



# A CRUCIAL STUDY ON GENDER BIAS ON LEADERSHIP ROLES

**Master of Business Administration**

**Submitted to: - Dr. Anushikha Sharma**

**LOVELY PROFESSIONAL UNIVERSITY**

**PHAGWARA, PUNJAB**

**SUBMITTED BY**

**Name of student**

**Vaishnavi**

**Harshit Madhesiya Suchita Chakraborty**

## **ABSTRACT**

There is a long-standing problem of gender prejudice in leadership roles, where women are frequently underrepresented and paid less than men. In addition, it causes gender-based harassment and discrimination at work, as well as discrimination in recruiting and promotion decisions. When inequality between men and women was noticed, gender was recognized and taken into account. Men are regarded as having the highest status in our culture, whereas women are viewed as having a lower status. This is a result of the way we nurture girls—giving them tea sets and doll toys as early as possible. Despite making up half of the global population, women do not have equal opportunity in the workplace. A group of feminists brought up the issue in the 1970s issue of women's lack of representation in senior corporate positions and positions at high echelons. Every organization has a gender idea that pertains to the roles, obligations, standing, caliber of work, and social recognition that are bestowed upon men and women. Society restricts both men and women to behave in particular ways, giving them different status and positions according to factors including job fit, dominance power, division of labor, and intellectual capacity.

## INTRODUCTION

### RESEARCH BACKGROUND:

Despite having higher academic achievement in high school and college, women are underrepresented in leadership roles and are paid 16.2% less than males for doing the same work.

As per the European Commission study (2020), women are effectively required to work for 59 days "for free" until their earnings equal those of men.

When inequality between men and women was noticed, gender was recognised and taken into account.

Men have the highest standing in our culture, whereas women have a lower status.

This is a result of the way we nurture girls—giving them tea sets and doll toys as early as possible.

Although they make up half of the world's population, women are not afforded comparable chances in their careers. A group of feminists brought up the problem of women's lack of significance in senior corporate positions and high ranks in the 1970s. Every organisation has a unique definition of gender, which relates to the roles, obligations, standing, calibre of work, and social acknowledgment that are bestowed upon men and women. Society restricts both men and women to behave in particular ways, giving them different status and positions according to factors including job fit, dominance power, division of labour, and intellectual capacity.

➤ Position	Percentage of Women (%)	Percentage of Men (%)
CEO	5.4	94.6
COO	16.9	83.1
CFO	36.1	63.9
CIO	21.3	78.7
CMO	40.9	59.1
CHRO	62.2	37.8
CDO	34.8	65.2
Board of Directors	22.6	77.4

According to the research, there appears to be a notable gender bias in leadership roles, as men predominate in positions of authority like CFO, COO, and CEO. In these roles, women hold only 15% of the leadership positions on average, while males hold 85% of them. The percentage of males in all occupied positions is far higher than the percentage of women. Comparatively speaking to other high positions, there are comparatively more women occupying the role of CHRO.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY:

Women are underrepresented in leadership positions, which has important ramifications for people, groups, and society as a whole. Diverse leadership teams improve decision-making, innovation, and overall organisational success, according to research. Even with a wealth of data on gender prejudice in the workplace, there are always questions, disagreements, and unanswered problems that require more study. With the help of this study, we hope to close these gaps and give organisations and policymakers useful information. Diversity in leadership teams has been shown to enhance decision-making, creativity, and overall organisational success. Women's underrepresentation in leadership roles has a significant impact on individuals, organisations, and society. Still, there remain disagreements, gaps, and unanswered questions that call for more study on gender discrimination in the workplace. The purpose of this research is to aid in bridging these gaps and providing actionable insights for organizations and policymakers.

## **CURRENT STATE OF KNOWLEDGE AND RESEARCH GAP**

Despite the significance of the research on leadership, there is still disagreement over the characteristics of good leaders. Should leaders strive for the same qualities or should they differ based on a person's gender? Do men and women value different things in the workplace? What effects does gender bias have on women's career advancement and how does it appear in leadership positions? The goal of this master's thesis is to ascertain the attitudes and views of the workforce regarding gender leadership and whether there are any differences in their thoughts on the qualities and competencies that a successful leader (representing each gender) ought to have.

## **PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Women still encounter obstacles in their pursuit of parity in leadership positions inside organizations, even in the face of advances in gender equality initiatives. Whether it is implicit or overt, gender bias is still a major problem that hinders women's ability to advance in their careers and achieve positive work-life balance. The purpose of this study is to investigate how gender prejudice affects women's experiences in leadership positions and what that means for organisational performance and efforts to promote genderparity.

### **why there is a problem: -**

**Gender Bias in Leadership Roles:** The title draws attention to the gender bias that exists in positions of leadership. This suggests that barriers or discriminatory actions that prevent women from advancing and succeeding in these roles may be encountered by them. Biassed evaluation criteria, unequal chances, and stereotyping are just a few examples of how gender bias can appear.

**Impact on Career Progression:** The implication of the title is that women's job growth paths are negatively impacted by gender bias. Notwithstanding their skills and abilities, women could face obstacles that hinder their advancement to more senior leadership roles. This issue has the potential to impede women's possibilities for advancement in the workplace and to maintain gender differences in organisational structures.

**Effect on Job Satisfaction:** Women's levels of job satisfaction might also be impacted by gender bias. Those

who feel that they are being treated unfairly or are not being acknowledged because of their gender may become disenchanted, disillusioned, and disengaged. This issue affects not just the well-being of the person but also the production and morale of the organisation.

**Influence on Work Outcomes:** The title recognises how gender prejudice affects all aspects of women's careers who hold leadership positions. Unfair assessments, restricted prospects for growth, and uneven resource accessibility might impede women's capacity to reach their maximum potential and make valuable contributions to the prosperity of their organisations. This issue not only keeps gender discrimination in the workplace alive but also deprives organisations of a variety of viewpoints and skills.

#### **✚ Research Problem and Research Questions:**

By applying relevant theory, methodologies and a review of recent findings from the research conducted in the field, the author aims to answer the following research questions:

Q1) Email\*

Q2) Name of the respondent:

Q3) Designation: \*

Q4) What is your gender: \*

Q5) Institution/Organization: \*

Q6) Your position in organizational hierarchy: \*

Q7) What is your age: \*

Q8) What is your education level? \*

Q9) What best describes the type of organization you are working for? \*

Q10) Which sector does your organization belong to? \*

Q11) What is the closest match for the title of your position? \* Q12) What is your working experience (in years/months) \*

Q13) Which city are you working in? \*

Q14) At the moment, your supervisor is: \*

15) Your preference regarding the gender of your supervisor\* Q16) In your opinion, who are more effective leaders? \*

Q17) In your opinion, what are the main factors that determine leadership effectiveness? \*

Q18) In your opinion, which leader is able to manage conflicts effectively? \*

Q19) In your opinion, which leader is more capable of listening and understanding their employees/subordinates? \*

Q20) In your opinion, who is better at controlling their emotions? \*

Q21) In your opinion, which attributes are most suitable for male leaders? Please choose at least 5\*

Q22) In your opinion, which attributes are most suitable for female leaders? Please choose at least 5 Q23) In your opinion, what are male leader competencies? Please choose the most suitable.

Q24) In your opinion, what are female leader competencies? Please choose the most suitable. Q25) Which leader do you trust most?

Q26) In your opinion why do you trust the gender that you prefer?

Q27) In your opinion, which leaders can resolve challenges at work easier.

Q28) In your opinion why do you think the gender that you prefer, can resolve the challenges at work easier?

Q29) Do you agree with the statement that it is more difficult for women to reach leadership positions?

Q30) In your opinion, why is it more difficult for women to reach leadership positions? (You can select more than one option)

Q31) Should you have any additional comments, please write them below in the space provided.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Across nations and occupations (Bashaw, 1999; Dhawan, 2000; Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty, & Keiser, 2012; Hull, 1999; McDuff, 2001), a significant body of research shows that women have higher job satisfaction than men, despite earning less money (Clark, 1997; Donohue & Heywood, 2004; Kristensen & Johansson, 2008; Loscocco & Bose, 1998; Metle, 2001; Mulinge & Mueller, 1998; Sloane & Williams, 2000). Still, other research (Bokemeier & William, 1987; Ehrenberg, 2003; Fields & Blum, 1997; Hodson, 1989; Mobley, Jaret, Marsh, & Lim, 1994; Robst et al., 2003; Westover, 2009; Zoghi, 2003) has not found any differences in job satisfaction between men and women. Work-life balance, work connections, intrinsic rewards, and extrinsic incentives are the four main categories of job satisfaction and gender that are examined in this research.

### Work Relations

Work interactions are another aspect of a job that could influence gender disparities in job satisfaction. Women may value certain aspects of their jobs more than males do, such as social relationships, task significance, and having a good supervisor (Clark, 1997; Harris, Moritzen, Robitschek, Imhoff, & Lynch 2001; Konrad et al., 2000). When their employment concentrated on teaching—which may be seen as relationship-based—rather than research, female university professors in the United States and Canada reported higher levels of job satisfaction than their male counterparts (Kessler, Spector, & Gavin, 2013). In workplaces with a high proportion of female employees, women may also enjoy more fulfilling working relationships. In work environments where women predominate, women tend to be more contented (Fricke & Beehr, 1992; Smart & Ethington, 1987) and rate their organisations under these circumstances (Clerkin, 2017), but they are dissatisfied in workplaces where men predominate, possibly as a result of having higher expectations there (Clark, 1997; Sloane & Williams, 2000). In a similar vein, other elements that may affect satisfaction levels include discrimination based on gender and unfair treatment. According to a Chinese study (Ngo, Foley, Ji, & Loi, 2014), perceptions of gender prejudice had a detrimental impact on career satisfaction and women were generally less content with their work than males, with the exception of situations when they felt supported by their organisations. Gender disparities have not been detected in other work-related aspects, such as employment well-being (how an individual feels while working). It has been demonstrated that wellbeing declines with age for both men and women (Wilks &

Neto, 2012).

## Work-Life Balance

Work-life balance factors could explain gender disparities in job satisfaction. Men may prioritise compensation above flexibility, while women may place a higher value on being able to balance work and family; yet, satisfaction is equal for both sexes when flexibility is taken into consideration (Bender et al., 2005). Similarly, when employees' actual and preferred work hours differ, there is no gender difference in life satisfaction (Ba levent & Kirmano lu, 2014). Job satisfaction and life satisfaction are not the same thing, but they do seem to connect (Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989). According to a meta-analysis, older women were less likely than their male counterparts to experience role overload—the need to satisfy numerous norms that require long time commitments—and were more satisfied with their supervisors (Ng & Feldman, 2010).

## Hiring

In 1957, Gary Becker shockingly asserted that more competition in the product market will eventually lead to a decrease in or outright elimination of discrimination against minorities and women. This suggests that there is a positive correlation between market power and employment discrimination: employers with more clout will be able to engage in discrimination to a larger degree than employers with less clout because discrimination is expensive in the sense that discriminating employers forfeit profits in order to satisfy their "taste for discrimination." The hypothesis has dynamic implications since shifts in market power will have an impact on how these disadvantaged groups' relative employment and earnings fluctuate. With a special focus on women, greater competition in the product market within a sector (or area) over time ought to decrease differences in employment and income between men and women, other things being equal. This theory appears to be supported by the recent shrinking of the gender wage gap in an era of heightened competitiveness brought about by international trade and deregulation. In actuality, since 1960, the proportion of GDP attributable to imports and the gender wage ratio have followed comparable temporal trends, with both series rising sharply through the early 1990s after staying relatively stable between 1960 and 1980. In spite of this, Page 4137 IJSRM volume 8, issue 5, May 2020, Sobana Hameed Arshad [www.ijrsm.in] Although there is compelling evidence (DOI: 10.18535/ijrsm/v4i5.06), few academics have examined the relationship between trade and gender discrimination in order to determine the reason behind the increase in female relative salaries and employment.

In the previous ten years, economists have

attempted to use correspondence experiments to quantify the amount of hiring discrimination against women in the labour market. In these studies, actual job postings receive pairs of fictional job applications, with the only difference being the candidate's gender. Discrimination is detected using typical probit regressions of the employer's call-back on the candidate's gender (Riach and Rich 2002). However, it should be noted that "existing [... correspondence evidence on gender discrimination is [... still open to this criticism," as stated by Azmat and Petrongolo (2014) in their summary of experimental achievements in the study of gender inequalities in the labour market. To close the distance The econometric framework of Neymark (2012) is applied by Carlsson et al. (2014) to many previously published correspondence studies, one of which examined prejudice based on

gender. Assume that, for male and female candidates applying for an open position, the average observed and average unobserved productivity determinants are the same, but that, at least in the employer's opinion, the variance of unobservable job-relevant characteristics is higher for female candidates than for male candidates. This will help us better understand the case of gender discrimination in hiring. Furthermore, let's say that the employer believes the motivation letter and the CV to be relatively poor indicators of productivity when compared to the job requirements. Given the likelihood that the combination of the observed and unobserved, it makes sense for the company to extend invitations to both the female and male candidates. The productivity of female candidates is higher. Therefore, the degree of prejudice against females may be underestimated by a correspondence test that identifies it.

### **Promotions and leadership**

Leadership disparities between genders are regularly observed. Women's organisational representation decreases as they climb the corporate ladder in both Canada (Catalyst, 2020) and the United States (Coury et al., 2020), indicating a "leaky pipeline." In Canada, for example, women make up 23% of CEOs, 37% of managers, and 47% of support personnel (Catalyst, 2020). The United States exhibits comparable trends (U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2020; Coury et al., 2020). According to the double jeopardy hypothesis (Beal, 1970), racialized women in Canadian and American corporations face a worse pipeline problem than White women, who make up 21% of the C-Suite. Interestingly, the gender gap is greater among Whites than it is among racialized women. people, mostly as a result of the high representation of White men in senior leadership roles (McKinsey & Company, 2022). Mothers face additional obstacles to becoming leaders: For every child they have, women are 4.3 times less likely to become CEOs (Hurley & Choudhary, 2016). Therefore, women suffer when they don't advance to positions of leadership. This is because, in comparison to women who do not occupy leadership roles, women in leadership enjoy higher levels of well-being, work satisfaction, salary, and perceived professional success (Frederick & Lazzara, 2020; Offermann, Thomas, Lanzo, & Smith, 2020). There is evidence to think that gender disparities are the cause of the discrepancy between the representation of men and women in leadership roles. Effective leadership is usually linked to being a man and having agentic qualities as opposed to being holding collective ones and being a woman (Schein, 2001; Schein & Davidson, 1993). Accordingly, women may find it more challenging to go up the organisational ladder and hold leadership roles as a result of these cultural gender stereotypes (Eagly & Karau, 2002). It does seem that women must meet greater requirements than men in order to hold leadership roles. For example, women have a history of much higher performance evaluations than males have when it comes to upper-level managers who get promoted (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). Moreover, meta-analyses show that compared to their male counterparts, female CEOs are older and possess a higher level of elite education (Wang, Holmes, Devine, & Bishoff, 2018). There is prejudice against female executives, especially in companies with a high male presence, according to an earlier meta-analysis of experimental research (Eagly et al., 1992). A more current trial shows that not in addition to the fact that a male leader is deemed more effective than a matched female leader, the gender impact also interacts with race to produce a double jeopardy effect wherein female Black leaders are rated lowest (Rosette & Livingston, 2012). According to role (in)congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002), women encounter

significant barriers in their pursuit of leadership roles as a result of the discrepancy between the expectations placed on them by society and their gender. Studies on the job performance of female leaders also point to injustices rather than inferior skill levels as the reason for their underrepresentation in these positions. According to a meta-analysis, real female leaders are seen as somewhat more effective than male leaders by others (such as managers, employees, and judges with training) (Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, & Woehr, 2014; see also Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Eagly et al., 1992). Women are more likely than men to use a transactional leadership style, which involves using rules, rewards, and punishments. This suggests that women's strong leadership performance may be partially explained by their stronger transformational leadership style (e.g., inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and follower consideration) (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003). Put another way, it seems that female leaders are more inclined to conform to the friendly, community gender ideals that are prescribed by society. Accordingly, a large number of women who achieve high leadership positions characterise their leadership approach as being very relational (Cheung & Halpern, 2010). Furthermore, the positive performance evaluations for female leaders can just be a reflection of their excellent quality (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). Compared to men, women are less likely to be in leadership roles for a number of reasons. To be successful in their leadership roles, female leaders must exhibit agentic behaviours; nevertheless, people detest very agentic women more than they dislike less agentic women or highly agentic males (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Lab experiment meta-analytic evidence shows that raters assess males more favourably than women when evaluating highly agentic leaders (Eagly et al., 1992). Consequently, raters may encourage women to occupy leadership roles less frequently if they find agentic women unpleasant or do not fit the prescriptive gender stereotype of being extremely communal (Rudman et al., 2012). However, when assuming a prominent role in leadership, Black women are viewed less unfavourably than White women (Livingston, Rosette, & Washington, 2012). This could be because, in accordance with the MOSAIC perspective, Dominance behaviours are stereotype consistent because black women are perceived as masculine (Hall et al., 2019).

### **Factors Contributing to Gender Bias in Leadership Roles**

Gender prejudice in leadership jobs is sustained by a number of variables, including as unconscious biases, cultural norms, and institutional hurdles. Women are disproportionately disadvantaged in the growth of leadership due to structural impediments such as gendered organisational rules and practices, restricted work-life balance policies, and restricted access to mentorship and sponsorship opportunities (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Furthermore, women who display features associated with masculinity—like aggressiveness and dominance—may encounter negative consequences due to cultural norms that designate these attributes as masculine (Early & Karau, 2002). Furthermore, implicit biases resulting from deeply rooted prejudices and cultural preconceptions impact decision-making procedures, giving preference to men over women in the assessment and selection of leadership roles (Heilman et al., 2004).

1. **Unconscious Bias:** Implicit biases, another name for unconscious biases, are attitudes and beliefs that subtly



affect how people make decisions. Studies have indicated that even when people explicitly support gender equality, they may harbour unconscious prejudices that favour males over women in leadership roles (Heilman et al., 2004). These prejudices may show up in judgements about hiring, promotion, and performance reviews, which can result in the underrepresentation of women in positions of leadership.

**2. Structural Barriers:** Restrictions that disproportionately hinder women's advancement into leadership positions can be established by organisational structures and practices. According to Eagly and Carli (2007), some examples of these obstacles include gendered professional trajectories and job positions, biased hiring and promotion procedures, restricted access to leadership development programmes, and rigid work schedules that penalize taking care of family members. The persistence of gender bias is facilitated by structural disparities that restrict women's access to leadership positions.

**3. Work-Life Balance Challenges:** Women face difficulties in juggling work and home obligations, which frequently leads to compromises that limit their capacity to advance into leadership positions. Expectations that women will put caregiving responsibilities ahead of professional development might cause delays in leadership position promotion, career disruptions, and decreased work hours (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008).

In addition to contributing to the underrepresentation of women in leadership roles, the unequal distribution of caregiving obligations perpetuates gender stereotypes.

**4. Organizational Culture and Climate:** Organizational cultures and climates can either strengthen or weaken initiatives to overcome gender bias in leadership positions. Women feel encouraged and inspired to pursue leadership possibilities in organizations with cultures that emphasize diversity, equity, and inclusion (Kulik & Ryan, 2018). On the other hand, societies that support or allow discriminatory actions reinforce gender inequality and prevent women from rising to positions of leadership.

## RESEARCH TIMELINE:

### **Phase 1: Literature Review**

Week 1- 2: Conduct an extensive review of literature related to gender bias in leadership roles, including studies on the manifestations of bias, its impact on women's career progression, and interventions to address bias.

Week 3- 4: Analyze and synthesize the literature to identify research gaps and establish a theoretical framework that will guide the research.

### **Phase 2: Research Design and Ethical Considerations**

Week 5: Develop the research design, including the selection of appropriate research methods (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods), sampling techniques, and data collection tools.

Week 6: Address ethical considerations and obtain necessary approvals (e.g., ethics committee) for conducting the research.

### **Phase 3: Data Collection**

Week 7- 8: Identify a diverse sample of participants, including women in leadership positions, employees, managers, and organizational leaders, using various recruitment strategies (e.g., organizational partnerships, professional networks).

Week 9- 10: Conduct interviews, focus groups, surveys, or other data collection methods to gather qualitative and/or quantitative data on gender bias in leadership roles.

### **Phase 4: Data Analysis**

Week 11- 12: Transcribe and analyze qualitative data from interviews and focus groups using appropriate qualitative analysis techniques (e.g., thematic analysis, content analysis).

Week 13- 14: Clean and analyze quantitative data from surveys using relevant statistical techniques (e.g., descriptive statistics, inferential analysis).

### **Phase 5: Findings and Discussion**

Week 15- 16: Interpret the findings from the qualitative and quantitative analyses, comparing them with existing literature on gender bias in leadership roles.

Week 17- 18: Discuss the implications of the findings, explore potential factors contributing to gender bias, and identify patterns or themes that emerge from the data.

## Phase 6: Report Writing and Presentation

Week 19- 20: Write the research report, including an introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, discussion, and conclusion, focusing on the study's specific objectives and research questions.

Week 21- 22: Revise and finalize the research report. Prepare a professional presentation summarizing the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

## Phase 7: Submission and Evaluation

Week 23: Submit the research report and presentation for evaluation.

Week 24: Address any feedback or revisions required by the evaluators and make necessary adjustments to the research report.

By following this timeline, the research project on gender bias in leadership roles can be completed within the designated time frame, allowing for a comprehensive understanding of the topic and providing insights to address the identified research gap.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### ✚ RESEARCH AIM AND OBJECTIVES:

The aim of this research is to examine and analyses and investigate and address gender bias in leadership roles. The specific objectives include:

- ✓ To study the examine and analyses the extent of gender bias in leadership positions across various industries and countries.
- ✓ To study and identify the specific challenges and obstacles that women face in advancing to leadership roles, and to propose solutions and strategies to promote gender equality and diversity in leadership.
- ✓ Examine the impact of gender bias on women's career progression, job satisfaction, and work outcomes.

### ✚ RESEARCH DESIGN:

The survey questionnaire can include items related to perceptions of gender bias in leadership, experiences of discrimination or unequal opportunities, and attitudes towards gender equality in the workplace. A Likert scale or other rating scales can be used to measure participants' responses, allowing for quantitative analysis of the data.

**Qualitative Component:** In the qualitative section, people who have experienced or witnessed gender bias in leadership posts can have their experiences, perspectives, and narratives explored using a phenomenological or grounded theory approach. To collect qualitative data, focus groups or semi-structured interviews might be held. Participants are given the chance to contribute their individual experiences, opinions, and observations regarding gender bias in leadership through qualitative data gathering techniques. You can explore their experiences, impressions of obstacles or difficulties encountered, and tactics utilized to combat gender bias by asking open-ended questions. To find important themes and patterns, the data gathered from focus groups and interviews can be subjected to a thematic analysis.

**Integration:** During the analysis stage, the quantitative and qualitative data can be combined to give a thorough picture of gender bias in leadership roles. A more comprehensive picture can be obtained from the quantitative data, which also show statistical linkages and trends. Rich tales and firsthand experiences found in the qualitative data might offer deeper insights. Triangulation is a technique for integrating data that compares, contrasts, or complements quantitative and qualitative findings in order to strengthen and justify the overall conclusions. This mixed-methods technique captures both the numerical trends and the individual's subjective experiences, enabling a more comprehensive analysis of gender bias in leadership posts. Researchers can address the study issue on gender prejudice in leadership roles in a thorough and effective manner by using a mixed-methods research design subtle way, illuminating the frequency, reasons, and effects.

#### **SAMPLING STRATEGY:**

**Target demographic:** The target demographic consists of people who hold or have held leadership roles in a range of industries or companies. This includes individuals of both sexes who have witnessed or experienced incidents of gender bias in leadership roles. The target group may also include pertinent stakeholders like HR specialists, diversity and inclusion officers, or organizational executives in responsibility of addressing gender discrimination.

**Sample Size:** The objectives of the research, the available resources, and the necessary degree of statistical power will all influence the appropriate sample size. A sample size that is both manageable within the confines of the research project and sizable enough to represent a range of viewpoints and experiences should be the aim. A sample size of at least 100 people is usually considered to be a decent place to start for qualitative research, though this could vary depending on the study's complexity and scope.

**Sample Method:** Depending on the objectives of the study, available resources, and needed statistical power, different sample sizes will be needed. A manageable sample size that encompasses the scope of the research project

while also being sufficiently large to represent a range of viewpoints and experiences should be the aim. Although it may vary depending on the complexity and scope of the study, a sample size of at least 100 people is usually considered a reasonable place to start for qualitative research.

### **RESEARCH APPROACH:**

There are many approaches to gather information for **quantitative research** including surveys, custom surveys, mail/e-mail/Internet surveys, telephone surveys, self-administered questionnaire surveys, omnibus surveys, structured interviews, structured observations, etc.

**Qualitative Exploration:** Qualitative methods, such as interviews and focus groups, will be used to explore individuals' experiences, perceptions, and narratives related to gender bias in leadership roles. These methods will provide in-depth insights into the underlying factors and contextual dynamics.

**Mixed Methods Approach:** The study will employ a mixed methods research approach to gain a comprehensive understanding of gender bias in leadership roles. This approach will allow for the integration of qualitative and quantitative data to provide a holistic view of the phenomenon.

### **+ DATA COLLECTION METHOD:**

**Surveys:** Utilizing surveys is a good way to get quantitative data from many respondents. In the context of gender bias in leadership roles, surveys can be designed to gather information on participant demographics, leadership positions held, experiences with bias, opinions of organizational policies, and attitudes towards gender equality. Quick data collection, statistical analysis, and population-wide generalization are all made possible by surveys.

**Document Analysis:** Analyzing relevant records, including news articles, reports, performance evaluations, and organizational policies, can provide insight into the formal and informal policies pertaining to gender discrimination in leadership roles. Taking into account the broader organizational and cultural problems that give rise to discrimination against women in documents. Analysis aids in placing the research findings in context

**Observations:** Observational methods can be used to make direct observations of interactions within organizational contexts, decision-making processes, and leadership behaviors. This may entail keeping a watch out for incidents of discrimination or unequal treatment in boardrooms, meetings, or leadership development initiatives. In addition to self-reported statistics, observations can provide a more objective viewpoint on the dynamics of gender bias in leadership.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**INDEPENDENT T TEST: -**

Study involves comparing means between two groups (e.g., male vs. female leaders), you might use an independent samples t-test to determine if there are significant differences in perceptions or behaviors related to leadership roles based on gender.

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
At the moment, your supervisor is:	Equal variances assumed	14.368	.000	2.000	117	.048	.165	.083	.002	.329
	Equal variances not assumed			1.962	101.679	.052	.165	.084	-.002	.332
Your position in organisational hierarchy:	Equal variances assumed	.409	.524	-.370	117	.712	-.046	.124	-.292	.200
	Equal variances not assumed			-.371	112.976	.711	-.046	.124	-.292	.200
What is your working experience (in years/months)	Equal variances assumed	.181	.672	-.119	117	.906	-.206	1.740	-3.653	3.240
	Equal variances not assumed			-.119	112.179	.906	-.206	1.738	-3.649	3.236
In your opinion why do you trust the gender that you prefer? [They can stabilise the situation quicker]	Equal variances assumed	.624	.431	.938	117	.350	.237	.253	-.263	.737
	Equal variances not assumed			.944	114.039	.347	.237	.251	-.260	.734

**INTERPRETATION**

**Supervisor vs. Trust in Gender:** Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: The assumption of equal variances is violated ( $p < 0.05$ ). t-test for Equality of Means: The difference in means between respondents' positions regarding their supervisor and their trust in their preferred gender is statistically significant ( $p = 0.048$  with equal variances assumed). The mean difference is 0.165, and the 95% confidence interval for the difference ranges from 0.002 to 0.329.

**Position in Organizational Hierarchy vs. Trust in Gender:** Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: Variances are equal ( $p > 0.05$ ). t-test for Equality of Means: The difference in means between respondents' positions in the organizational hierarchy and their trust in their preferred gender is not statistically significant ( $p = 0.712$  with equal variances assumed). The mean difference is -0.046, and the 95% confidence interval for the difference ranges from -0.292 to 0.200.

**Working Experience vs. Trust in Gender:** Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: Variances are equal ( $p > 0.05$ ) t-test for Equality of Means: The difference in means between respondents' working experience and their trust in their preferred gender is not statistically significant ( $p = 0.906$  with equal variances assumed). The mean difference is -0.206, and the 95% confidence interval for the difference ranges from -3.653 to 3.240.

**Reasons for Trusting Preferred Gender (specifically, stabilizing the situation quicker) vs. Trust in Gender:**

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: Variances are equal ( $p > 0.05$ ).

t-test for Equality of Means: The difference in means between respondents who trust their preferred gender for stabilizing the situation quicker and their overall trust in their preferred gender is not statistically significant ( $p = 0.350$  with equal variances assumed). The mean difference is 0.237, and the 95% confidence interval for the difference ranges from -0.263 to 0.737.

## T-Test

**Group Statistics**

	What is your gender:	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
At the moment, your supervisor is:	female	53	.38	.489	.067
	male	66	.21	.412	.051
Your position in organisational hierarchy:	female	53	2.15	.662	.091
	male	66	2.20	.684	.084
What is your working experience (in years/months)	female	53	11.90	9.360	1.286
	male	66	12.10	9.497	1.169
In your opinion why do you trust the gender that you prefer? [They can stabilise the situation quicker]	female	53	3.43	1.323	.182
	male	66	3.20	1.406	.173

## INTERPRETATION: -

Female respondents generally have higher levels of trust in their supervisors compared to male respondents. There's no substantial difference in the mean position level between male and female respondents.

Male respondents have slightly higher mean working experience compared to female respondents, but the difference is not significant.

Female respondents, on average, have a slightly higher trust score in their preferred gender's ability to stabilize situations quicker compared to male respondents, though the difference is not substantial.

## CHI- SQUARE

examining the relationship between gender (male/female) and a categorical variable (e.g., perceptions of leadership qualities), you can use a chi-square test to determine if there's a significant association between the two variables.

**In your opinion, who are more effective leaders?**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
males	53	59.5	-6.5
female	66	59.5	6.5
Total	119		

**At the moment, your supervisor is:**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
male	85	59.5	25.5
female	34	59.5	-25.5
Total	119		

**In your opinion, which leader is more capable of listening and understanding their employees/subordinates?**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
males	39	59.5	-20.5
female	80	59.5	20.5
Total	119		

**Which leader do you trust more?**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
males	54	59.5	-5.5
female	65	59.5	5.5
Total	119		

## INTERPRETATION

**For males**, the observed count (53) is lower than expected (59.5), resulting in a negative residual of -6.5. This suggests that there are fewer respondents who perceive males as effective leaders than would be expected based on an equal distribution of perceptions.

**For females**, the observed count (66) is higher than expected (59.5), resulting in a positive residual of 6.5. This suggests that there are more respondents who perceive females as effective leaders than would be expected based on an equal distribution of perceptions.

**For males**, the observed count (39) is lower than expected (59.5), resulting in a negative residual of -20.5. This suggests that there are fewer respondents who perceive males as more capable of listening and understanding their employees or subordinates than would be expected based on an equal distribution of perceptions.

**For females**, the observed count (80) is higher than expected (59.5), resulting in a positive residual of 20.5. This suggests that there are more respondents who perceive females as more capable of listening and understanding their employees or subordinates than would be expected based on an equal distribution of perceptions.

## MULTIPLE REGRESSION:



Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.352	3	.451	1.849	.142 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	28.043	115	.244		
	Total	29.395	118			

a. Dependent Variable: What is your gender:  
b. Predictors: (Constant), What is your working experience (in years/months), What is your education level?, What is your age:

## INTERPRETATION

The p-value associated with the F-statistic is 0.142, which is greater than the conventional significance level of 0.05. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that the regression model is not statistically significant. This suggests that the predictors (working experience, education level, and age) included in the model do not significantly explain the variation in the dependent variable (gender) in this analysis.

## Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.536	.196		2.730	.007
	What is your age:	.005	.006	.102	.843	.401
	What is your education level?	-.138	.063	-.200	-2.197	.030
	What is your working experience (in years/months)	-.004	.006	-.080	-.661	.510

a. Dependent Variable: What is your gender:

## INTERPRETATION: -

**Constant:** This represents the value of the dependent variable when all independent variables are zero. In this case, the constant is 0.536. This means that when age, education level, and working experience are all zero, the predicted value for the gender variable is 0.536.

**Age:** The coefficient for age is 0.005, indicating that for every one-unit increase in age, the predicted value of the gender variable increases by 0.005 units. However, this coefficient is not statistically significant ( $p = 0.843$ ), suggesting that age does not have a significant impact on gender.

**Education Level:** The coefficient for education level is -0.138. This means that for every one-unit increase in education level, the predicted value of the gender variable decreases by 0.138 units. Since the p-value (0.030) is less than 0.05, this coefficient is statistically significant. Therefore, higher education levels are associated with a lower predicted value for the gender variable.

**Working Experience:** The coefficient for working experience is -0.004, indicating that for every one-unit increase in working experience, the predicted value of the gender variable decreases by 0.004 units. However, like age, this coefficient is not statistically significant ( $p = 0.510$ ), suggesting that working experience does not have a significant impact on gender.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we performed quantitative based survey in which we distributed 100 questionnaires among the various academic's institution employees, our questionnaire was based of 31 questions, which was classified into six factors and the factors were Confidence, Inspire Action, Vision, Communication and Empathy. Our respondents were male and females. In the response from the respondents, we get that our research is very reliable. Responses from the respondent lies mostly between the "Strongly agree" and "Agree". Independent variable gender has is not significant with dependent variable gender and they have weak relationship. According to regression response which indicates that Our Model is not in good fit. From the times of old to the current period, there are still supposition's that men are the ones who should predetermined to lead, and woman, regardless of how much they are skilled or qualified, will serve as supporters for the greater part of their lives. The quote above, while positively dated, surely no one today would even try to defy. The way that men are destined to lead, and that the women's place is at best close by, yet never in front, is getting to be increasingly hard to acknowledge. In this paper, we have investigated the absolute most fundamental qualities required in an effective leader, beginning off with some commonly definitions that what leadership in real, while a few qualities appear to be more present in male than females, there are still numerous females that gangs the vital attributes to be extremely powerful pioneers. We took a gander at a couple studies that broke down leadership under research environments and we have additionally investigated a portion of this topic. Yet no place in these studies arrived any proof to propose that the most basic or required attributes for leadership effectiveness is the sexual orientation of the leader. Some historical perspectives of leadership were exhibited, and also some current theories of leadership, and once more, there was no mention of sex being a important element as far as leadership effectiveness. We then went into detail on the most common qualities or properties of effective leadership, and once more, there was a glaring rejection identifying with sexual orientation in the vast majority of the data exhibited. There was data displayed on the part of the subordinate in assessing the effectiveness of leader, and any sexual orientation related issues that may become possibly the most important factor in such manner. Additionally, a part of the information about Transactional and transformational leadership depicted females as being appraised higher on the transformational initiative style than males. Similarly, in conclusion, we took a look at how integrity, behavior and rationality applied in the application of leadership effectiveness. After immense research on the topic, we discover a

wide range of hard information on why male keep on climbing the leadership ladder in front of ladies, our decisions

have demonstrated the exact inverse. There is basically no obvious reason or hypothesis or method of reasoning to disclose why females keep on lacking in the initiative race in corporate world.

#### REFERENCES: -

- <https://hbr.org/2007/09/women-and-the-labyrinth-of-leadership>
- <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2002-08253-002>
- <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01541.x>
- [https://digitalcommons.lib.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=chip\\_docs](https://digitalcommons.lib.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=chip_docs)
- <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2787021>
- <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24773399/>

