

GENDER AND FEMALE LEADERSHIP

GENRE ET LEADERSHIP FEMININ

RGUIBI Khalid

Enseignant chercheur

ENCG

Université Ibn Tofail – Maroc

Laboratoire de Recherche en Sciences de Gestion des Organisations

krgui2014@gmail.com

ATID Asma

Doctorante

ENCG

Université Ibn Tofail –Maroc

Laboratoire de Recherche en Sciences de Gestion des Organisations

atid.asma.2016@gmail.com

Date submitted : 28/06/2022

Date of acceptance : 13/10/2022

To cite this article :

RGUIBI K. & ATID A. (2022) «Gender and female leadership », Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion
«Volume 5 : Numéro 4» pp : 90 - 112

Abstract

Leadership is the subject of a large amount of research in management science. However, many researchers agree that it is anchored and described in masculine terms.

For a long time, the position of leader was embodied by men. When women have more massively acceded to management and leadership positions, the question of female leadership has become a hot topic.

Today, women are rapidly entering male-dominated work sectors. However, the women receive a hostile reaction. Moreover, this reaction is based on stereotypical attitudes regarding the nature of work and the role of female employees. Gender role stereotypes portray men as more competent, but less warm or expressive than women. Thus, competence is referred to as a masculine characteristic, while feminine characteristics are often related to warmth and expressiveness. The literature also suggests that women encourage participation, share power and information, and attempt to improve the self-esteem of their followers. They lead through inclusion and rely on their charisma, expertise, interpersonal skills and connections to influence others.

Nowadays, there is a need to rethink traditional notions of femininity and masculinity because gender is a multiple and heterogeneous issue.

Keywords: female leadership; management; gender; social role; gender role.

Résumé

Le leadership fait l'objet de nombreuses recherches en sciences de gestion. Cependant, de nombreux chercheurs s'accordent à dire qu'il est ancré et décrit en termes masculins.

Pendant longtemps, la position de leader a été incarnée par des hommes. Alors que les femmes ont accédé plus massivement aux postes de direction et de leadership, la question du leadership féminin est devenue un sujet brûlant.

Aujourd'hui, les femmes entrent rapidement dans les secteurs de travail dominés par les hommes. Cependant, les femmes reçoivent une réaction hostile. De plus, cette réaction est basée sur des attitudes stéréotypées concernant la nature du travail et le rôle des femmes employées. Les stéréotypes sur les rôles des sexes présentent les hommes comme étant plus compétents, mais moins chaleureux ou expressifs que les femmes. Ainsi, la compétence est qualifiée de caractéristique masculine, alors que les caractéristiques féminines sont souvent liées à la chaleur et à l'expressivité. La littérature suggère également que les femmes encouragent la participation, partagent le pouvoir et l'information, et tentent d'améliorer l'estime de soi de leurs adeptes. Elles mènent par l'inclusion et s'appuient sur leur charisme, leur expertise, leurs compétences interpersonnelles et leurs contacts pour influencer les autres. De nos jours, il est nécessaire de repenser les notions traditionnelles de féminité et de masculinité car le genre est une question multiple et hétérogène.

Mots clés : leadership féminin; le management ; le genre; rôle social; rôle de genre

Introduction

In general, each organization designs, organizes and manages its resources in its own way. It would also be a singular entity, characterized by a management method and a style of direction specific to it. Depending on whether you are a manager and or a leader, the identity of the organization is built, stands out and evolves through multiple interactions with its internal and external environment.

However, due to the different social construction between men and women the title of manager and/or leader is often associated with men and is only the representation of a strong masculinity (Blumen 1992). Women in decision-making positions are therefore incompatible and in contradiction with the gender role in society (Schein 1973).

According to Simon (1967), "we are not born a woman, we become so in the same way we are not born a man". This quote confirms that it is society, through its standards and education that awards specific qualifications to women and men. Therefore, the relationships between women and men are the consequences of a social construction and in no way innate.

This distinction is indeed gendered and linked to social stereotypes, and in no case is it the cause of a biological difference.

According to the theory of Eagly (1987), individuals are subject to social norms that condition their ways of thinking, acting and behaving. It is a purely male construction based on virility and physical strength, which distinguish boys from girls. As a result, they are placed higher in the hierarchy than girls, and whose better (Sonh, 2009).

Gender has an important role in defining leadership roles and determining the quality of services in organizations. Gender refers to the social traits of men and women that range from norms and relationships to roles. Studies show that people's perceptions of gender vary from society to society and are likely to change over time. Society inculcates behaviors and norms in people, such as opposite-sex relationships or relationships between work colleagues. Gender structures, relationships and social roles influence people's activities and approaches to leadership challenges and responsibilities. In essence, leadership decisions and gender have a significant link that needs to be assessed to facilitate the smooth functioning of the organization. Leadership refers to practical skills that incorporate an individual's ability to guide others towards a common goal.

Our interest in the subject of gender and leadership in high organizational spheres comes in particular from a questioning of the gender dichotomy in the exercise of leadership and more particularly of the ambiguity that persists with regard to women's leadership.

The question that arises from this issue is: **Do women have such a different approach to men?**

To fulfil this aim this paper will be structured in 5 parts:

The first part will be devoted to the social construction of gender; we have got to focus on distinction between sex and gender, social construction of identity and the role of gender stereotypes in maintaining identity differences. The second part focuses on the study of gender issues in organizations, and we will retain 3 issues: Work-life balance, female and male skills, and the ideal worker. The third part will present female leadership through two essential points; social representations of female leadership and gender effect. Thus the following sections discuss leadership styles: gender differences and similarities. Finally, the section dealing with men, women and the exercise of power will be identified.

1. Social construction of gender

1.1. Distinction between sex and gender

At the beginning of this section, we feel it is important to be clear about the concepts of gender and sex, in view of the debates they have been generating in recent years. One, gender, sex differences in most socio-cultural contexts.

Several definitions are given to the concept of gender. The briefest and most comprehensive definition is that of Nay (2014) who understands gender as any social and cultural construct based on the difference between the male and female sexes. Indeed, for him, gender emphasizes the socially, culturally and even historically constructed character of the differences that exist between women and men¹.

Sex, on the other hand, represents the biological side (nature) of human existence. This idea is found in the conception of the WHO (World Health Organization). According to this concept, the difference between these two notions is based on the fact that sex refers more to the biological and physiological characteristics that differentiate men and women, while gender refers to the socially determined roles, behaviors, activities and attributes that a society

¹ Boukar H. & Habiba M. (2020), « Les obstacles à l'exercice du leadership féminin au sein de l'Université », Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion. « Volume 3 : Numéro 2 » p 183

considers appropriate for men and women. A nuance whose effects result in the categorization of men and women in relation to biological sex and that of male and female, referring to social sex.

1.2. Social construction of identity

Identity is what makes an individual similar to himself and different from others, what makes him feel he exists as a person and as a social figure with roles, status and functions. The individual thus defines himself through this identity and feels accepted and recognized as such in his socio-cultural environment (Tap, 1986). As a constituent element of an individual's personality, identity is a concept that is constructed through a process whose goal is the incorporation of the way of doing things, norms and values that will influence behavior throughout a lifetime: the socialization process. This process represents the path through which we build our identity. This one is built as we grow up and "the individual does not build it alone: his identity depends as much on the judgments of others as on his own orientations and thus, "the identity is the product of its successive socialization", (Dubar, 2015). It develops through the relationship with the other and the place of each one in his group of belonging in particular, and in the society in general.

Vouillot (2002) defines gendered identity as "gender orientation, that is, the degree of adherence that individuals exhibit to the various categories of gender roles prescribed to their biological sex." In other words, the orientation we give to our attitudes, behaviors or even thoughts are consistent with our biological sex.

This is what makes a man adopt masculine characteristics and a woman adopt This is what makes a man adopt masculine specificities and a woman feminine specificities in a perspective of conformism with respect to his status and the associated values and prerogatives in a given environmental context.

1.3. The role of gender stereotypes in maintaining identity differences

1.3.1. Gender stereotypes

Presented as beliefs about the characteristic traits of members of a social group, beliefs that are socially shared, stereotypes are based on elements that distinguish one group from another. These elements can be physical or behavioral traits, etc. Gender categorization affects the functioning of daily life in human societies because it leads to a different perception of men and women in terms of their social status and associated roles. Gender stereotypes therefore represent shared beliefs about the character traits associated with each

sex (Eagly, Wood & Diekmann, 2000) and have a function based on a double aspect (Gaborit, 2009): cognitive (they psychologically structure the world around individuals) and collective (they influence behavior and actions).

Gender stereotypes significantly reinforce the specificities traditionally attributed to each sex in the form of social roles. Masculinity and femininity represent the extent to which men and women incorporate into their character traits the perceptions of self that are considered in their culture to participate in fitting in or not (Best & Williams, 2010). Stereotypical elements thus represent for social groups the reference models that fuel their daily lives. It is what justifies the place that each person has as a man or as a woman. Moreover, depending on the culture, the role of women is predetermined by the standards that govern the relationship with men and vice versa. In most cases, women have more responsibility in the domestic sphere. As for the man, his responsibilities concern external activities considered as professionalizing and providing and income-generating activities.

1.3.2. Influence of gender stereotypes on the behavior of men and women

The idea of the existence of biological physiological differences between men and women is inescapable. It is these differences that justify the levels of treatment reserved for them in societies. These differences also have an impact on the behavior and attitudes of individuals. Yourcenar speaks of a difference between "virtues said to be feminine" and "virtues said to be masculine" to refer to masculine specificities or feminine specificities. The transmission of the parents to the children of these virtues or specificities, as we had already specified it, influences these last ones in their attitudes or behaviors.

1.3.3. Male and female specificities: the work of Sandra Bem

Bem (1944-2014) developed a theory to explain gender development and measure the characteristics of masculinity, femininity and androgyny. According to her, social expectations play a very important role in how each individual expresses his or her identity as masculine, feminine or androgynous.

According to her theory, gender roles are developed and maintained through culturally situated stereotypes. These stereotypes correspond to the representation that individuals have of masculine and feminine in relation to what they have always known. The construction of gender identity is lifelong and once an individual is fully aware of his or her status as male or female, it is almost impossible to change this conception, as it is deeply rooted in the individual.

The theory of the gender schema that Bem (1981) develops takes into account the fact that individuals rely on sex to organize daily life through a system of categorization. Its aim was to challenge the idea of a bipolar (or opposite) conception of the sexes, and to promote the fusion of male and female traits in order to be fully functional to develop a so-called androgynous personality. This suggests the existence of several types of personalities ranging from the most masculine to the most feminine, in addition to the so-called neutral personalities (neither feminine nor masculine, rather both at the same time). The notion of gender is an integral part of the daily life of human societies, and male and female stereotypes are products of these societies whose cultures determine their specificities. This is what is at the root of social roles linked to gender.

The masculine and feminine specificities are transmitted from generation to generation in the form of mental programming allowing individuals, as soon as they are acquired, to classify them as belonging to such or such another category initially, and thus to appropriate them in a second time (depending on their gender). These are mental patterns that we inherit from our parents (and everyone in our immediate environment), who also inherited this from their parents.

2. Gender issues in organizations

Organizations can be gendered in several ways. First, the issue was raised in terms of work-life balance and career progression. A second aspect of the research concerns the classification of skills as feminine or masculine. Finally, the concept of the 'ideal worker' has been at the heart of several debates on gender in organizations.

2.1. Work-life balance

The issue of work-life balance has always been of concern to researchers interested in quality of work life and quality of life in a broader sense. It has been widely argued that work-life balance is important for women because of the many social roles they take on, yet where this need is important, organizations do not allow for the flexibility to meet it (Hewlett and Luce, 2005). Although more and more organizations are introducing work-life balance policies as an integral part of their personnel management, gender issues underlie these approaches, as it is predominantly women who take up flexible working arrangements (Smithson and Stokoe, 2005). This phenomenon, while beneficial in terms of better career and life balance, reinforces the idea that men and women in the labour market have different needs and relative availability, and therefore require 'tailored' treatment. In addition, those who want to work

flexibly are often excluded from career progression opportunities and their commitment to work is likely to be questioned (O'Leary, 1997).

Women in this case feel that the organization makes little effort to develop their leadership when they use flexible working methods according to Kelan (2008):

"The fact that women are not developed as leaders may be related to unfair assumptions about women's desire to lead ("they would really rather stay at home") and their dedication to the organization ("they don't care as much about this company as male workers").

The underlying argument suggests that women have unique ways of approaching and solving problems in the unique ways of approaching and solving problems in the organizational arena. The authors point out that their practice emphasizes cooperation and reciprocity, as opposed to competition and individual achievement, which is more and individual success, which is more akin to male behavior. Gender would therefore be the source of a difference in managerial behavior, skills and style (Spurgeon and Cross, 2006). Moreover, the literature has attempted to list competences according to gender, and associates certain skills with men or women depending on what is apparent in practice.

2.2.Female and male skills

Following on from this work, (Blake & Mouton 1964) propose a grid of management behaviors in two poles: structuring behaviors, which refer to a task orientation and consideration behaviors, which lead to a people orientation.

After reviewing the literature on the differences and similarities between men and women and through comparative gender studies, Marshall (1984) concludes that there is no significant difference between men and women in the behaviors and skills used to assess management potential.

What would influence research results is the perception of subordinates and colleagues of women managers; this perceived potential is influenced more by stereotypes than by actual behavior. Gutek (1993) summarizes this phenomenon under the argument of sex-roles or gender roles, which states that a certain set of behaviors is generally considered acceptable, appropriate, even desirable and expected by a person according to his or her gender. The apparent preference for male managers in this context may signify a preference for power and the maintenance of its traditional form in a predominantly patriarchal culture (Grant & Porter 1994).

Early research on gender in organizations also showed that the sex of the worker plays a central role in how skills are assessed (Phillips & Taylor 1980). The authors demonstrated through several examples of jobs in the manufacturing sector (which requires few skills) that women were considered 'unskilled', while men are described as 'semi-skilled'. "What is skill for the male is luck for the female", said (Deaux & Emswiller 1974, p.80).

The classification of women's jobs as unskilled and men's jobs as skilled or semiskilled frequently bears little relation to the actual amount of training or ability required for them. Skill definitions are saturated with sexual bias. The work of women is often deemed inferior simply because it is women who do it. (Phillips et Taylor, 1980, p.79)

2.3. The ideal worker

Thirdly, the notion of the 'ideal worker' has often been taken up in debates on gender and organizations. Acker (1990) has suggested that organizations have constructed an image of an 'ideal worker' who is available full-time, highly skilled and dedicated to his or her work. Based on this research, other authors have suggested that this ideal worker has been constructed as male (Benschop Deaux & Emswiller 1974). (Doorewaard 1998; Bendl 2008; Kelan 2008). While organizations claim to be gender-neutral, these researchers point out that in the reality of the world of work, the characteristics of the ideal worker correspond more to men than to women (Kelan, 2008).

The workplace as a whole is shaped around these ideal workers, who are distinguished by their availability at all times, mainly because they have no family obligations. For management positions, the ideal worker is also able to work long hours, travel or move. These characteristics discriminate against both mothers and women without children, who are also far from the ideal type, because they are still These characteristics discriminate against both mothers and childless women, who are also far from the ideal type, but are still considered 'potential mothers' (Heppner, 2013). Joan Williams (2000) describes the opportunities for women in this - ultimately discriminatory - system as follows:

« They can perform as ideal workers without the flow of family work and other privileges male ideal workers enjoy [because they have wives]. This is not equality. Or they can take dead-end mommy-track jobs or "women's work." That is not equality either. A system that allows only these two alternatives is one that discriminates against women ». (p.39)

3. Female leadership

Until the end of the 1970s, studies on leadership were almost exclusively concerned with men; very few studies were interested in the difference in leadership according to gender. Moreover, the question did not really arise since the masculine is the traditional reference for the definition of leadership and therefore, logically, a leadership position naturally belongs to a man. However, the history of peoples teaches us that women have not always been non-existent in leadership positions.

Some of them have been real leaders who have played highly strategic roles, especially in politics (Adler, 1993).

However, there is no real scientific interest in the specificity of the behavior of these women in positions with positions with strong masculine characteristics. It was not until the 1980s, with the increasing number of women in leadership positions in organizations and in politics, to see an ever increasing amount of research on female leadership (Doutre, 2009). One of the main focuses of this research is One of the main focuses of this research is the effect of gender on leadership style.

For some researchers, the differences between men and women in terms of leadership are not very variable, if not minimal (Kanter, 1977; Powell, 1993). There would therefore be no significant difference in the leadership style used by leaders of both sexes. These researchers are based on the structural theory of Kanter (1977), and argue that the role of leader requires a certain type of internalized leadership in both men and women who exercise the same roles and behave in the same way. This argument is based on the assumption that men and women had to go through the same necessities to achieve their leadership role and be in the first position.

In this context, the leader's behavior is modeled and directed in a particular direction in order to meet the expectations associated with the leadership role. This pressure to behave similarly between male and female leader's means that there would be no gender-related differences in leadership style. And if there are differences, they must be relatively small. Furthermore, women and men leaders have undergone a process of socialization and assimilation which explains this conformity of behavior between men and women (Cornet & Bonnivert, 2008).

For other researchers, however, there is a sufficiently marked difference between the leadership style developed by men and women. The results of this research show that in their leadership style, women would be likely to increase participation and democracy in decision-

making (Eagly, 1991) and are more team-oriented (Ferrario, 1994). It must be said that the beginnings of these results were already announced by the work of Burns (1978), who introduced the notions of transformational and transactional leadership.

Helgesen (1990) found that female leaders, compared to male leaders, have less hierarchical leadership behavior, more cooperative and collaborative and more oriented towards the personal development of their subordinates. Along the same lines, studies focusing, for example, on what is commonly called 360-degree evaluation (Levyleboyer, 2011), which is an approach that allows line managers, peers and subordinates to assess leadership, show different transactional and transformational leadership based on gender.

These studies show that for managers, women's leadership is perceived as less effective compared to men's. At the same time, peers and subordinates tend to find this style of leadership more effective than men's. At the same time, peers and subordinates tend to find this leadership style.

At the same time, peers and subordinates tend to find this leadership style effective and transformational. Therefore, it can be noted that: "the research thus highlights a gap between bosses who are more concerned with transactional behaviors and employees who are concerned with transformational behaviors" (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe 2002).

3.1. Social representations of female leadership

3.1.1. Social roles

In order to understand and explain what is at the origin of the real and represented differences between women and men, several authors have adopted the social role theory. This theory is the result of Eagly's work in 1987. Thus, summarized in a few words, the social role theory is defined as the fact that women and men, from birth, are assigned a distinct set of tasks (Koenig & Eagly, 2014). It should be noted that this distinction of roles was made on the basis of, among other things, the biological attributes that differ between women and men. In doing so, the performance of certain activities appears to be more efficient (or natural) when performed by one sex or the other. (Eagly & Wood 2011a) explain that these activities are related, for women, to their biological function of gestation and, for men, to their large size and physical strength. They are subsequently reproduced through the differential socialization of women and men. Therefore, this gendered attribution has an influence on the construction of their identity (Koenig and Eagly, 2014).

In this extension, again according to (Eagly & Wood 2011), social roles have confined women to the task of care, thus exacerbating their relational side and their propensity to communicate. They are associated with the tasks of nurses, nannies, and the broader task of house maker, among others. Furthermore, Koenig and Eagly (2014) explain that when a woman is observed in a role (paid or unpaid) that involves caring for a child; observers will assume that all women possess these skills. They will also assume that this woman is naturally 'maternal'. This attribution can be explained by a cognitive process (matching bias) in which individuals assume that the behaviors exhibited reflect intrinsic characteristics (Eagly & Wood 2011a).

On the other hand, men are categorized in protective roles according to various tasks. These include providing financially for the family by working outside the home (Eagly & Wood, 2011a). It is these tasks, such as hunting to feed the family, that have enabled them to develop leadership skills. On the other hand, this role assignment suggests that women have not been able to develop these same in being able to develop these same leadership skills. Eagly and Wood (2011b) explain that many evolutionary psychologists support this view. They support it from the theory of Social Darwinism (evolution has only allowed the strongest, in this case men, to the strongest, in this case men, to lead societies). It should be noted that in order to improve the approach of evolutionary psychologists, and to better understand the differences and similarities between women and men, these authors have instead developed a theory that combines biological and social aspects (biosocial constructionist theory). Finally, in the light of these studies, we note that women have been associated with tasks in the private (domestic) sphere and men with those in the public (professional) sphere.

3.1.2. Representations of the female gender

As demonstrated earlier, social roles have resulted in the attribution of traits and behaviors naturally expected of women and men that are often distinct and mutually exclusive from each other. As a result, there is a female gender for female individuals and a male gender for male individuals. In this sense, gender representations need to be highlighted in order to understand how they ultimately impact on women who occupy, or hope to occupy, a leadership role.

According to (Bem 1974), gender is expressed in terms of the instrumentality-expressivity dichotomy. She associates masculinity with the instrumental orientation, i.e. a cognitive attention to the execution of work. Femininity refers to the expressive orientation. Women are said to have an affective concern for the well-being of others. This dichotomy is often linked

to the dichotomy of task orientation and interpersonal relationships discussed earlier. Bem defines androgyny as the overlap of feminine and masculine characteristics in the same individual. In order to understand what elements characterize the female and male gender, she conducted a study that In order to understand what elements characterize the feminine and masculine gender, she conducted a study that classified characteristics belonging to women and men. To do this, the author used a Lickert-type scale, where study participants were given the opportunity to rate over four hundred American characteristics of masculinity and femininity as "not at all desirable" to "extremely desirable". A characteristic was classified as "masculine", "feminine" or "androgynous" only if it was rated as such by both men and women. Thus, the characteristics she classifies as masculine include traits of aggressiveness, ambition, independence and individuality. Those associated with femininity include kindness, loyalty, affection and compassion. It should be remembered that these latter traits were judged to be more desirable for women than for men, by all of the participants. Finally, the traits seen as "neutral" become the traits associated with androgynicity. In this category we find, among other things, joy, sincerity, adaptation, friendship and jealousy. In addition, the author shows that men have significantly higher results than women in the male category. Similarly, women score significantly higher than men in the female category. That said, she argues that these gender characteristics generate expectations and cause individuals to internalize them as socially desirable behaviors.

Following (Eagly & Karau 2002), the author argues that individuals are motivated to maintain behaviors consistent with the gendered standards they have internalized. Finally, this internalization presumes to perform by suppression any behaviors that may appear to be undesirable or inappropriate for one's gender. According to her, the situation would greatly influence the appearance and modulation of these behaviors. We note that gendered behaviors are not determined by sex, but rather culturally and socially prescribed. Furthermore, the gender dichotomy has led women and men to endorse different representations of the end-group (women's group) and the ex-group (men's group). In doing so, women are described with the term communal and men with the term agentic. According to (Sarlet & Dardenne 2012), these dimensions emerge from studies on impression formation, in which they are sometimes called sociability (communal) and competence (agentic). In order to remain as close as possible to the semantics of the terms, we will use the expressions: communal and agentic. Let us add that for (Eagly & Wood 2011a), this dichotomy corresponds to what they call gender stereotypes.

In sum, as women are perceived and generally see themselves as communal, their presence in leadership roles does not seem as natural as that of men. In this regard, (Koenig & colleagues 2011) state that 'descriptively, women appear less equipped or natural in most leadership roles; and prescriptively, they appear inappropriate or presumptuous when they demonstrate the agentic behaviors often required in these roles.' In other words, women who become leaders transgress the expectations of their female role.

3.2. Gender effect

According to (Flament & Rouquette 2003) gender effects do not result in different social representations: "the object remains unique and we only record variations, possibly spectacular, possibly significant also in terms of the applications of the peripheral system". According to them, the presence of two distinct groups, such as men and women, leads to a controversial relationship about a particular object that corresponds in every way to the social differentiation of these same groups with regard to their relative positions. in power, whether economic or symbolic.

A study by (Tafari and Deschamps, 2004) demonstrates the effects of the perception of gender domination relationships. These authors make a link between the role of memberships in the construction and the organization of social representations. According to them:

Gender effects are not reduced to the sole effects of existing asymmetries in the economic or cultural field ... but are also the subject of their own dynamics. This contributes in particular to perpetuating male domination through the incorporation of thought patterns resulting from the sexual division of labor and specific roles that the social system imposes on each gender. In this sense, we see the existence confirmed, within this representational field, of a principle of structural homology resulting in a formal and functional correlation between the cognitive structures developed by individuals and the social structure of reference ... (and) also provides an experimental confirmation of the effect of social positions on the dynamics of social representations ... these results clearly highlight the homology between the structure of the relations of domination within a given field and the dynamics of social representations.

4. Leadership styles: gender differences and similarities

4.1 Gender similarities

Several studies argue that there are no gender differences in leadership styles (Bass, 1981; Nieva and Gutek, 1981) between men and women in positions of power in organizations. The study of the behaviors of men and women in positions of power would show that they have

similar modes of leadership, there would be certain characteristics common to leaders but without there being any differentiation between the sexes. There would therefore be no gender effect for these authors. Thus, if other studies do not observe differences in female and male leadership styles, they will try to explain this absence of differences by relying on gender theories and on the analysis of social relations and domination between women and men. For these authors (notably Kanter, 1977; Wajcman, 1998; Acker, 1999), there is no difference because there has been a selection process that chooses the women who most fit the dominant model, in this case the male model. These women and men have undergone a process of socialization and assimilation that explains this conformity of behaviors. Leadership roles are often clearly defined in terms of expectations at the behavioral level. These managers were socialized in these expectations as soon as they were identified as one day able to exercise a function of responsibility (Feldman, 1976; Graen, 1976; Terborg, 1977). For these authors, women have the same leadership styles as men because they have had to abandon their femininity to develop attributes and behaviors consistent with those of men in these positions of power.

4.2 Gender differences

As (Cleveland et al. 2000) have pointed:

- ✓ Women would have an interactive, relational, transformational, emotional (express enthusiasm/dynamism) leadership style, encouraging participation, sharing power and information, focused on the motivation of their subordinates, focused on task and results, mobilizing networks and connecting people and goals, with problem solving centered on intuition. The look of psychoanalysis highlights that these characteristics all refer to the mother that any woman would be first and foremost. His emotionality, his encouragement to take a stake, his attention to the other ... are all "maternal" traits that are assumed that every woman is naturally endowed with, since her body is made to procreate.
- ✓ Conversely, men would have a directive, transactional, personal fulfillment and career-centered leadership style, with information retention, analytical, more strategic and visionary, encouraging more risk-taking, more reserved and with higher emotional control.

These differences between men and women are always demonstrated by their opposite: what one has, the other does not. If women operate on intuition, men will have a monopoly on

analysis. If women are emotional, they will be more strategic. Their natures support each other, and can only be explained in relation to each other. This, in the long run, leaves little room for change in gender relations.

5. Men , women and the exercise of power

The classic conception of power is quite negative since it often refers to the domination, the exploitation of an individual (or a group of individuals) by another. It therefore seems to us that the common meaning that current language attributes to the notion of power, that is to say this ability to constrain, by force or otherwise and to dominate others (Rocher, 1986) is incompatible with the so-called feminine values or specificities, such as diplomacy, consensus, listening, empathy, etc. (Cherret de la Boissiere, 2009). This implies that the exercise of power is rather reserved for men, who are perceived as possessing a certain natural authority, or having this ability to be directive. It is in this perspective that the debate on a usual conception of power (Rocher, 1986) takes on an important character for us because we are called upon to ask ourselves if the exercise of power has value only in a perspective of domination. It turns out, as (Hersey, Blanchard & Natemeyer 1979) state, in their article on the perception of a leader's power bases and its influence on the use of different leadership styles, that a leader does not can automatically influence others people without making use of power. Even if there are different types of power, the fact remains that in a leadership situation, the leader has one or more of these types of power. Who says leadership, therefore says power over others. Since women have distinguished themselves and continue to excel in terms of leadership, they therefore use a certain power like their male counterparts. We mentioned in particular the fact that the exercise of power, or at least of leadership (in view of the fact that when we speak of leadership, we also speak of the exercise of power) seems incompatible with the social roles attributed or expected of women.

When we examine the structure of the different theoretical models of leadership that we have discussed, we realize that certain types of leadership are rather in line with the roles attributed and expected of women. Among these types of leadership, we have for example the types of leadership: democratic and transformational. The first reflects the sharing of power and taking subordinates into account in the management of activities (traits generally attributed to women), and the second makes it possible to transform subordinates to make them leaders in turn. Moreover, numerous studies (Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996; Kouzes & Posner, 1990; Rosener 1990) show that women deploy a more transformational style of leadership thanks in

particular to their ability to take care of others (consideration) and to an idealized form of influence. They are seen and see themselves as using a more transformational style compared to men.

These results show us that the mode of use of power through their leadership style refers rather to sharing and consideration of others. Which goes completely against the usual conception of the notion of power which, as we say, refers to domination and exploitation?

It therefore appears that men and women are able to each other to exercise positions that require the exercise of power, despite the fact that this was rather reserved for men.

Women have gradually entered the sphere of decision-making, but this certainly leads to other phenomena or difficulties whose consequences are perceptible in various aspects such as professional equality between men and women, or even in their way of working.

Conclusion

For a long time, the notions of gender and female leadership have been the subject of lively debates and continue today to animate the podium of research in management sciences.

For this, this point aims to successively present gender and female leadership.

For the purpose of this article, we wanted to study the potential relationship between gender and female leadership style, while seeking an answer to the following question: Do women have such a different approach to men?

Traditionally, the most valued leadership characteristics have been male in nature. Yet, in recent years, researchers have shown that many of these traits (assertiveness, individualism, and task orientation) do not always contribute to leadership effectiveness. Instead of the theory of leadership centered on the Great Man, transformational leadership has emerged, and its effectiveness is supported by more and more researchers. Interestingly, many traits of transformational leadership (such as collaboration and empowerment) are traditionally associated with women, showing that many female characteristics contribute to leadership effectiveness.

Men and women, as biological opposites, support the balance of the world and generate harmony. Their approaches to life complement each other. The same thing we can see in all areas of life, including business. The interaction of two management styles, feminine and masculine, in business brings wisdom. It is very important for the manager to practice the right approach that will correlate with his personality.

Finally, we can conclude that the gender perspective aims to highlight the organization of relations between the two sexes and the way in which social roles are defined, with a view to questioning them and providing another social response, namely that of equal rights given that inequality dominates.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- Acker, J. (1999).** Rewriting class, race and gender. Problems in feminist rethinking, in Revisioning gender, ed M.M. Ferree, J. Lorber, et B.B. Hess. Thousand Oaks : Sage, 44-69
- Adler, L. (1993).** Histoire des femmes politiques. Paris : Seuil.
- Adler, N.J. et Dafna ,N.I. (1994).** Competitive frontiers : Women managers in a global economy. Cambridge , UK: Blackwell Business .
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J. & Atwater, L. (1996).** Transformational and transactional leadership of men and women.. doi : 10.1111/j.1464- 0597.1996.tb00847.x. Applied psychology, 45, 5-34
- Bass, B.M. (1981).** Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership. Edition revue et augmentée. New York : The Free Press. 856.
- Bass, B.M. (1990).** From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18,19-31.
- Bem, S. L. (1981a).** A manual for the Bem sex role inventory. California: Mind Garden.
- Bem, S. L. (1974).** The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Blumen J.L. (1992).** Connective leadership: female leadership styles, in the 21st -Century Workplace
- Boukar H. & Habiba M. (2020).** « Les obstacles à l'exercice du leadership féminin au sein de l'Université », Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion. « Volume 3 : Numéro 2 » p 183
- Burns, J. M. (1978).** Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burke,S. et Collins, K.M. (2001).** Gender differences in Leadership styles and management skills. Women in Management Review,16(5), 244-256.
- Buttner, E.H. (2001).** Examining female entrepreneur's management style: an application of a relational frame. Journal of Business Ethics, 29, 253-269.
- Buttner, E.H. (2002).** High- performance classrooms for women? Applying a relational frame to management/organizational behaviour courses. Journal of Management Education,26(3), 274-290.
- Cherret De La Boissière, A. (2009).** Leadership au masculin et au féminin : le management aux valeurs mixtes : l'avenir de l'entreprise. Paris: Dunod.

Chodorow, N.(1978). The reproduction of mothering . Bekerley , CA: University of California Press.

Cleveland ,J., Stockdale,M. & Murphy,K.R.(2000), Women and men in Organizations: sex and gender issues at work, Mahwah, N.J.:Laurence Erhaum Associates.

Cornet, A. et Bonnivert, S. (2008). Leadership et genre. Paris : Vuibert.

Cole, P.(1997). Women in family business. Family Business Review, 10(4) ,353-371.

Davidson, M.J. et Cooper, C.L. (1987). Females managers in Britain : A comparative perspective . Human Resource Management , 26(2), 217-242.

Doutre, E. (2009). La dimension psychologique de l'exercice du Pouvoir dans les organisations de travail en changement. De l'exercice du pouvoir à l'introduction du changement: effet de la dimension psychologique sur les conduites des chefs et de leurs collaborateurs, HDR, Université Pierre Mendès France, Grenoble II.

Eagly, A.H. et Wood, W. (2011a). Social role theory. Handbook of theories of social psychology, 2,458-478.

Eagly, A.H. et Wood, W. (2011b). Feminism and the evolution of sex differences and similarities. Sex Roles, 64, 758-767.

Eagly, A.H. et Carli, L.(2003). The female leadership advantage : An evaluation of the evidence . The Leadership. Quaterly, 14,807-834.

Eagly, A.H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.-C. et van Engen, M.L.(2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. Psychological Bulletin, 129(4), 569-591.

Eagly, AH. et Karau, J.S. (2002). Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders. Psychological Review, 109(3),573-598.

Eagly, A. H. (1991). Gender and leadership. 99th meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

Eagly A.H. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior : A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Flament, C., & Rouquette, M. L. (2003). Anatomie des idées ordinaires: Comment étudier les représentations sociales. Paris: A. Colin. 47

Feldman,, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. Administrative , Science Quarterly, 21, 433-452.

Fletcher,J. et Bailyn, L.(1996). Contestation de la dernière frontière . In M. Arthur et D.Rousseau (dir). La carrièr sans frontières . Oxford, GB : University Press. 256-267.

- Fletcher , J. et Jacques , R. (1998).** Relational practice : An emerging stream of theorizing and its significance for organizational study . In Center for Gender and Organizational Effectiveness ; Graduate School of Management , Working paper, 3. Boston, MA: Simmons.
- Ferrario, M. (1994).** Women as managerial leaders. In M. J. Davidson & R. Burke (Dir.), Women in Management: Current Research Issues (pp. 110-128). London: Sage.
- Geary, D.C. (1998).** Male, female: The evolution of human sex differences. Washington , DE: American Psychological Association.
- Gilligan, C. (1986).** Une si grande différence . Paris, FR: Flammarion.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. E. (1979).** Situational Leadership, Perception, and the Impact of Power. Group and organization studies, 4(4), 418-428. En ligne: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/105960117900400404>.
- Helgesen, S. (1990).** The female Advantage : Women's Ways of leadership. New York: Doubleday
- Hegelsen, S. (1995).** The female advantage : Women's ways of leadership. New York , NY: Doubleday/ Currency.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977).** Men and Women of the Corporation. New-York: Basic Books
- Kanter, R. M. (1977b).** Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. American Journal of Sociology, 82, 965-990.
- Kinser, P.A. et Lewis, J.A. (2005).** Understanding gender construction : creating space for feminist health care practice and research health. Care for Women International, 26,422-429.
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H, Mitchell, A. A. et Ristikari, A. (2011).** Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analyse of three research paradigms. Psychological Bulletin, 137(4), 616-6.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1990).** Leadership practices inventory (LPI): a selfassessment and analysis. San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Lapierre, I. (1994).** L'entreprise familiale : étude de l'étape de l'incubation dans la préparation de la relève chez les filles. Mémoire de maîtrise. Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales, Montréal, Québec.
- Levy-Leboyer, C. (1980).** Le psychologue et l'entreprise. Paris: Masson
- McClelland, D. (1979).** Power: The Inner Experience. New York, NY: Irvington
- Nay O. (2014).** Lexique de science politique. Vie et institutions politiques , Dalloz.
- Nieva, V.F. et Gutek, B.A. (1981).** Women and Work: A Psychological Perspective. Greenwood Publishing Group.177.

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

Powell, G.N. (1990). One more time: do female and male managers differ? *Academy of Management Executive*, 4(3), 68-75.

Powell, G. (1993). *Women and Men in Management*, 2e éd. Newbury Park: Sage.

Putnam, C.A.(1993). A conceptual model of women entrepreneurs in small businesses. Thèse de doctorat, UMI: Oregon State University.

Rapoport , R. et Bailyn, L.(1996). Relinking life and work : Toward a better future. A Ford foundation report.

Rocher, G. (1986). Droit, pouvoir et domination. *Sociologie et sociétés*, 18(1), 33-46. doi:10.7202/001652ar.

Rosener, J. (1995). America's competitive secret: Utilizing Women as a Management Strategy . Oxford , GB: University Press.

Sarlet, M. et Dardenne, B. (2012). Le sexisme bienveillant comme processus de maintien des inégalités sociales entre les genres. *Année Psychologique*, 112,435-463.

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

Schwartz, S.H. et Rubel, T.(2005). Sex differences in value priorities : Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 1010-1028.

Simon, H. A. (1967). Motivational and emotional controls of cognition. *Psychological Review*, 74(1), 29-39.

Stoller, R.J. (1978). A contribution to the study of gender identity. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 45,220-226.

Sonh L. (2009). *Sociologie de travail*. Volume 51, issue 2, 170-182.

Surrey, J. (1991). The self-in –relation: A theory of women's development . In J . Jordan , A.Kaplan, J.B. Miller, I Stiver and J. surrey (dir.) *Women's Growth in Connection* (p.51-56). New York , NY: Guilford Press.

Tafani É. & Deschamps J.-C. (2004). Identité sociale et dynamique représentationnelle : positions sociales, menace identitaire et processus de différenciation. *New Review of Social Psychology*, 3, 38-46.

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

Vecchio , R.P .(2002). Leadership and gender advantage. The leadership Quaterly, 13, 643-671.

Vecchio, R.P. (2003). In search of gender advantage . The leadership Quaterly ,14,835-850.

Vikinias , T. et Cartan, G.(1993). Competences of australian women in management. Women in Management Review,8(3), 31-35.

Voelck J. (2003). Directive and connective: Gender- Based differences in the management styles of academic library managers. Libraries and the Academy , 3(3), 393-418.

Wajcman, J. (1998). Managing Like a Man: Women and Men in Corporate Management., Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998.

Witting, M.A. et Peterson , A.C.(1979). Sex related differences in cognitive functioning. New York , NY: Academic.