LEADERSHIP AND THE GENDER BALANCE: PAST, PRESENT AND PERSPECTIVES

Alecxandrina Deaconu
alecxandrinadeaconu@gmail.com
Academy of Economic Studies in Bucharest
Lavina Rasca
laviniar@asebuss.ro
Institute for Business Administration in Bucharest

The current paper aims at studying the profile of the successful leader and at identifying the differences that occur when the gender variable is taken into account. Staring from Kouzes and Posner's model (2002), we investigated the differences in perception regarding the characteristics that favour the success of a leader. We used two groups of subjects: students in the Academy of Economic Studies in Bucharest and managers in Romanian companies. Each group was made up of 50 people. They hierarchized ten descriptors according to their importance for the success of a leader, in more hypostases specified in the study. The obtained results demonstrate the almost unanimous agreement as concerns the most important traits that define the successful leader and also some differences of opinions emerging when the gender variable is introduced.

1. Introduction

In the context of a fast and uncertain economic evolution the top leaders exercise a higher and higher influence on their companies. This happens also because many successful leaders have gained today special competence skills and have a very different profile from that of the traditional leaders. This change is the result of a product of adaptation to the business environment and/or of the modification of the philosophy regarding the employee-employer relationship in a company. Thus, the question is if the preservation of the gender stereotypes would lead to a visible underrepresentation of some credible voices in this elite of power, with direct impact on our chances of progress. (Hoyt, 2011)

We all know that at the beginning of this century, the professional activity was totally different from the reality nowadays. There was no discussion upon flexibility and innovation as phenomena characterizing the global economic conditions and there were not such fast changes in technology. Cameron (1995) calls these transformation *changes in the culture of Anglo-American capitalism,* and associates them with the passage to the norms of traditional interaction (aggressiveness, competitiveness, individualism) to a new leadership style focused on *flexibility, team work and collaboration in problem solving.*

Traditionally, the most appreciate leadership characteristics were masculine by their nature (Eagly, 2011). Yet, in the last years, the researchers have shown that many of these traits (assertiveness, individualism, task orientation) did not always contributed to the efficacy of leadership (Judge and Piccolo, 2004). Instead of the leadership theory centered on *The Great Man*, *the transformational leadership* has emerged, and its efficiency is supported by more and more researchers (Eagly, 2007). It is interesting that many of the traits of the transformational leadership (such as collaboration and empowerment) are associated traditionally with women (Eagly, 2007), which illustrates that many feminine features contribute to the leadership efficacy. *Fortune 500* showed how the companies with many female managers have a much higher average productivity of the own capital in comparison with the companies with few female managers. (The White House Project Report, 2009). Despite this information, female leaders still deal with many disadvantages. Often people tend to attribute their success as leaders rather to some external than internal factors (Heilman, 2001) and avoid placing them on leadership positions.

However, analyzing this phenomenon at a large scale, we can admit that the situation has improved. Eagly and Carli (2003) showed that increasing the number of female leaders has been accompanied by changes of theory and practice in leadership. They also specify that the most modern

International Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy" ISSN-L 2067-0532   ISSN online 2344-5386
XVIth Edition, 2015, Galati, Romania,
"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

characterization of an efficient leadership found in the literature and in press is much based on the characteristics considered to be feminine. At the same time they state that if the leadership roles belong to more women and/or are perceived feminine attributes, we will continue to assist a serious cultural change. It is a real success the fact that many analyses (Eagly& Carli, 2003; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & van Engen, 2003; Eagly, 2003) emphasize the fact that the employees position female leaders better than male leaders at more traits of the transformational leadership (charisma, ability to motivate the employees, and creativity in problem solving). Moreover, these characteristics of leadership are considered a real support for the efficacy of leadership. Also, Eagly pointed out, on the basis of his researches, that the subordinates of some female leaders are more willing to make supplementary effort, are more satisfied with their leaders and more efficient competitively in comparison with the subordinates of male leaders. Gorman and Kmec (2007) stated that women work harder than men on the same position, and this difference is explainable by the strict standards and exigencies manifested towards women. In addition, even if O'Campo, Eaton and Muntaner (2004) advanced the idea that women and men are equal from the point of view of education in many occupational fields, US Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009b) still shows that women obtain only 80% of men's incomes. This inequality affects women at various professional levels. At a high level, women are less preferred for the managerial and professional positions (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2009a) and for the positions involving decision-making regarding the policy of the company (O'Campo, 2004).

Various papers published on this topic develop and compare *the feminine leadership* with *the masculine leadership*. The feminine leadership style was called *social-expressive*, with personal attention paid to subordinates and with focus on a good work environment; by contrast, the masculine leadership style was described as an instrumental one, focused on giving directions. Helgesen (1990) made researches that led to the identification of the differences between the masculine and feminine leadership styles.

Table 1: Differences in leadership styles

Male leaders	Female leaders
They work at a constant speed, without taking breaks.	They work constantly and plan small breaks within their working day.
They describe their work day as characterized by discontinuity and interruptions.	They cope better with interruptions and do not consider.
They do not have much time for activities outside their work.	They make time for other activities outside their work.
They show a preference for short and directed conversations and meetings.	They prefer face-to-face meetings but they plan time for correspondence.
They maintain a complex social network only to people outside the company.	They have a complex system of relationships within the institution as well.
They do not have or do not take time to contemplate.	They think about an ecological style of leadership.
They identify totally with their work.	They see their own identity as complex and multidimensional.
They rarely pass on information.	They allocate time for sharing information.

Source: Helgesen, 1995.

Exploring the literature we would like to investigate if in Romania there are nowadays changes of perception meant to open the women's way to top leadership. As we have noticed, it is more and more spread the idea that we witness today a modification of the successful leader's profile and at a decrease of the interest in certain traits considered to be masculine (example: ambition, self-control). In this context, our objective was to describe the successful leader's profile on the basis of the answers received from people informed about the investigated topic, to see if we obtain opinions that confirm the studies published up to now, if the gender stereotypes are very visible at the Romanian surveyed subjects and if there are major gaps between the characteristics of the ideal and real leaders.

To collect the necessary information we launched a questionnaire-based survey, and the obtained results represent a useful completion to the studies in the filed published up to now. The conclusions of the current study can be a starting point for future researches and for decisions

International Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy"   ISSN-L 2067-0532   ISSN online 2344-5386
XVIth Edition, 2015, Galati, Romania,
"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

required at the level of business environment in Romania if we want to comply with the European trends of support of the gender balance in top leadership.

2. Research on the successful leader's profile

Our study is based on the list of the ten descriptor words defined by Kouzes and Posner and included in the Checklist of Admired Leaders (2002): *Ambitions, Caring, Competent, Determined, Forward-looking, Honest, Imaginative, Inspiring, Loyal and Self-controlled* and aimed at the identification of the successful leader's characteristics in more hypostases:

- when the successful leader is a woman;
- when the successful leader is a man ;
- when the successful leader has unspecified gender;
-when we refer to an ideal successful leader (woman or man) and
- when we refer to a successful leader (woman or man) met in a work relationship.

Thus, our research did not take into account only the imagined successful leader mentioned by Kuzes and Posner, but also aims at identifying the characteristics of a successful real leader, who acts directly in the Romanian business environment. We did this because we consider that a more detailed investigation could offer more nuanced results and favour the identification of the reasons on which the differences of opinions are based.

The research was carried out in the autumn of 2014 and the investigated subjects are students of the Academy of Economic Studies in Bucharest and managers in companies activating in Romania and that collaborate with our university. The target group, made up of 100 persons received a questionnaire in physical format requesting two types of information: on the one hand personal information (gender, age, experience, professional status) and on the other hand each respondent's opinion regarding the importance of the leadership traits (each respondent was asked to make the hierarchy of the above mentioned ten descriptor words according to their importance in providing the success of a leader. 1 represents the most important descriptor for ensuring the success of a leader, 2 stands for the descriptor with the next importance, while 10 is given for the descriptor with the lowest importance for the success of a leader). The average time for the completion of a questionnaire was of maximum 15 minutes. Taking into account the close relationship with the surveyed we have a rate answer of 88% (100% for students and 76% in the case of managers).

The research was designed so that it could lead to the verification of the following hypotheses:

H1: Hierarchy of the descriptors is different according to the respondents' gender;

H2: Hierarchy of the descriptors made by managers is different from that made by non-managers;

H3: Hierarchy of the descriptors for an ideal leader is different from that for a real leader;

H4: Hierarchy of the descriptors is different when we imagine a successful female leader or a successful male leader;

H5: Hierarchy of the descriptors for a successful female leader is different from that for a successful male leader - real;

H6: Hierarchy of the descriptors for a successful leader without gender specification is closer to that for successful male leaders than to that for successful female leaders.

After collecting the answers we grouped the expressed opinions so that at the end of the computations we could verify if our hypotheses are valid or not.

For the first research hypothesis (H1), regarding the way the gender of the respondents influences their opinion on the successful leader's profile, we took into account the options of all the respondents (88 people) and we established the hierarchy proposed by women and men for a successful leader (the question in the questionnaire asking for the hierarchy of the descriptors without specifying the gender of the leader). The first work variant was that in which the opinion referred to an ideal, imagined successful leader. Before presenting the obtained results in the below tables, we should mention that out of the 88 respondents, 52 were women (17 managers and 35 students) and 36 were men (21 managers and 15 students).

International Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy" ISSN-L 2067-0532   ISSN online 2344-5386
XVIth Edition, 2015, Galati, Romania,
"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

Table 2: Hierarchy of the descriptors is different according to the respondents' gender (an ideal leader, with no specified gender)

Descriptors	Men		Women		Deviation
	Average score	Hierarchy	Average score	Hierarchy	
Ambitious	4.5	3	8.8	10	7
Caring	8.7	10	4.7	5	5
Competent	3.0	1	5.0	7	6
Determined	4.6	4	3.4	1	3
Forward looking	3.3	2	3.6	2	0
Honest	5.2	5	4.1	4	1
Imaginative	8.0	9	4.9	6	3
Inspiring	6.5	7	4.0	3	4
Loyal	7.8	8	8.6	9	1
Self-controlled	5.3	6	7.8	8	2

The analysis of data reveals the fact that the first positions in the hierarchy made by the surveyed men refer to *Competent, Forward looking* and at a higher distance *Ambitious,* while according to the female respondents to have success as a leader means to have high levels of *Determined, Forward looking* and *Inspiring*. By comparing the hierarchies we can notice that one of the characteristics valued by the male respondents, *Ambitious,* is placed by women on the last position. In exchange, they emphasize *Inspiring* descriptor, expressing thus a more advanced approach and closer to the transformational leadership practices by the modern companies. Great differences appear also for *Competent* and *Caring,* women stressing more *Caring* and less *Competent.* This can be explained by the fact that female respondents consider *Competent* trait as a starting condition fulfilled by all who are top leaders in the successful companies and consequently it should be completed with other complementary characteristics. At the same time, the need of being *Competent* is not provided exclusively by the leader, but also by each member of his/her team. Also, *Forward looking* descriptor has the same importance both for men and for women, which can be explained by a common experience of all the respondents who, activating in the Romanian business environment saw many companies with short term visions leaving the market.

From the analysis of the answers grouped according to the respondents' gender, we retain the fact that at the level of the whole list of descriptors, there are different visions concerning the profile of the successful leader and we consider that *H1 hypothesis is confirmed.* It should be emphasized the overlapping of the opinions of male and female subjects as regards the *Forward looking* descriptor.

The second hypothesis, H2, regards the way the successful leader is perceived by people with *managerial* and *non-managerial* positions. The group of subjects was made up of 38 managers, and 26 students currently working and having non-managerial positions and the information in the below table regard the situation of the successful leader met in a work relationship.

Table 3: Hierarchy of the descriptors made by managers and non-managers (real leader)

Descriptors	Managers		Non-managers		Deviation
	Average score	Hierarchy	Average score	Hierarchy	
Ambitious	5.9	5	7.4	10	5
Caring	9.0	10	6.6	5	5
Competent	2.5	2	1.0	1	1
Determined	2.8	3	4.4	3	0
Forward looking	1.8	1	2.4	2	1
Honest	6.0	6	5.0	4	2
Imaginative	6.4	7	7.2	8	1
Inspiring	8.6	9	6.9	7	2
Loyal	8.0	8	6.7	6	2
Self-controlled	4.5	4	7.3	9	5

International Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy" ISSN-L 2067-0532 ISSN online 2344-5386
XVIth Edition, 2015, Galati, Romania,
"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

A first analysis of the classification made by managers and non-managers could lead to the conclusion that deviations are very low, at more than half of the descriptors proposed by Kouzes and Posner: 0 for *Determined*, 1 for *Competent, Forward looking* and *Imaginative*, 2 for *Honest, Inspiring* and *Loyal*. However, there are descriptors with important differences: *Ambitious, Caring, Self-controlled.* This can suggest a possible conflict situation between managers and non-managers. Corroborating the obtained results with those from the previous hypothesis, we can notice a repetition of the differences of opinions as regards *Ambitious* and *Caring* descriptors, which will require the search for explanations on the occasion of a future research.

In comparison with the previous hypothesis asking for the opinion regarding an ideal successful leader, now the answers reflect characteristics of those currently having leader positions in Romanian companies. The fact that the first trait mentioned by the respondents is *competence* can be a focus on this dimension in the context in which at the level of the society there is a widespread perception that at the moment the professionals are not fully capitalized in the enterprises they are a part of. Such a situation is less probable as the lack of confidence in the system of evaluation and promotion of leaders does not refer to private companies but rather to public institutions. From another perspective we can talk about the situation in which all the surveyed had the chance to work with competent leaders and connect their success to this characteristic.

Synthetizing these observations we can conclude that on the whole *H2 hypothesis was confirmed.*

The third hypothesis of our research (H3) faced the image of an ideal leader with the image of a successful real leader. For the ideal image we took into account the answers to the whole group and we calculated the average score of the descriptors, without taking into account the gender of the respondents. For the profile of the successful real leader that our subjects met in their direct activity, the answers belonged to working individuals, no matter if they had managerial or non-managerial positions. The below table displays the results calculated on the basis of the hierarchy provided by 152 people (88 individuals who referred to 64 people who met in their work successful leaders).

Table 4: Hierarchy of the descriptors: ideal leader versus real leader

Descriptors	Ideal manager		Real manager		Deviation
	Average score	Hierarchy	Average score	Hierarchy	
Ambitious	7.0	9	6.5	6	3
Caring	6.3	7	8.0	10	3
Competent	4.2	3	1.9	1	2
Determined	3.9	2	3.5	3	1
Forward looking	3.5	1	2.0	2	1
Honest	4.6	4	5.6	4	0
Imaginative	6.2	6	6.7	7	1
Inspiring	5.0	5	7.9	9	4
Loyal	8.3	10	7.5	8	2
Self-controlled	6.8	8	5.6	5*	3

The comparative analysis of the scores established by the respondents shows that there are not high differences when the subjects appreciate the ideal successful leader and when they appreciate the successful leaders they meet in direct professional relationships. An explanation of this situation could be the large of the models of successful leader, the information and an education process making our subjects be extremely realist in their appreciations. We also notice that the descriptors placed on the first three positions are the same and according to the opinion of our group, a successful leader should also be *Forward looking, Determined* and *Competent* and the successful leaders they met in their professional life are *Competent, Forward looking* and *Determined*. We also retain the total agreement as regards *Honest* descriptor which is placed on the fourth position in both cases, and the controversies concerning the descriptors *Ambitious* and *Caring.* Synthetizing the observations regarding this hypothesis, we can consider that *H3 hypothesis is just partially validated.*

To verify the fourth hypothesis (H4), we took over the information collected from the 88 questionnaires and we obtained the following scores regarding the imagined profile of a successful

International Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy" ISSN-L 2067-0532   ISSN online 2344-5386
XVIth Edition, 2015, Galati, Romania,
"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

female leader. Then we compared the hierarchy obtained in this situation with the hierarchy of the successful ideal leader in the previous table.

Table 5: Hierarchy of the descriptors: successful female leader (ideal)

Descriptors	Ideal female manager		Ideal manager (unspecified gender)		Deviation
	Average score	Hierarchy	Average score	Hierarchy	
Ambitious	9.8	10	7.0	9	1
Caring	5.0	6	6.3	7	1
Competent	3.5	2	4.2	3	1
Determined	4.8	5	3.9	2	3
Forward looking	2.0	1	3.5	1	0
Honest	4.5	4	4.6	4	0
Imaginative	4.3	3	6.2	6	3
Inspiring	5.5	7	5.0	5	2
Loyal	7.5	8	8.3	10	2
Self-controlled	9.0	9	6.8	8	1

Our attempt to reconstitute the profile of the female leader on the basis of the received answers emphasized the focus laid on two descriptors: *Forward looking* and *Competent* and a great preference, which was not influenced by the leader's gender for *Honest* descriptor and the opinion according to which *Imaginative* characteristic is important for the success of a female leader. At this level of the analysis we consider that *H4 hypothesis is partially validated.*

For H5 hypothesis (Hierarchy of the descriptors for a successful female leader is different from that for a successful male leader – real) we took into account the answers formulated by the 64 respondents currently working. Out of them 16 declared that they did not meet successful female leaders and their questionnaires were eliminated from the analysis of this hypothesis.

Table 6: Hierarchy of the descriptors: successful female/male leader (real)

Descriptors	Female leader		Male leader		Deviation
	Average score	Hierarchy	Average score	Hierarchy	
Ambitious	5.0	4	6.3	6	2
Caring	5.8	6	6.5	7	1
Competent	2.5	1	3.3	2	1
Determined	4.5	2	4.5	4	2
Forward looking	6.5	8	5	5	3
Honest	6.3	7	6.8	8	1
Imaginative	5.3	5	7.8	9	4
Inspiring	7.8	10	3.8	3	7
Loyal	4.8	3	8.0	10	7
Self-controlled	6.8	9	3.2	1	8

The scores registered for this hypothesis emphasize high variations of opinion. As it results from table 6, the female leaders are perceived as *Competent, Determined* and *Loyal* – a novel aspect. In the mirror, the successful male leaders are *Self-controlled, Competent* and *Inspiring.* We can also notice high differences in the hierarchy descriptors: *Inspiring, Loyal* and *Self-controlled.* The fact that there are male leaders able to inspire their collaborators is useful and can contribute actively to performance and the organizational climate. This thing does not fully harmonize with the previous studies that revealed high scores for this descriptor to female leaders. The fact that the successful female leaders were seen also as *Loyal* is interesting and can be extremely benefic for the consolidation of the enterprises and for the fidelization of their members.

All these observations entitle the idea that there are differences between the behavior of female and male leaders and we consider that *H5 hypothesis is true.*

International Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy" ISSN-L 2067-0532 ISSN online 2344-5386
XVIth Edition, 2015, Galati, Romania,
"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

In the following we will analyze the last hypothesis (H6), according to which the hierarchy of the descriptors for a successful leader without gender specification is closer to that for successful male leaders than to that for successful female leaders. We when formulated this hypothesis, we considered that it would be validated because, according to the statistics, both in Romanian and in other European countries the number of women that become successful leaders in business is small. Under these circumstances it is natural not to overlap the image of the female leader on the image of the successful leader met in the real life.

For the hierarchy of the male and female leaders we used the result in Table 6: Hierarchy of the descriptors: successful female leader/male leader (real), and for the hierarchy of the successful leader with no specified gender we used the results in Table 4: Hierarchy of the descriptors: ideal leader versus real leader.

We centralized everything in the table below. For a simplified interpretation, the results were presented in two successive tables, as it follows:

Table 7: Hierarchy of the descriptors: successful leader/male leader (real)

Descriptors	Real leader (unspecified gender)		Male leader		Deviation
	Average score	Hierarchy	Average score	Hierarchy	
Ambitious	6.5	6	6.3	6	0
Caring	8.0	10	6.5	7	3
Competent	1.9	1	3.3	2	1
Determined	3.5	3	4.5	4	1
Forward looking	2.0	2	5	5	3
Honest	5.6	4	6.8	8	4
Imaginative	6.7	7	7.8	9	2
Inspiring	7.9	9	3.8	3	6
Loyal	7.5	8	8.0	10	2
Self-controlled	5.6	5*	3.2	1	4
	x	x	x	x	**26**

The above table confirms the focus on *Competent, Determined* and *Forward looking* in both analyzed cases, but it also reveals some special scores for the descriptors *Inspiring* and then *Honest* and *Self-controlled.* In other words, when referring to the male successful leaders, our subjects emphasized the high consideration they had for *Inspiring* (the third position in the hierarchy) and *Self-controlled* (the first position) comparatively with a relatively lower consideration for *Honest* descriptor (the eight position).

All in all, the above mentioned results lead to arguments that make us think that H6 hypothesis is not validated.

We were curious to see if the differences are higher or lower when the successful manager is a woman. We reunited the findings in the below table:

Table 8: Hierarchy of the descriptors: successful leader/female leader (real)

Descriptors	Real leader (unspecified gender)		Female leader		Deviation
	Average score	Hierarchy	Average score	Hierarchy	
Ambitious	6.5	6	5.0	4	2
Caring	8.0	10	5.8	6	4
Competent	1.9	1	2.5	1	0
Determined	3.5	3	4.5	2	1
Forward looking	2.0	2	6.5	8	6
Honest	5.6	4	6.3	7	3
Imaginative	6.7	7	5.3	5	2
Inspiring	7.9	9	7.8	10	1

International Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy" ISSN-L 2067-0532   ISSN online 2344-5386
XVIth Edition, 2015, Galati, Romania,
"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

Descriptors	Real leader (unspecified gender)		Female leader		Deviation
	Average score	Hierarchy	Average score	Hierarchy	
Loyal	7.5	8	4.8	3	5
Self-controlled	5.6	5*	6.8	9	4
	x	x	x	x	**28**

The scores in the above table show that the respondents also stressed *Competent* and *Determined,* in both cases. However, there are descriptors such as *Loyal* which are better scored when we talk about successful female leaders that in the case of the successful leaders without gender specification. If we look at the total in the last column, we can draw the conclusion that in this last case the differences between the successful leader (without gender specification) and the female leader are higher than in the previous case (28 in comparison to 26).

The analyses for the verification of the last hypothesis show definitely a change of interpretation of the descriptors as regards the leaders' gender. Under these circumstances we can admit that the managerial practice is based on the culture of the society and that the profile of the successful leader will depend on the image the woman gained and especially on her professional evolution. In fact there is a vicious circle that has to be managed skillfully: on the one hand, the image of the woman in the society can facilitate or prevent her evolution within the organization and on the other hand the image of the woman in the society depends strongly on her professional status, on her activity as a leader in business.

On the basis of the synthesis of this research regarding the leadership and the gender variable we had confirmed but also invalidated hypotheses. Thus, H1 hypothesis (Hierarchy descriptors is different according to the respondents' gender) was confirmed; H2 hypothesis (Hierarchy of the descriptors made by managers is different from that made by non-managers) was also validated; H3 hypothesis (Hierarchy of the descriptors for an ideal leader is different from that for a real leader) was also validated; H4 hypothesis (Hierarchy of the descriptors is different when we imagine a successful female leader or a successful male leader) was also validated; H5 hypothesis (Hierarchy of the descriptors for a successful female leader is different from that for a successful male leader – real) was also validated; the last hypothesis, H6 (Hierarchy of the descriptors for a successful leader without gender specification is closer to that for successful male leaders than to that for successful female leaders) was invalidated.

Conclusions

The evolutions around us (in the business world and not only) convinced us that the leadership skills required in the future will emerge through the development of a combination of the masculine and feminine characteristics, involving strategic thinking, communication skills and the ability to interrelate with the others. Both men and women have things to learn and gain if they cooperate (Powel. 1988). The focus many enterprises lay today on training, team work, on the network of relationships and on power and information segregation make us consider women's abilities as a consistent advantage. So that the leadership skills be adequate to reality, it is necessary a cultural awareness and the overcoming of some mental barriers that slowed down our evolution. Our study is not a strictly reparatory approach, but a lucid, rational one, aware of the need and the benefits of the intelligent capitalization of the feminine human resources in professional contexts of maximum responsibility.

During our research we have encountered some weaknesses that made our work more difficult and prevented us from drawing more and more firm conclusions. We mention the following:
- *Establishing the work group*. We preferred to create large questionnaire and launch it to all the surveyed and then to regroup the answers according to their usefulness for a certain hypothesis. The experience in the project revealed the fact that the work with homogenous groups required to order the descriptors only for certain hypostases would have been more efficient. Such a modality of work would have brought more clarity and the answers could have been more trenchant.
- *The lack of some questions referring to the work field* of some respondents. We believe that the preference for certain descriptors can be associated also with the work environment in which the leader acts. There are strictly regulated environments in which the freedom of movement is more restricted while others allow more innovation. Also, the work environment is tightly

International Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy" ISSN-L 2067-0532 ISSN online 2344-5386
XVIth Edition, 2015, Galati, Romania,
"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

correlated with the level of education and qualification of the employees, another factor that can modify the profile of the successful leader.

- *The level of thoroughness of the research.* When we investigated H2 hypothesis we could have analyzed the answers of people with managerial positions when they are men and women. The same thing could have been done in the case of managers and non-managers. Thus, we could have obtained results of the conjugated action of two variables: the position occupied in the organization and the respondent's gender.

- *The study of the effects of the combined variables in the case of H4 and H5* hypotheses. It was useful to take into account the gender structure of the surveyed group to see if the respondents appreciate or not the leaders that belong to the same gender category. Many studies regarding the gender issues emphasized several conclusions that could have been thus verified. For example, there is an assumption that the success of some people of the same gender motivates positively, and this can explain the efforts to support women in the managerial hierarchy. On the other hand, there is the finding that women are orientated to work rather with a male leader than with a female leader. The same thing happens in the case of men.

- *The support of our conclusions only on the computation of averages.* The use of more varied statistical techniques could have allowed the computation of other useful functions, and to enrich the current results.

As research perspectives we would like to investigate the change of perception regarding the leader profile over time. Currently, for the surveyed group we can relatively easily make temporal frameworks. However, we believe that in order to obtain pertinent conclusions it is useful to enlarge the group of subjects and to include people with more professional experience. On this occasion we will use a larger portfolio of analysis techniques and we expect that our results will help us anticipate and project future transformations in leadership.

References
1. Cameron D., (1995), Verbal hygiene, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
2. Eagly, A.,H.,(2007), Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: resolving the contradictions, Psychology of Women Quarterly, vol.31, nr.1, pp.1-12
3. Eagly, A., H., Carli, L.,L.,(2003), The female leadership advantage: an evaluation of the evidence, The leadership quarterly, vol.14, nr.6, pp.807-834
4. Eagly, A., H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M., C.,van Engen, M., L.,(2003), Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analyses comparing women and men. Psychological Bulletin,129, 569-591
5. Eagly, A,H., Koenig, A., M., Mitchell, A., A., Rstikari, T.,(2011), Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms, Psychological Bulletin, vol.137, nr.4, pp.616-642
6. Gorman, E., H., Kmec, J., A., (2007), We (have to) try harder: Gender and required effort in Britain and United States. Gender&Socety, 21, 828-856
7. Heilman, M., E.,(2001), Description and prescription: how gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder, Journal of Social Issues, vol.57, nr.4, pp. 657-674
8. Helgesen, S., (1995), The web of inclusion, New York, Doubleday
9. Helgesen, S.,(1990), The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership, New York, Doubleday
10. Hoyt, C., L., Simon, S., (2011), Female Leaders: Injurious or Inspiring Role Models for Women?
11. Judge, T., A., Piccolo, R., F.,(2004), Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity, Journal of Applied Psychology, vol.89, nr.5, pp. 755-768
12. Kouzes, J.M.,Posner, B.,Z.(2002), The Leadership Challenge, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco
13. O'Campo, P., Eaton, W., W.,Muntaner, C., (2004), Labor market experience, work organization, gender inequalities and health status: Results from a perspective analysis of US employed women. Social Science&Medicine, 58, 585-594
14. Powel, G., N., (1988), Women and men in management, Newbury Perk, Sage Publications
15. The White House Project Report, (2009), Benchmarmking women's leadership, www.benchmarks.thewhitehouseproject.org
16. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics ,(2009a), Household data annual averages, http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.pdf
17. US Bureau of Labor Statistics, (2009b), Median weekly earnings of full-time wage and salary workers by selected characteristics, http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat37. pdf