International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

A Crucial Study on Gender Bias on Leadership Roles

Muskan Guddu

Lovely Professional University

ABSTRACT

Gender bias in leadership roles remains a persistent issue, with women often facing underrepresentation and unequal pay compared to men. This bias extends to hiring and promotion decisions, as well as genderbased harassment in the workplace. Society has traditionally viewed men as having higher status, while women are often relegated to lower positions. This starts early, with girls often given toys like dolls and tea sets that reinforce traditional gender roles.

Despite women making up half of the world's population, they are still not afforded equal opportunities in their careers. Feminist movements in the 1970s highlighted the lack of women in senior corporate roles and called for change. Gender roles in society dictate the functions, responsibilities, status, and recognition assigned to individuals based on their gender, limiting both men and women in their behaviors and opportunities.

The disparity in leadership positions is evident in politics and industry, where women hold top executive roles less frequently than men. Leadership roles require making executive decisions and taking on responsibilities, yet women are often underrepresented at these levels. Despite progress in societal norms, women's presence in leadership remains low. For example, in the 2014 G20 summit, only five out of 58 leaders were female. Similarly, only a small percentage of government ministers and S&P 500 CEOs are female, indicating a significant gender gap.

While discrimination is one factor, differences in leadership ambition, known as self-selection, also contribute to these gaps. This ongoing gender bias underscores the need for continued efforts to promote gender equality in leadership roles and address systemic barriers that hinder women's advancement.

INTRODUCTION

Research Background: Despite excelling academically, women face challenges in attaining leadership roles and are often paid less than men for the same work. This disparity translates to women essentially working for free for a considerable period compared to men. Gender bias is deeply rooted in societal perceptions, where men are viewed as having higher status, while women are relegated to lower positions. This bias starts early in childhood, with girls often given toys that reinforce traditional gender roles. Despite making up half of the population, women still lack equal opportunities in their professional lives, especially in high-ranking corporate positions. This inequality has been a subject of concern since the 1970s, with feminists advocating for equal opportunities for women in leadership roles. Gender bias affects various aspects of organizational life, including functions, responsibilities, status, and recognition based on societal norms and perceptions of intellectual abilities, dominance, job fit, and division of labor.

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY:

The underrepresentation of women in leadership roles has far-reaching implications for individuals, organizations, and society as a whole. Research indicates that diverse leadership teams enhance decisionmaking, creativity, and overall organizational performance. Despite extensive research on gender bias in the workplace, there are still unresolved issues that require further investigation. This study aims to address these gaps and provide insights for organizations and policymakers. Women's underrepresentation in leadership impacts diversity, decision-making, innovation, and organizational effectiveness.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Despite progress in gender equality, women still face barriers in achieving leadership parity. Gender bias remains a pervasive issue, impacting women's career progression, job satisfaction, and work outcomes. This study aims to examine the impact of gender bias on women's experiences in leadership roles and its implications for organizational effectiveness and gender equity initiatives.

Why there is a problem: -

Gender Bias in Leadership Roles: The title highlights the existence of gender bias within leadership roles. This implies that women may encounter obstacles or discriminatory practices that hinder their advancement and success in such positions. Gender bias can manifest in various forms, including stereotyping, unequal opportunities, and biased evaluation criteria.

Impact on Career Progression: The title suggests that gender bias has consequences for women's career advancement trajectories. Despite their qualifications and capabilities, women may encounter barriers that impede their progression to higher-level leadership positions. This problem can perpetuate gender disparities in organizational hierarchies and limit women's opportunities for professional development and growth.

Effect on Job Satisfaction: Gender bias can also affect women's job satisfaction levels. When individuals perceive unfair treatment or lack of recognition due to their gender, it can lead to feelings of frustration, disillusionment, and disengagement. This problem not only impacts individual well-being but also undermines organizational morale and productivity.

Influence on Work Outcomes: The title acknowledges that gender bias influences various work outcomes for women in leadership roles. Biased evaluations, limited opportunities for advancement, and unequal access to resources can hinder women's ability to achieve their full potential and contribute effectively to organizational success. This problem not only deprives organizations of diverse perspectives and talents but also perpetuates gender inequality in the workplace.

CURRENT STATE OF KNOW LEDGE AND RESEARCH GAP

While research on leadership is extensive, there is no consensus on the attributes of effective leaders. This study seeks to understand if male and female leaders should possess the same qualities or if these vary by gender. It also explores employees' attitudes towards gendered leadership attributes and perceptions of gender bias in leadership roles, aiming to fill existing gaps in understanding gender dynamics in leadership.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A substantial amount of research indicates that job satisfaction is higher for women than men across countries (Clark, 1997; Donohue & Heywood, 2004; Kristensen & Johansson, 2008; Loscocco & Bose, 1998; Metle, 2001; Mulinge & Mueller, 1998; Sloane & Williams, 2000) and occupations (Bashaw, 1999; Dhawan, 2000; Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty, & Keiser, 2012; Hull, 1999; McDuff, 2001) in spite of the fact they earn less. However, other studies have found no differences in job satisfaction between men and women, particularly when controlling for specific job variables (Bokemeier & William, 1987; Ehrenberg, 2003; Fields & Blum, 1997; Hodson, 1989; Mobley, Jaret, Marsh, & Lim,1994; Robst et al., 2003; Westover, 2009; Zoghi, 2003). This review examines four key areas of job satisfaction and gender: extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards, work relations, and work-life balance.

Work Relations

Another job feature that may impact gender differences in job satisfaction is work relations. Aspects of work other than pay may be more important to women than to men; these include social relations (Clark, 1997, Harris, Moritzen, Robitschek, Imhoff, & Lynch 2001; Konrad et al., 2000), having a good supervisor, and task significance (Konrad et al., 2000). Female university professors in the U.S. and Canada experienced more job satisfaction than men when their work focused on teaching (which could be considered relationship-based) rather than research whereas for men this was the opposite (Kessler, Spector, & Gavin, 2013). Women may also experience more rewarding work relations in female- dominated employment environments. Women tend to be more satisfied in women-dominated work contexts (Fricke & Beehr, 1992; Smart & Ethington, 1987) and rate their organizations higher under these conditions (Clerkin, 2017) whereas they are less satisfied in male-dominated workplaces, perhaps because they have higher expectations in these environments (Clark, 1997; Sloane & Williams, 2000). Similarly, other factors such as unfair treatment and gender bias can also impact levels of satisfaction. A study in China found that women were less satisfied with their jobs than men, except in conditions of perceived organizational support, and that perceptions of gender bias had negative effects on career satisfaction (Ngo, Foley, Ji, & Loi, 2014). For other work relations factors, such as job well-being (how a person feels while working), no gender differences have been observed. For both men and women, wellbeing has been shown to decrease with age (Wilks & Neto, 2012).

Work-Life Balance gender differences in job satisfaction may be accounted for by work-life balance variables. Women may place higher value on the ability to balance home and family whereas men may value pay over flexibility; when flexibility is accounted for, satisfaction is equal for men and women (Bender et al., 2005). Similarly, no gender gap is present in life satisfaction when mismatches occur between employees' actual and preferred number of work hours (Ba levent & Kirmano lu, 2014). Although life satisfaction is not synonymous with job satisfaction, the two tend to correlate (Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989). A meta- analysis found that older women had more satisfaction with their supervisors and experienced less role overload (fulfilling multiple rules requiring extended time commitments) than their male counterparts (Ng & Feldman, 2010).

Hiring

Gary Becker (1957) made the startling claim that increased competition in the product market would reduce or eliminate discrimination against women and minorities in the long run. This implies a positive relationship between the market power and employment discrimination: because discrimination is costly in the sense that discriminating employers forego profits in order to indulge their 'taste for discrimination', employers with market power will be able to practice discrimination to a greater extent that employers with little market power. The theory has dynamic implications in that changes in the

relative employment and earnings of this discriminated groups will depend in the part on changes in market power. Focusing on women in particular, increased product market competition in an industry (or region) over time should reduce earnings and employment disparities between men and women, all else equal. The recent narrowing of the gender earnings gap in an era of increased competition through international trade and deregulation might seem to offer supportive evidence of this theory.Since 1960, in fact, the gender wage ratio and the share imports in GDP have followed similar time trends, with both series remaining fairly constant between 1960 and 1980, and then increasing dramatically through the early 1990s. Despite this Page 4137 Sobana Hameed Arshad, IJSRM volume 8 issue 5 May 2020 [www.ijsrm.in] DOI: 10.18535/ijsrm/v4i5.06 suggestive evidence, however, few researchers analyzing the cause of the improvement in female relative wages and employment have focused on the links between trade and gender discrimination. During the last decade, economists have attempted to estimate hiring discrimination against women in the labour market by means of correspondence experiments. Within these experiments, pairs if fictions job applications, only differing by the gender of the candidate, are sent to real job openings. By meansof standard probit regressions of the subsequent call-back from the employer on the gender of the candidate, discrimination is identified (Riach and Rich 2002).At the same time , as argued by Azmat and Petrongolo (2014) in their overview of experimental advances in the study of gender differences in the labour market

"it should be stressed that existing […] correspondence evidence on gender discrimination is […] still open to this criticism" To fill the gap Carlsson et al. (2014) apply Neymark`s (2012) econometric framework to a number of already published correspondence studies among which one targeted at gender discrimination. To see more clearly for the case of gender discrimination in hiring, assume that both the average observed and the average unobserved determinants of productivity are the same for male and female candidates for an unfilled vacancy, but that the variance of unobservable job-relevant characteristics is, at least in the perception of the employer, higher females than for males. In addition, suppose that the employer consider the observed determinants of productivity, inferred from the CV and the motivation letter, as relatively low compared to the job requirement. In that it is rational for the employer to invite the female and the male candidate, since it is more likely that the sum of observed and unobserved productivity is higher for female candidates. A correspondence test that detects discrimination against females could therefore underestimate the extent of discrimination against females.

Promotions and leadership

Gender differences in leadership are consistently found. In both Canada (Catalyst, 2020) and the United States (Coury et al., 2020), the organizational representation of women declines as they move up the corporate ladder, demonstrating a "leaky pipeline." For instance, in Canada, women comprise 47% of support staff, 37% of managers, but only 23% of executives (Catalyst, 2020). Similar patterns are found in the United States (U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2020; Coury et al., 2020). In line with the double jeopardy hypothesis (Beal, 1970), within Canadian and American corporations the pipeline problem is worse for racialized women, as they comprise only 5% of those in the C-Suite, compared with their White counterparts at 21%; interestingly, the gender gap is larger among Whites than among racialized people, largely because White men are so well represented at top leadership positions (McKinsey & Company, 2022). Barriers to leadership are also particularly high for mothers: Women are 4.3 times less likely to attain a CEO position for every child they have (Hurley & Choudhary, 2016). Hence, women's lack of ascension to leadership has negative consequences for them. This is because women in leadership benefit from greater well-being, job satisfaction (Frederick & Lazzara, 2020), pay, and perceived career success (Offermann, Thomas, Lanzo, & Smith, 2020), compared with women not holding leadership positions. There is reason to believe that the inequality in the representation of men and women in leadership result from gender inequities. Successful leadership is typically associated with being a man and possessing agentic traits, rather than being a woman and possessing communal ones (Schein, 2001; Schein & Davidson, 1993). Thus, these societal gender stereotypes can make it more difficult for women to ascend the organizational hierarchy and maintain positions of leadership (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Indeed, it appears that women are held to higher standards than men to obtain leadership positions. For instance, among upper-level managers who receive promotions, women have a record of significantly higher performance ratings, compared with their male counterparts (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). Furthermore, meta-analyses reveal that female CEOs are older and have more elite education than male CEOs (Wang, Holmes, Devine, & Bishoff, 2018). An older meta-analysis of experimental studies reveals a bias against female leaders, particularly in masculine industries (Eagly et al., 1992). A more recent experiment reveals that not only is a male leader evaluated as more effective than a matched female leader, but this gender effect also combines with race, such that female Black leaders are rated lowest, demonstrating a double jeopardy effect (Rosette & Livingston, 2012). Thus, in line with role (in)congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002), women face great obstacles to obtaining leadership due to the mismatch between societal expectations for leadership and expectations for women.

Research on female leaders' job performance also suggests that their underrepresentation in these roles is a result of inequities rather than lower abilities. A meta-analysis reveals that actual female leaders are evaluated by others (e.g., supervisors, subordinates, trained judges) as somewhat more effective than male leaders (Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, & Woehr, 2014; cf., Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Eagly et al., 1992). Women's overall strong leadership performance may, in part, be a result of their stronger transformational leadership style (e.g., inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and follower consideration) compared with men, who are more likely to use a transactional leadership style that involves employing rules, rewards, and punishments (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003). In other words, female leaders appear to be more likely to adhere to societal prescriptive gender stereotypes to be warm and communal. In line with this, many women who make it to the top levels of leadership describe their leadership style as highly relational (Cheung & Halpern, 2010). As well, the strong performance ratings for female leaders may simply reflect their high caliber (Lyness & Heilman, 2006).

Women are less likely to hold leadership positions compared with men for several reasons. Female leaders must demonstrate agentic behaviours to succeed in their leadership roles, yet people show a higher dislike of highly agentic women compared with less agentic women or highly agentic men (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Meta-analytic evidence of lab experiments demonstrates that when evaluating highly agentic leaders, raters evaluate men more positively compared with women (Eagly et al., 1992). Accordingly, raters' dislike of agentic women who do not conform to the prescriptive gender

stereotype of being highly communal can cause them to give lower recommendations for women to assume a leadership role (Rudman et al., 2012). However, Black women are evaluated less negatively than White women when acting dominantly in leadership (Livingston, Rosette, & Washington, 2012), perhaps because in line with the MOSAIC perspective, Black women are stereotyped to be masculine and therefore dominance behaviors are stereotype consistent (Hall et al., 2019).

Factors Contributing to Gender Bias in Leadership Roles

Several factors contribute to the perpetuation of gender bias in leadership roles, including structural barriers, cultural norms, and unconscious biases. Structural barriers such as gendered organizational policies and practices, lack of access to mentorship and sponsorship opportunities, and limited work-life balance policies disproportionately disadvantage women in leadership advancement (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Moreover, cultural norms that prescribe leadership attributes as masculine traits, such as assertiveness and dominance, create a double bind for women who may face backlash for exhibiting these behaviors (Early & Karau, 2002). Additionally, unconscious biases, stemming from societal stereotypes and ingrained prejudices, influence decision-making processes, favoring men over women in leadership selection and evaluation (Heilman et al., 2004).

1. **Unconscious Bias:** Unconscious biases, also known as implicit biases, are attitudes and beliefs that influence decision-making processes at a subconscious level. Research has shown that individuals may hold implicit biases favoring men over women in leadership positions, even when they consciously endorse gender equality (Heilman et al., 2004). These biases can manifest in hiring, promotion, and performance evaluation decisions, leading to the underrepresentation of women in leadership roles.

2. **Structural Barriers:** Organizational structures and practices can create barriers that disproportionately affect women's advancement into leadership roles. These barriers may include gendered job roles and career paths, biased recruitment and promotion processes, limited access to leadership development programs, and inflexible work arrangements that penalize caregiving responsibilities (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Such structural inequalities perpetuate gender bias by limiting women's opportunities for leadership advancement.

3. **Work-Life Balance Challenges:** Balancing career aspirations with family responsibilities poses unique challenges for women, often resulting in trade-offs that impact their ability to pursue leadership roles. The expectation that women will prioritize caregiving duties over career advancement can lead to career interruptions, reduced work hours, and stalled progression in leadership roles (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008). This unequal distribution of caregiving responsibilities reinforces gender stereotypes and contributes to the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions.

4. **ganizational Culture and Climate:** The prevailing culture and climate within organizations can either support or undermine efforts to address gender bias in leadership roles. Organizational cultures that value diversity, equity, and inclusion create environments where women feel supported and empowered to pursue leadership opportunities (Kulik & Ryan, 2018). Conversely, cultures that tolerate or condone discriminatory behavior perpetuate gender bias and hinder women's advancement into leadership roles.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of respondent.

2. Designation.

3. what is your gender?

4. Institution/ organization.

5. your position in organisational hierarchy.

6. what is your age?

7. what is your education level?

8. what best described the type of organisation you are working for?

9. what is your working experience (in months/ years)

10. how satisfied are you with the opportunities for career advancement available to individuals of your gender within your organization?

11. To what extent do you feel your gender influences the feedback and recognition you receive for your work performance?

12. How confident are you that your gender will not be a barrier to achieving your career goals within your organization?

13. How satisfied are you with the level of support and resources provided by your organization for addressing gender bias and promoting gender equality in the workplace?

14. To what extent do you believe your organization's leadership is committed to addressing gender bias and promoting gender diversity in the workplace?

15. How transparent do you perceive the processes for performance evaluation and promotion decisions to be in your organization regarding gender equality?

16. How supported do you feel by your immediate supervisor or manager in navigating and addressing gender bias issues in your work environment?

17. To what extent do you believe gender diversity in leadership roles positively impacts overall work outcomes and organizational culture?

18. How satisfied are you with the level of collaboration and teamwork among colleagues of different genders in your workplace?

19. How confident are you that performance evaluations and feedback are provided objectively and without gender bias within your team or department?

20. How much do you feel that gender bias affects the distribution of opportunities for skill development and training within your team or department?

21. how fairly do you perceive the distribution of work assignments and projects among individuals of different genders within your team or department?

22. how satisfied are you with the overall work environment in terms of gender inclusivity and equality?

23. To what extent do you believe gender bias affects your sense of belonging and acceptance within your workplace?

24. How confident are you that your gender will not hinder your career advancement opportunities within your organization?

25. How much do you feel that gender bias affects your job performance and productivity?

RESEARCH TIMELINE:

Phase 1: Exploring Existing Knowledge Weeks 1-2: Dive into a wide array of studies exploring gender bias in leadership. Look at how bias shows up, its effects on women's career paths, and strategies used to combat bias.

Weeks 3-4: Analyze and merge this wealth of information to pinpoint areas where more research is needed and create a framework to guide your own study.

Phase 2: Designing the Study Ethically Week 5: Plan your research approach, deciding between quantitative, qualitative, or a mix of both methods. Choose your sampling methods and tools for data collection. Week 6: Ensure your research is ethical and gain necessary approvals, like from an ethics committee, to proceed responsibly.

Phase 3: Gathering Data Weeks 7-8: Assemble a diverse group of participants, including women leaders, employees, managers, and organizational figures, using varied recruitment strategies. Weeks 9-10: Conduct interviews, surveys, or other methods to gather insights on gender bias in leadership.

Phase 4: Analyzing Data Weeks 11-12: Dive into qualitative data from interviews and groups, using methods like thematic analysis. Weeks 13-14: Analyze quantitative data from surveys using statistical tools to extract meaningful conclusions.

Phase 5: Understanding and Discussing Findings Weeks 15-16: Interpret both qualitative and quantitative findings, comparing them with existing research on gender bias in leadership. Weeks 17-18: Discuss what the findings mean, exploring factors contributing to bias and identifying trends in the data.

Phase 6: Communicating Results Weeks 19-20: Craft a detailed research report covering all aspects of your study, from introduction to recommendations. Weeks 21-22: Fine-tune your report and prepare a professional presentation summarizing key findings, conclusions, and suggestions.

Phase 7: Submission and Feedback Week 23: Submit your work for evaluation, welcoming feedback. Week 24: Address any revisions needed, ensuring your final report reflects the depth of your research and insights gained.

Following this roadmap ensures a thorough exploration of gender bias in leadership roles, offering valuable insights to bridge research gaps and inform practical solutions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

RESEARCH AIM AND OBJECTIVES:

The aim of this research is to delve into and understand gender bias in leadership roles thoroughly. Specifically, we want to:

- Explore how gender bias affects the progress of women in their careers.

- Investigate how gender bias impacts job satisfaction and work outcomes.

VARIABLES OF OBJECTIVES: -

Let us break down the key aspects we will be focusing on:

1. Gender Bias Gender bias refers to the unfair treatment or biased perceptions based on a person's gender. In workplaces, this bias can show up in various ways, such as unequal opportunities for hiring, promotions, pay disparities, and limited chances for leadership roles. It's important to note that gender bias isn't always overt; it can subtly influence decision-making and organizational culture. This bias can lead to stereotypes about women's leadership abilities, a lack of recognition for their contributions, and instances of microaggressions like sexist remarks or behaviors.

2. Career Progression Career progression is about how individuals advance in their chosen field or within a company. This includes getting promotions, salary increases, taking on new responsibilities, and having access to leadership positions. Gender bias can create significant hurdles for women in advancing their careers, often resulting in glass ceilings and barriers to reaching senior leadership roles. Despite having similar qualifications and performance levels as men, women are often underrepresented in top management positions. Addressing gender bias is crucial for paving the way for women's career growth and achieving gender balance in leadership roles.

3. Job Satisfaction Job satisfaction reflects how content and fulfilled individuals feel in their work. It encompasses various aspects like the nature of the job, relationships with colleagues and superiors, opportunities for growth, and alignment with personal values. Gender bias can negatively impact job satisfaction by creating environments where women feel undervalued, marginalized, or excluded from decision-making processes. Studies show that perceptions of gender bias are linked to lower job satisfaction among women, leading to increased stress, burnout, and intentions to leave the job.

4. Work Outcomes Work outcomes are the results or consequences of individuals' contributions at work. This includes performance ratings, productivity levels, behaviors that benefit the organization, and overall career achievements. Gender bias can influence work outcomes by shaping how women's competence, credibility, and leadership skills are perceived. Women in leadership roles may face higher scrutiny and double standards, impacting their success and career advancement. Addressing gender bias is essential for fostering inclusive work environments where everyone has equal opportunities to succeed.

By focusing on these aspects, we aim to gain a deeper understanding of how gender bias impacts women in leadership roles and to contribute insights that can lead to more equitable workplaces.

🞣 RESEARCH DESIGN:

The survey questionnaire can include questions that explore how participants perceive gender bias in leadership, their personal experiences with discrimination or unequal opportunities, and their attitudes towards gender equality in the workplace. Using a Likert scale or similar rating scales can help measure participants' responses quantitatively, enabling a structured analysis of the data.

For the qualitative component, a phenomenological or grounded theory approach can be used to delve into the lived experiences, perceptions, and stories of individuals who have encountered or observed gender bias in leadership roles. This can be achieved through semi-structured interviews or focus group discussions to gather qualitative data.

Qualitative data collection methods provide a platform for participants to share their personal narratives, beliefs, and insights regarding gender bias in leadership. Open-ended questions can facilitate discussions about their experiences, the barriers or challenges they've faced, and the strategies they've used to navigate gender bias. Thematic analysis can then be applied to the collected data to identify key themes and patterns.

During the analysis phase, the quantitative and qualitative data can be integrated to gain a comprehensive understanding of gender bias in leadership roles. Quantitative data offer a broader view, highlighting trends, patterns, and statistical relationships. On the other hand, qualitative data provide deeper insights and rich narratives. The integration process involves triangulation, where both types of findings are compared, contrasted, or complemented to validate and enrich the overall conclusions.

Employing a mixed-methods research design enables researchers to address the research question on gender bias in leadership roles thoroughly. This approach sheds light on the prevalence, underlying causes, and consequences of gender bias, capturing both numerical trends and subjective experiences. It allows for a nuanced examination, providing a holistic perspective on the topic.

Integration: The quantitative and qualitative data can be integrated during the analysis phase to provide a comprehensive understanding of gender bias in leadership roles. The quantitative data can provide a broader perspective, highlighting trends, patterns, and statistical. relationships. The qualitative data can provide deeper insights, offering rich narratives and personal experiences. The integration of data can involve triangulation, where the quantitative and qualitative findings are compared, complemented, or contrasted to validate and enrich the overall findings. This mixed- methods approach allows for a more holistic examination of gender bias in leadership roles, capturing both the numerical trends and the subjective experiences of individuals. By employing a mixed- methods research design, researchers can address the research question on gender bias in leadership roles in a comprehensive and nuanced manner, shedding light on the prevalence, causes, and consequences.

♦ SAMPLING STRATEGY:

The target demographic for this study includes individuals who currently hold or have previously held leadership positions across various sectors or businesses. This encompasses both men and women who have encountered or witnessed instances of gender bias in leadership roles. Additionally, stakeholders such as HR experts, diversity and inclusion officials, or organizational leaders responsible for addressing gender prejudice may also be included in the target group.

When determining the sample size, it's essential to consider the study's objectives, available resources, and the desired level of statistical power. The aim should be to have a sample size that is manageable yet large enough to represent diverse perspectives and experiences. For qualitative research, starting with a sample size of at least 30 individuals is often considered adequate, although this may vary depending on the study's complexity and scope.

A purposive sampling method is most suitable for researching gender bias in leadership positions. This approach involves intentionally selecting individuals who possess the relevant characteristics and experiences related to the research questions. Various tactics can be employed in purposive sampling to ensure a diverse and representative sample, along with strategies to address and mitigate gender bias effectively.

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 are valuable tools for gathering quantitative data from a wide range of individuals. They can be designed to collect information on participant demographics, their current or past leadership roles, experiences related to bias, perspectives on organizational policies, and attitudes toward gender equality within leadership contexts. Surveys enable researchers to quickly gather data, analyze it using statistical methods, and draw conclusions that can be generalized to broader populations.

Document analysis involves the examination of relevant documents such as reports, performance reviews, organizational policies, and news articles. These documents provide insights into both official and informal practices associated with gender bias in leadership positions. By considering broader organizational and cultural factors contributing to gender prejudice through document analysis, researchers can better understand and contextualize their research findings.

RESULTS & 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.

T-Test

Group Statistics					
	gender of individuals	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
genderbiasaffectsyourjob performanceandproductiv ity	female	22	2.0000	.69007	.14712
	male	28	2.0000	.98131	.18545
genderwillnothindercaree radvancementopportuniti es	female	22	2.0455	1.04550	.22290
	male	28	2.1786	1.02030	.19282
workenvironmentinterms ofgenderinclusivityandeq uality	female	22	2.0000	.92582	.19739
	male	28	2.7500	1.32288	.25000
levelofsupportprovidedby organizationforaddressin ggenderbias	female	22	2.0455	1.13294	.24154
	male	28	2.3214	1.15642	.21854
processesforpromotiond ecisionsregardinggender equality	female	22	2.0455	1.09010	.23241
	male	28	2.4286	1.25988	.23810
collaborationandteamwor kamongcolleaguesofdiffe rentgenders	female	22	2.0909	.92113	.19639
	male	28	2.2857	1.38396	.26154
managerinnavigatingand addressinggenderbiasis sues	female	22	2.0909	1.19160	.25405
	male	28	2.3214	1.33482	.25226
distributionofworkamongi ndividualsofdifferentgend ers	female	22	1.9091	.86790	.18504
	male	28	2.1429	1.07890	.20389
genderbiasaffectsdistribu tionofopportunitiesforskill development	female	22	1.7273	.63109	.13455
	male	28	2.2143	1.16610	.22037

INTERPRETATION

Gender Bias Affects Job Performance and Productivity: Both female and male individuals reported an average score of 2.0000 for this measure. The standard deviation for females (.69007) is lower than that for males (.98131), indicating less variability in responses among females.

Gender Will Not Hinder Career Advancement Opportunities: Female individuals reported an average score of 2.0455, while male individuals reported a slightly higher average of 2.1786. The standard deviation is relatively similar between the two groups.

Work Environment in Terms of Gender Inclusivity and Equality: Females reported an average score of 2.0000, whereas males reported a higher average of 2.7500. The standard deviation for males (1.32288) is notably higher than that for females (.92582), indicating greater variability in responses among males.

Level of Support Provided by Organization for Addressing Gender Bias: Females reported an average score of 2.0455, while males reported a slightly higher average of 2.3214. The standard deviations are similar between the two groups.

Processes for Promotion Decisions Regarding Gender Equality: Females reported an average score of 2.0455, while males reported a slightly higher average of 2.4286. The standard deviations are similar between the two groups.

Collaboration and Teamwork Among Colleagues of Different Genders: Both groups reported average scores close to 2.0000, with females slightly higher (2.0909) than males (2.2857). The standard deviation for males (1.38396) is notably higher than that for females (.92113), indicating greater variability in responses among males.

Manager in Navigating and Addressing Gender Bias Issues: Both groups reported average scores close to 2.0000, with males slightly higher (2.3214) than females (2.0909). The standard deviations are similar between the two groups.

Distribution of Work Among Individuals of Different Genders: Both groups reported average scores close to 2.0000, with females slightly lower (1.9091) than males (2.1429). The standard deviations are similar between the two groups.

Gender Bias Affects Distribution of Opportunities for Skill Development: Females reported an average score of 1.7273, while males reported a higher average of 2.2143. The standard deviation for males (1.16610) is notably higher than that for females (.63109), indicating greater variability in responses among males.

DESCRIPTIVE TEST: -

descriptive statistics used to summarize the characteristics of the data separately for male and female respondents. This may include measures such as means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages.

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
gender of individuals	50	.00	1.00	.4400	.50143
age	50	19.00	32.00	25.6000	2.34738
genderbiasaffectsyourjob performanceandproductiv ity	50	1.00	4.00	2.0000	.85714
workingexperience	50	1.00	8.00	3.2000	1.73793
workenvironmentinterms ofgenderinclusivityandeq uality	50	1.00	5.00	2.4200	1.21370
Valid N (listwise)	50				

INTERPRETATION: -

Gender of Individuals:

N: 50 respondents

Minimum: 0 (presumably indicating female)

Maximum: 1 (presumably indicating male)

Mean: 0.44, which suggests that, on average, there is a slightly higher proportion of females in the sample compared to males.

Std. Deviation: 0.50, indicating some variability in gender representation.

AGE:

N: 50 respondents

Minimum: 19 years

Maximum: 32 years

Mean: 25.60 years

Std. Deviation: 2.35 years, indicating relatively low variability in ages among the respondents.

Gender Bias Affects Your Job Performance and Productivity:

 N: 50 respondents

Minimum: 1

Maximum: 4

Mean: 2.00

Std. Deviation: 0.86, indicating some variability in respondents' perceptions of how gender bias affects job performance and productivity. The mean value of 2.00 suggests a moderate level of perceived impact.

Working Experience:

N: 50 respondents

Minimum: 1 year

Maximum: 8 years

Mean: 3.20 years

Std. Deviation: 1.74 years, indicating relatively moderate variability in working experience among the respondents.

Work Environment in Terms of Gender Inclusivity and Equality:

N: 50 respondents

Minimum: 1

Maximum: 5

Mean: 2.42

Std. Deviation: 1.21, indicating some variability in respondents' perceptions of gender inclusivity and equality in the work environment. The mean value of 2.42 suggests a moderate level of perceived inclusivity and equality.

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.

Test Statistics

	gender of individuals	age	working experience	collaboration and teamwork among colleagues of different genders	work environment in terms of gender inclusivity and equality	level of support provided by organization for addressing gender bias	processes for promotion decisions regarding gender equality	manager in managing and addressing gender bias issues	gender bias affects distribution of opportunities for skill development	gender bias affects your job performance and productivity	distribution of work among individuals of different genders	gender will not hinder career advancement opportunities
Chi-Square	.720ᵃ	29.200ᵇ	25.040ᶜ	19.600ᶜ	11.600ᵈ	16.400ᵉ	15.200ᵈ	16.200ᵉ	27.600ᵈ	14.320ᵉ	25.400ᵈ	22.000ᵉ
df	1	10	6	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	.396	.001	.000	.001	.021	.003	.004	.003	.000	.003	.000	.000

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 25.0.

b. 11 cells (100.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 4.5.

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 7.1.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 10.0.

e. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 12.5.

INTERPRETATION:

The provided test statistics include chi-square values, degrees of freedom, and corresponding p- values for various variables related to gender bias in the workplace. Below is an interpretation of these results:

Gender of Individuals:

- Chi-Square: 0.720

- Degrees of Freedom: 1

- p-value: 0.396

Interpretation: The chi-square test does not indicate a significant association between the gender of individuals and this particular variable related to gender bias.

Age:

- Chi-Square: 29.200

- Degrees of Freedom: 10

- p-value: 0.001

Interpretation: There is a significant association between age and the variable related to gender bias. However, further analysis is needed to understand the nature of this association.

Working Experience:

- Chi-Square: 25.040

- Degrees of Freedom: 6

- p-value: 0.000

Interpretation: There is a significant association between working experience and the variable related to gender bias.

Collaboration and Teamwork Among Colleagues of Different Genders:

- Chi-Square: 19.600

- Degrees of Freedom: 4

- p-value: 0.001

Interpretation: There is a significant association between collaboration and teamwork among colleagues of different genders and the variable related to gender bias.

Work Environment in Terms of Gender Inclusivity and Equality:

- Chi-Square: 11.600

- Degrees of Freedom: 4

- p-value: 0.021

Interpretation: There is a significant association between the work environment in terms of gender inclusivity and equality and the variable related to gender bias.

Level of Support Provided by Organization for Addressing Gender Bias:

- Chi-Square: 16.400

- Degrees of Freedom: 4

- p-value: 0.003

Interpretation: There is a significant association between the level of support provided by the organization for addressing gender bias and the variable related to gender bias.

Processes for Promotion Decisions Regarding Gender Equality:

- Chi-Square: 15.200

- Degrees of Freedom: 4

- p-value: 0.004

Interpretation: There is a significant association between processes for promotion decisions regarding gender equality and the variable related to gender bias.

Manager in Navigating and Addressing Gender Bias Issues:

- Chi-Square: 16.200

- Degrees of Freedom: 4

- p-value: 0.003

Interpretation: There is a significant association between the manager's role in navigating and addressing gender bias issues and the variable related to gender bias.

Gender Bias Affects Distribution of Opportunities for Skill Development:

- Chi-Square: 27.600

- Degrees of Freedom: 4

- p-value: 0.000

Interpretation: There is a significant association between gender bias affecting the distribution of opportunities for skill development and the variable related to gender bias.

Gender Bias Affects Your Job Performance and Productivity:

- Chi-Square: 14.320

- Degrees of Freedom: 3

- p-value: 0.003

nterpretation: There is a significant association between gender bias affecting job performance and productivity and the variable related to gender bias.

Distribution of Work Among Individuals of Different Genders:

- Chi-Square: 25.400

- Degrees of Freedom: 4

- p-value: 0.000

Interpretation: There is a significant association between the distribution of work among individuals of different genders and the variable related to gender bias.

Gender Will Not Hinder Career Advancement Opportunities:

- Chi-Square: 22.000

- Degrees of Freedom: 4

- p-value: 0.000

Interpretation: There is a significant association between the belief that gender will not hinder career advancement opportunities and the variable related to gender bias.

CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we conducted a quantitative survey by distributing 30 questionnaires among employees of various academic institutions. Our questionnaire comprised 20 questions categorized into six factors: Confidence, Inspire Action, Vision, Communication, and Empathy. Both male and female respondents participated in our survey, and their responses indicated a high level of reliability. Most responses fell within the "Strongly agree" and "Agree" categories.

We analyzed the relationship between the independent variable, gender, and the dependent variable, leadership, and found a weak and insignificant connection. Our regression analysis revealed that our model did not fit well. This led us to reflect on historical assumptions about leadership, where men were traditionally seen as natural leaders while women were expected to support them.

However, contemporary views challenge these assumptions, recognizing that effective leadership qualities are not gender-specific. While some traits may be more commonly associated with males, many females also possess essential leadership attributes. Our review of existing literature and studies found no conclusive evidence linking gender to leadership effectiveness.

We delved into theories of leadership, examining qualities that define effective leaders, and found no emphasis on gender as a determining factor. Studies on transactional and transformational leadership styles indicated that females often excel in transformational leadership.

In conclusion, our research did not find any clear reasons or explanations for why males continue to dominate leadership positions over females in the corporate world. Our findings suggest that gender should not be a significant factor in assessing leadership effectiveness.

REFRENCES: -

Appelbaum, S., & Kamal, R. (2000). An analysis of the utilization and effectiveness of nonfinancial incentives in small business. Journal of Management Development, 19(9), 733-763.

Bashaw, D. (1999). Gender earnings and job satisfaction: The case of US physicians. Ph.D. Dissertation, UMI Number 9916558, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Ba levent, C., & Kirmano lu, H. (2014). The impact of deviations from desired hours of work on the life satisfaction of employees. Social Indicators Research, 118(1), 33-43.

Bassett, G. (1994). The case against job satisfaction. Business Horizons, 37(3), 61-68. Brief, A. P. (1998).

Attitudes in and around organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bernstein, D. A., & Nash, P. W. (2008). Essentials of psychology (4th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=4Do-bFrt9tUC Bender, K.

A., Donohue, S. A., & Heywood, J. S. (2005). Job satisfaction and gender segregation. Oxford Economic

Papers, 57(3), 479-496. Blau, G. (1994). Developing and testing a taxonomy of lateness behavior. Journal

of Psychology, 79(6), 959-70. Applied Brown, S.

P., & Lam, S. K. (2008). A meta-analysis of relationships linking employee satisfaction to customer responses. Journal of Retailing, 84(3), 243-255.

Bokemeier, J. L. & William, B. L. (1987). Job values, rewards, and work conditions as factors in job satisfaction among men and women. The Sociological Quarterly, 28(2), 189-204. Carleton, C. J., & Clain, S.

H. (2012). Women, men, and job satisfaction

Eastern Economic Journal, 38(3), 331-355. Clerkin, C. (2017). What women want—and why you want women—in the workplace. Center for Creative Leadership. Retrieved from https://www.ccl.org/wp