketing/Communications/Customer Service was one of the fields with the highest average representation. In all but the Latin cluster, Corporate Management, Planning, and Legal was also a highly represented occupation. In other clusters, such as the Nordic and Germanic, Finance/Accounting/Tax/Money and Risk Management was also included among the highest represented fields. Human Resources was also among the most common fields in the Latin and Anglo clusters. Across most of the cultural groups, the percentages of men and women respondents in each of these fields were similar. One exception was Human Resources. Table 5 shows that women in the Latin and Anglo cultures were more likely to be in Human Resources than were men.\(^99\) Respectively, 28 percent and 25 percent of Latin and Anglo women were in Human Resources, compared to 8 percent of Latin and Anglo men.

The largest industries in terms of respondent representation were also similar across culture groups. Collectively, these included: Engineering, Consulting, Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate, Manufacturing, and Mining and Services (other than Consulting). In most clusters, women and men were similarly represented in these industries. However, in the Latin cluster, a much larger proportion of men were in Manufacturing and Consulting industries than women, and in the Nordic cluster a higher percentage of men were in Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate industries than women. In the Germanic cluster, a much larger percentage of women were in the Mining industry compared to men.

Finally, Table 5 shows that in most clusters, women and men also looked similar in terms of the size of their employers. For both women and men, representation tended to be highest at firms with revenues up to 1 billion and higher than 15 billion. The Nordic cluster was an exception to this trend. Most women and men in the Nordic cluster worked for firms under 1 billion in revenue, with the remaining respondents being somewhat evenly distributed among the other revenue categories.

\(^{98}\) Chi-square tests showed that the distribution of women and men respondents by management status was significantly different (Chi-square=104.04, df=3, p<.01).

\(^{99}\) Chi-square tests showed that Latin and Anglo women were more likely than Latin and Anglo men to be in the Human Resources field (Chi-square=20.61, df=1, p<.01).
Table 5: Women and Men Respondents, by Occupational Field, Industry, and Company Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORDIC CLUSTER</th>
<th>Women Respondents</th>
<th>Men Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Fields with Highest Average Representation (top 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Management, Planning, and Legal</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Accounting/Tax/Money and Risk Management</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Marketing/Communications/Customer Service</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industries with Highest Average Representation (top 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Revenue (USD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Billion or less</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-5 Billion</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-15 Billion</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 Billion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATIN CLUSTER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Fields with Highest Average Representation (top 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Marketing/Communications/Customer Service</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Management, Planning, and Legal</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industries with Highest Average Representation (top 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (other than Consulting)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Revenue (USD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Billion or less</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-5 Billion</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-15 Billion</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 Billion</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Women and Men Respondents, by Occupational Field, Industry, and Company Revenue *continued*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women Respondents</th>
<th>Men Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GERMANIC CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Fields with Highest Average Representation (top 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Management, Planning, and Legal</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Accounting/Tax/Money and Risk Management</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Marketing/Communications/Customer Service</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industries with Highest Average Representation (top 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Revenue (USD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Billion or less</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-5 Billion</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-15 Billion</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 Billion</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGLO CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Fields with Highest Average Representation (top 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Management, Planning, and Legal</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Marketing/Communications/Customer Service</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industries with Highest Average Representation (top 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Revenue (USD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Billion or less</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-5 Billion</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-15 Billion</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 Billion</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Demographics.** Table 6 shows that, in each cluster, women and men were similarly represented by nationality, with the Anglo group being the most obvious exception. More Anglo men (90 percent) than women (68 percent) were from the United Kingdom.
Lastly, women and men respondents also had similar levels of formal education in each cluster. Again, there was more of a gap between Anglo women and men. As Table 6 shows, 50 percent of Anglo women had 18 or more years of formal education, compared to 35 percent of men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Women Respondents</th>
<th>Men Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORDIC CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Formal Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or less</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or more</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATIN CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Formal Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or less</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or more</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GERMANIC CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Formal Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or less</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or more</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGLO CLUSTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Formal Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or less</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or more</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**METHODOLOGY**

Respondents were recruited from IMD’s alumni database to participate in the study via email. The email included a web link to the survey. The response rate was approximately 10 percent.

In the body of the survey, participants were first asked to estimate, based on their own experiences, the percentage of women that performed each of 14 different leader behaviors. After respondents indicated their estimates about women leaders, they completed items about their cultural beliefs. In another separate task, they were asked to estimate the percentages of men that they believed to be effective at the same 14 leader behaviors we referenced earlier.\(^{10}\) After each set of leader items (related to women and related to men), participants were asked to elaborate on their experiences with women and men leaders in open-ended comments.

We based our analyses on the average differences between the percentage estimates respondents gave for women and men on each behavior. Specifically, Catalyst subtracted respondents’ percentage estimates for men from the percentage estimates for women leaders and tested whether the average difference for each behavior was statistically significant. As such, when we found significant differences that were negative (i.e., higher percentage estimates for men than for women leaders), we inferred that respondents perceived a leadership advantage for men. Conversely, when there was a significant positive difference (i.e., women leaders’ percentage estimates were higher than estimates for men leaders), we inferred a women’s leadership advantage for the relevant leader behavior.

Additionally, we conducted a separate study where respondents included 90 IMD students (16 percent women) to determine whether the leader behaviors were seen as being related to masculine, feminine, or neither masculine nor feminine stereotypic traits. Respondents completed a paper-and-pencil survey in class in which they were given a list of the same 14 leader behaviors (already referenced) about which we asked managers. In addition to definitions of these behaviors, respondents were given a list of masculine and feminine stereotypic traits (shown in the Appendix on page 49). They were asked to indicate, using a seven-point scale, whether each leader behavior was strongly associated with feminine stereotypic traits on one end of the scale, with masculine stereotypic traits at the other end of the scale, or neutral (neither associated with feminine nor masculine stereotypic traits) in the middle of the scale. Using chi-square tests, we assessed differences in the likelihood that behaviors would be judged masculine, feminine, or neutral.

---

\(^{10}\) Using a ten-point scale, respondents indicated whether their estimate fell within one of the following intervals for each of the leader behaviors: 0-10, 11-20, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 71-80, 81-90, 91-100. Analyses of respondent estimates were based on the upper limit of each interval such that a response of 0-10 was coded as 10 percent and a response of 11-20 was coded as 20 percent.
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Table 7 shows a subset of traits most associated with men and women in more than 80 percent of the countries studied by Williams and Best (1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotypically Masculine Traits</th>
<th>Stereotypically Feminine Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Affectionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Charming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Complaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dreamy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventive</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Fearful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confident</td>
<td>Submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Superstitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX

Williams and Best, p.77.
Figure 8 shows the results of an additional survey that was conducted among 90 IMD business students. Results showed that the behavior most associated with feminine stereotypic traits was supporting others. As shown, 82.2 percent of responses described the behavior of supporting others as “feminine,” “very feminine,” or “somewhat feminine” because of its strong association with feminine stereotypic traits. In contrast, only 1.1 percent of responses described supporting others as “masculine,” “very masculine,” or “somewhat masculine” due to a perceived association with masculine stereotypic traits.

Figure 8: Supporting Others: Proportion of Feminine and Masculine Pre-Test Responses

Chi-square tests showed that respondents were significantly more likely to view supporting others as being linked to feminine stereotypic traits than to masculine stereotypic traits (Chi square = 71.1, df=1, p<.01).

Figure 9 shows that the behavior most associated with masculine stereotypic traits was problem-solving. As shown, 82.3 percent of business students described problem-solving as a “masculine,” “very masculine,” or “somewhat masculine” behavior because it seemed clearly related to masculine stereotypic traits. However, only a very small percentage of responses, 6.6 percent, attributed the label “feminine,” “very feminine,” or “somewhat feminine” to problem-solving because of a perceived connection to feminine stereotypic traits.

Figure 9: Problem-Solving: Proportion of Feminine and Masculine Pre-Test Responses

Chi-square tests showed that respondents were significantly more likely to view problem-solving as being linked to masculine stereotypic traits than feminine stereotypic traits (Chi square = 57.8, df=1, p<.01).
Table 8: Incremental and Cumulative Effects of Gender Stereotypes on the Advancement of Women and Men in a Hypothetical Organization From Previous Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Stage</th>
<th>Number of Men</th>
<th>Number of Women</th>
<th>% of Women in the Workforce</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial applicant pool</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision 1 (50%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without stereotypes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With stereotypes</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision 2 (50%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without stereotypes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With stereotypes</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision 3 (50%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without stereotypes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With stereotypes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision 4 (25%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without stereotypes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With stereotypes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates the percentage of the population that will advance after a particular decision.
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