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ABSTRACT

This paper examines several leadership paradigms and theories currently practiced in contemporary organizations in order to determine which ones best support women’s attempts to advance to decision-making positions of leadership in higher education settings. Using an interdisciplinary approach, the study first compares hierarchical to non-hierarchical structures and examines how globalization has prompted an evolution towards non-hierarchical structures in recent years. Transactional and transformational leadership styles and their implications regarding gender are then examined. But although women have a proven affinity towards transformational leadership, and this type of leadership is most commonly practiced in non-hierarchical globalized settings, the perceived ‘female leadership advantage’ this should confer upon them is undercut, due largely to gender incongruity and an organizational culture that still favours men in leadership roles. The focus then turns to an examination of four transformational, participatory leadership models (distributed leadership, servant leadership, shared leadership, and responsible leadership) and their implementation in a higher education setting. Conceptual integration of the related factors and theories is performed. The conclusion is that, provided we accept the premise that higher education is becoming increasingly corporate, responsible leadership provides the best potential for addressing the inclusion of women in decision-making positions of leadership in higher education.
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INTRODUCTION

There is much debate as to why geese fly in V formations. The most common assumption is that the goose in front is strongest and must lead the way for those who follow. Another hypothesis is that this formation allows all of the geese to ride on updrafts generated from the wingtips of fellow geese. A branch of mathematics used to examine the aerodynamics of aircraft has been used to study geese, and the results make it clear that flying together works best; one calculation shows that when birds fly tip to tip their range is increased by 71 percent over birds flying solo and expending an equal amount of energy. Furthermore, Munk’s Stagger Theorem asserts that the V formation is not necessarily required; the benefit to all birds would be just as strong if they were flying abreast in a straight line with no designated leader (Ingram, 2009, p. 103).

Further debate focuses on whether it is the alignment of the wingtips or the angle of the V that matters most, as many geese abandon the V and form echelons (staggered single files), inverted Js, or clusters. Munk’s theory indicates that the best V would be slightly bent, with geese intermittently drifting in and out of alignment. Social scientists suggest that geese are under ‘social pressure’ to maintain their position in the V in order to contribute to the good of the whole, while biologists assert that the V is the most recognizable ‘advertisement’ to prompt other geese to follow, thereby creating an even larger flock that then holds a greater communal knowledge of where to find food (Ingram, 2009, p. 106).
Organizational leadership encompasses many of the same behaviours and principles as the analogy above. Some institutions operate with one leader who determines the direction of the company, while others spread authority amongst a large number of employees. Organizations come in many shapes and sizes, and factors such as globalization and organizational culture contribute to molding and redirecting institutions in ever-changing ways. For example many educational institutions, traditionally hierarchical and bureaucratic in nature, are now moving towards non-hierarchical, transformational structures (Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006, p. 24; Kezar, 2001, p. 85). Gender also plays a role, as the traditionally male-dominated workforce leading up to the 21st century is rapidly giving way to an ever-increasing number of women obtaining positions of leadership in organizations.

An examination of these factors, considered from an interdisciplinary perspective, may generate valuable insight into the question of which leadership paradigms and theories better address the inclusion of women in decision-making positions of leadership in higher education and therefore take into consideration the changing face of leadership.

**LEADERSHIP DEFINED**

The definition of leadership is “an essentially contested concept” (Grint, 2005, p. 17) with multiple interpretations depending on one’s perspective. However, since ‘to lead’ originates from the Latin verb ‘agere’, meaning ‘to set into motion’, an appropriate modern definition encompasses the idea of someone who “sets ideas, people, organizations, and societies in motion” (Adler, 1997, p. 173). Leading such a motion is
an interactive process that requires vision, courage and influence and therefore leaders are those who “significantly influence the thoughts, behaviours, and/or feelings of others” (Adler, p. 173).

**HIERARCHICAL AND NON-HIERARCHICAL LEADERSHIP STRUCTURES**

Most organizations are either hierarchical or non-hierarchical. The hierarchical structure, predominant in the first half of the 20th century, is frequently compared to a pyramid, with a designated leader at the top, a small number of vice presidents under the leader, several layers of management below that, and the majority of employees at the bottom of the pyramid (Page & Wong, 2010, p. 8). Power, responsibility and authority are concentrated at the top and decisions flow downwards. Jobs are typically divided into functions by department. Leaders tend to be autocratic, authoritative and stereotypically masculine, with a strict adherence to the company’s strategic goals. Due to its focus on disciplinary power and top-down layout, hierarchical structure is frequently associated with a transactional style of leadership, which is conventional in nature and involves “clarifying subordinate responsibilities, rewarding them for meeting objectives, and correcting them for failing to meet objectives” (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & van Engen, 2003, p. 571).

The non-hierarchical structure is flat and decentralized, with a number of employees sharing leadership duties and delegating authority to those with pertinent skills. The focus is on tasks, and employees are divided into teams based on the needs of the work. Non-hierarchical structure is frequently associated with a transformational
style of leadership, in which leaders act as role models and engage in strategies to motivate employees to reach a higher level of performance and success. The focus is on team-building, collaboration and the successful attainment of goals, and opportunities for personal growth and empowerment are available to all employees (Eagly et al., p. 571).

Up until thirty years ago leadership in western culture had been overwhelmingly hierarchical (Kezar & Carducci, 2007, p. 3; Kezar & Lester, 2010, p. 164), and its tenets have been supported in the disciplines of organizational behaviour, sociology, and psychology (Anderson & Brown, 2010, p. 56). But more recently, non-hierarchical and increasingly participatory forms of leadership have gained ground and organizations are moving away from vertical, authority-based leadership frameworks and towards more horizontal, collaborative frameworks that promote empowerment, teamwork and social responsibility (Kezar & Carducci; Chin, 2011).

THE EFFECTS OF GLOBALIZATION

One major factor underlying this evolution is globalization. Due to the explosion of technology in the 1980s and 1990s, regionally- and industry-based economies shifted towards a new globalized economy (Hagen, Vaicys & Hassan, 2002, p. 20; Chin, 2011, p. 7). Technology decreased decision time, connected people across the world and enabled more local forms of leadership that emphasized context and culture. Since those throughout the world could now connect instantly and work together in greater numbers, social and cultural differences were acknowledged and studied in relation to leadership
The changing face of leadership (Kezar & Carducci, 2007, p. 5), and traditional hierarchical ways of doing business became less feasible.

The global economy has also created a “new competitive landscape” (Hagen et al., 2002, p. 20), in which circumstances change unpredictably and rapidly and affect all sections of organizations (Greenwood and Hinings, 1996, as cited in Hagen et al., p. 20). The ambiguity and uncertainty resulting from these revolutionary changes has forced organizations to accelerate their decision-making processes by relying more heavily on human capital (i.e. the knowledge and skills of a company’s workforce), now considered an organization’s most valuable resource. Hence the ability to expand, share and leverage knowledge is quickly replacing the control of assets as the primary source of competitive advantage (Drucker et al., 1997, as cited in Hagen et al., p. 20). Within this new context of greater competition and reduced funding, networking with others to pool resources and ideas is now an indispensable component of leadership. Globalization, above all other factors, has played the most significant role in changing the face of leadership from one based on hierarchical structure to one based on non-hierarchical structure.

TRANSACTIONAL AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLES

We will now take a closer look at the transactional and transformational leadership styles and their implications regarding gender. Just as, 30 years ago, leadership in western culture began to make the transition from hierarchical to non-hierarchical structure, the workforce itself was undergoing a change in regard to gender. Although
women had begun to enter the workforce in larger numbers in the 1960s, it was not until the 1980s that their presence became more prominent and they began to pursue positions of higher authority and decision making. However their progress appeared hampered by the so-called ‘glass ceiling’, which created an invisible yet distinct barrier preventing them from attaining the jobs they desired. Despite their increased representation in the workforce, women continue to be “sparsely represented at the higher levels of organizations and extraordinarily rare in top managerial positions” (Eagly, Karau, Miner & Johnson, 1994, p. 137). But what role is gender playing, if any?

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Bass & Avolio (1990), is an assessment tool designed to measure a broad range of leadership styles, including the six factors of transformational and transactional leadership. It has been used in numerous studies to evaluate the types of leadership traits most often exhibited by men and women. The factors that denote transformational leadership are: idealized influence (the ability to inspire respect and pride), inspirational motivation (exhibiting optimism and excitement about goals), intellectual stimulation (exploring new perspectives for solving problems and completing tasks), and individualized consideration (contributing to the development and mentoring of followers and attending to their individual needs). The factors that denote transactional leadership are: contingent reward (providing rewards for satisfactory performance by followers) and management by exception (addressing followers’ mistakes and failures to meet standards) (Eagly et al., 2003, p. 571).
Druskat utilized the MLQ to test gender differences in leadership style and found that women exhibited significantly more transformational behaviours than men, while men exhibited significantly more transactional behaviours than women, although both sexes exhibited more transformational leadership behaviours overall (1994, p. 114). Her findings were consistent with Rosener’s seminal article, “Ways Women Lead” (1990). Judy Rosener, a pioneer in the field of participatory leadership, found that women are more likely than men to practice transformational leadership—motivating others by turning their individual self-interest into group goals. They also adopt an interactive style by encouraging participation, sharing power and information, and enhancing others’ self-worth. In addition, they are more likely than men to attribute their power to interpersonal skills rather than organizational stature and endeavour to make others feel part of the organization in the belief that they will perform better and feel better about themselves and their work (Alimo-Metcalfe, 2010, p. 644).

House and Howell take this premise one step further by positing that transformational leadership is a feminine form of leadership for both men and women and contend that transformational leaders “do not fit the stereotype of a bold, forceful, assertive, and aggressive leader...Rather the findings describe a leader who is sensitive to follower needs, nurturant and developmentally oriented” (1992, p. 90).

In a meta-analysis conducted by Eagly et al., results showed small but significant gender differences indicating that women rated higher than men on all four of the transformational factors while men rated higher than women on the two transactional
scales (2003, p. 586). Although other studies on this topic have elicited greater gender stereotypic sex differences, the researchers noted that in the organizational behaviour discipline, since male and female managers “were selected by similar criteria and subjected to similar organizational socialization—forces that tend to equalize the sexes” (Eagly & Carli, 2003, p. 814)—results derived from these workplaces tend to be less pronounced than in those carried out by other disciplines such as gender studies.

Qualitative research has unearthed similar results. One recent study concurs that leadership has evolved from a transactional to a transformational style in the past 30 years mainly due to globalization and assigns leadership the traits of listening and learning from others, acting for the benefit of everyone, empowerment of others to lead, and recognition of achievement; all traits associated with transformational leadership and women (Evans, 2010, p. 349). Since women are more likely to favour this approach, it should therefore result in a slight advantage over men when pursuing leadership roles.

It appears clear that “women are more likely than men to lead in a style that is more effective under contemporary conditions” (Eagly & Carli, 2003, p. 807), i.e. transformational / participatory as opposed to transactional. It has also been shown that non-hierarchical has surpassed hierarchical as the structure of choice for many companies nowadays due to globalization. Therefore it should follow that women will have an advantage in obtaining decision-making positions of leadership in organizations (frequently referred to as ‘the female leadership advantage’) (Eagly & Carli, 2003;

THE GENDER FACTOR

The scarcity of women in leadership positions in almost every type of organization, including higher education institutions, appears to be a worldwide phenomenon (Heslop, 1994, as cited in Alimo-Metcalfe, 2010, p. 640). In the U.S., only 16% of college and university presidents are female (Chin, 2011, p. 2). A leading explanation for this disparity is role incongruity. Role congruity theory, as defined by Eagly & Karau (2002), is “perceived incongruity between the female gender role and leadership roles” (p. 573) leading to two forms of prejudice: perceiving women less favourably than men as potential leaders, and evaluating leadership behaviour less favourably when it is exhibited by a woman. In other words, although current leadership theories favour collaborative leadership styles, any perceived advantage this confers upon women is offset by the fact that organizational cultures often mirror social constructions of gender norms in society (Chin, p. 1) and perceive women as being less likely leaders. The consequences are that it is more difficult for women to obtain and succeed in leadership roles and that attitudes are less positive toward them when they do.

Numerous studies have examined gender bias by testing the consequences of each sex adopting male or female leadership styles. One such study (Cuadrado et al., 2008) found that when females exhibited a male-stereotypical leadership style, men evaluated them less favourably. However when males exhibited a female-stereotypical leadership
style, women did not evaluate them less favourably. In terms of effectiveness, men performed traditionally male tasks (i.e. directing and controlling others) more effectively than women and women performed traditionally female tasks (i.e. exhibiting interpersonal skills, cooperating) more effectively than men. In other words, females are at a disadvantage when they exhibit stereotypically male styles and are evaluated by men, not due to the fact that they act differently, but rather because others react differently to them (Cuadrado et al., p. 56). Furthermore, the qualities that men perceive as leadership traits are those most commonly possessed by males. Since males are more likely to hold senior management positions, they are therefore more likely to choose other males rather than females for leadership roles (Alimo-Metcalfe, 2010, p. 646).

Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra also wished to test the theory of a female leadership advantage. They studied whether or not beliefs and expectations about gender roles led to prejudice. In this experiment, participants evaluated a male or a female candidate for a leadership position in an industry that was congruent or incongruent with the candidate’s gender role. Results indicated that male candidates were more favoured overall, and that there was indeed prejudice against the female candidate, especially when she worked in an industry incongruent with her gender role. The participants also predicted that the female candidate would earn less money in the future regardless of the industry in which she worked (2006, p. 58). Interestingly, there was also a difference as to which factors attributed to the predicted success of a female and a male candidate. If a woman was predicted to be successful, it was more often attributed to external causal factors such as the need for the company to expand its staff. However if a man was
predicted to be successful, it was more often attributed to internal causal factors such as
the preparedness of the candidate. In other words, women’s success was attributed less
often to their ability than was men’s success (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, p. 58). It
appears that the so-called female advantage that women should have in obtaining
leadership positions in today’s transformational organizations is indeed undercut by the
fact that they are subject to a gender bias in our culture that results in women being
deemed less likely and less capable leaders.

LEADERSHIP AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Globalization has essentially given birth to a multitude of non-hierarchical,
transformational, participatory leadership styles, many of which are being incorporated in
higher education. The higher education field is unique due to its dual role in both the
development of new knowledge and the dissemination of existing knowledge. For many
years universities were stable environments in which change occurred slowly at a pace
dictated by the universities themselves (Davies, Hides & Casey, 2001, p. 1026). But in
the past 20 years they have been subject to substantial change: a decrease of resources,
changing student and staff demographics, a shift from teacher-centric to student learning,
the explosion of the Internet and technology, a challenge to traditional instructional
methods, increasing regulation by external agencies, public skepticism about their ability
to meet the needs of consumers, increased competition from private-sector institutions,
the blurring of service boundaries resulting from online and distance education, growing
interest in other methods of credentialing (González Sullivan, 2010, p. 559), and
extensive remodelling of operations and structure (corporatization) (Jones, Lefoe, Harvey
Further complications result from the “dynamic social, economic and policy contexts in which most colleges and universities operate (Goldring & Greenfield, 2002, as cited in Smith & Hughey, 2006, p. 159). For these reasons, higher education will be the focus in our examination of transformational leadership models.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP MODELS: A CLOSER EXAMINATION

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership has come to prominence in school leadership discourse as a means of enabling the participation and empowerment of faculty and support staff and creating more democratic schools (Hatcher, 2005, p. 253). It is defined as “a group or network of interacting individuals engaged in concertive action, creating a new organisational culture based on trust rather than regulation in which leadership is based on knowledge not position” (Hatcher, p. 254). The key factors of this model are that there are multiple leaders, the focus is on interactions rather than actions, and that these leaders can be in both formal and informal roles (Harris & Spillane, 2008, p. 31).

The discipline of industrial psychology endorses distributed leadership on the premise that “alienation and powerlessness are detrimental to the performance of workers and therefore to economic efficiency” (Kiloh, 1986, as cited in Hatcher, 2005, p. 254), whereas teamwork can improve job satisfaction, promote greater commitment and increase efficiency (Kester, Zammit & Gold, 2002, as cited in Hatcher, p. 254). For example, within an academic context some argue that the hierarchical leadership model is
unable to cope with an increasingly complex and intensive work process in which principals and department heads have become dependent on teachers and support staff to implement mandated reforms (Hatcher, p. 254). In this view, distributed leadership can exist separately from power in that the opportunity to practice leadership is provided to teachers by creating a non-hierarchical network of collaborative learning alongside the hierarchical structure of power (Hatcher, p. 255) in which it resides. While Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2008) caution that some institutions have reported difficulties in maintaining “an appropriate balance between top-down, bottom-up and lateral processes of communication and influence” (p. 364), Harris and Spillane assert that a distributed leadership model best reflects the new model of learning now emerging in schools, which is based on collaboration, networking and community partnerships (2008, p. 32).

Adding another dimension to the discussion, Jones et al. (2012) strongly promote the importance of incorporating a cross-functional as well as multi-level element to the distributed model. They note that while it is important to have all faculty or all administrative staff ‘on board’ with the model, its full potential will not be realized unless every level of employee at every department at a given institution supports it and participates actively in its implementation (p. 73).

**Servant Leadership**

Servant leadership is another transformational approach being adopted by many higher education institutions. As its name suggests, it is based on the notion of leaders serving others. In this model, leadership is team-based and promotes self empowerment. Information is shared broadly and openly and all stakeholders (faculty, support staff,
administrators and students) are encouraged to participate in the decision-making process. It is typically non-hierarchical in structure and works in a collective fashion (Kezar & Lester, 2010, p. 170).

But are institutions that function under participatory models truly as participatory as they claim? In a study exploring organizational fit problems at colleges and universities, Kezar (2001) studied a college at which the president initiated the servant leadership model because the traditional hierarchical structure did not fit with his own personal beliefs about leadership. He endorsed servant leadership because he felt it created an open environment where all employees could feel comfortable and free expressing their own opinions and working collaboratively with each other. However once the model was implemented many employees reported not feeling involved and included. Those who felt unaligned included employees with a critical perspective who were vocal or questioning, employees who were goal driven and preferred to work individually, employees who were introverted, and faculty who believed that administrative work should not be defined as leadership (p. 92). The irony was that although diversity of thought is part of the servant model this did not extend to the dissenters’ diversity of leadership beliefs, and there were attempts by some employees to coerce them into alignment or exclude them from the new model altogether. While this is only one example of a transformational approach not functioning in the intended way, it raises the important point that, if not implemented properly, a participatory model can result in being no different from an authoritative, hierarchical model, simply replacing one set of defined characteristics of leadership for another (Kezar, p. 98).
Shared Leadership

Business management supports the notion that as knowledge work (i.e. the type of intellectual capital originating from the more skilled professionals of our globalized world) becomes more team-based, it is getting increasingly difficult for any one person to maintain expertise in all aspects of an organization, which brings traditional vertical models of leadership into question (Carson, Tesluk & Marrone, 2007, as cited in Bergman, Rentsch, Small, Davenport & Bergman, 2012, p. 20). The solution proposed in this case is that leadership should be shared by team members and team leaders, rotating naturally to whoever has the key knowledge and skills for the particular issue at hand (Pearce, 2004, p. 47). In other words, shared leadership “entails a simultaneous, ongoing, mutual influence process within a team that is characterized by ‘serial emergence’ of official as well as unofficial leaders” (p. 48).

A supporting study illustrated that poorly performing teams tended to be dominated by the team leader, while teams that performed strongly utilized shared leadership by dispersing leadership responsibilities amongst all team members (Pearce & Sims, 2002, as cited in Pearce, p. 47). What distinguishes this model from others is that its proponents believe leadership from above is still necessary and critical to the overall functioning of the organization (Pearce, 2004; Bergman et al., 2012). Therefore the challenge lies in deciding when and how leadership is most appropriately shared. Pearce also echoes Bolden et al.’s concern that the top-down pressures of the competitive global environment are frequently at odds with the bottom-up pressures of a more highly
educated workforce eager to offer its advanced knowledge and make a more meaningful impact on the organization (Pearce, p. 47).

The concept of shared leadership also has applications in the educational field. One recent study carried out in the U.S. (Bright, Turesky, Putzel & Stang, 2012) illustrated how professors can use shared leadership (i.e. learner centric teaching) in the classroom. Rather than presenting lessons from the front of the classroom in a top-down, hierarchical manner, the professor instead acts as coach and facilitator, enabling students to build classroom culture collectively. The results are stronger relationships and increased initiative among the students. The discipline of organizational behaviour supports the notion of bottom-up organization on the premise that it naturally generates informal order and system-level pattern (Bunge, 2003; Bedau, 1997, as cited in Bright et al., p. 158). The elements of this approach in the classroom include encouraging learning by experimentation, allowing students to self-organize, and providing a syllabus detailing assignments and readings but leaving it up to students to determine how and when the work gets done (Bright et al., p. 161). Despite evidence of initial anxiety and confusion amongst students, final results indicated that high quality relationships were developed and students became self-empowered as they realized the impact they had on their own learning (Bright et al., p. 167). Although this study was carried out within a specific academic program, there is potential for this style of leadership to be practiced in other programs, other levels of education, and amongst employees of higher education institutions.
Responsible Leadership

A recently emerging model of leadership originates from the discipline of ethics. We have reviewed how globalization has drastically altered the ways in which most organizations do business. We have also noted that the higher education field has undergone significant change in the past 20 years in regard to the principles under which it operates. The prevailing view is that academic institutions are now run more like private corporations than ever before, and the goal of educating students is now intertwined with the goal of generating a profit (Smith & Hughey, 2006, p. 157). Due to the de-emphasis of hierarchical structures and the increased participation of employees and other stakeholders (in this case, the government, students, and local communities) in the leadership process, colleges and universities are under greater scrutiny to be responsive to the needs of business and industry and to be ethically and financially accountable for how they operate (González Sullivan, 2010, p. 567).

Responsible leadership originates from an overlap between business ethics and leadership, and addresses the question of “who is responsible for what and toward whom” (Voegtlin, Patzer & Scherer, 2012, p. 2) in an interconnected, globalized business world. It is a “value-based and through ethical principles driven relationship between leaders and stakeholders” (Pless, 2007, as cited in Voegtlin et al., p. 3) as opposed to leaders and followers. In other words, responsible leaders must encourage the exchange of opinions and establish institutional modes of communication with stakeholders and the public while carefully considering the consequences of decisions for all affected parties (Voegtlin et al., p. 12). But questions such as who decides what is morally ‘right’ and
whether good leadership necessarily constitutes good ethics must also be considered. In a heterogeneous stakeholder society, there are a multitude of conflicting norms regarding rightness and values. For this reason philosophy must also be called into play to help frame the discussion of how to address these questions (Voegtlin et al., p. 4).

Another distinguishing feature of this style of leadership is that while most leadership paradigms focus on the micro-level perspective of internal organizations (i.e. individual leadership behaviour), responsible leadership takes a cross-level approach by examining how micro-level (individual), meso-level (organization) and macro-level (societal) entities interconnect (Voegtlin et al., p. 2). For example, individual leadership action is constrained to an extent by organizations and by societal structures in that both function under socially embedded practices that contain inherent costs for those who choose not to conform. On the other hand, it is possible for individuals to shape these practices and foster changes in structural conditions over time, especially through collective action (Voegtlin et al., p. 6). Therefore the inclusion of a wider range of stakeholders in this model makes it more comprehensive and complex than some of the models above, and perhaps better suited to the realities of a globalized world and the increasingly corporatized institution of academics.

**DISCUSSION / CONCLUSION**

Just as there is much debate about why geese fly in V formations, there will always be debate as to which leadership paradigms and theories better address the inclusion of women in decision-making positions of leadership in higher education. But
an examination of the question from the perspectives of organizational behaviour, adult education, sociology, psychology, gender studies, and business ethics shed light on this issue and allow some conclusions to be drawn. In a comparison of hierarchical and non-hierarchical structures, non-hierarchical, transformational structures appear to be more advantageous for women because they better align with women’s natural affinity towards collaborative, team-based leadership approaches. Furthermore, the fact that globalization has caused more organizations than ever to transition towards non-hierarchical structures increases the number of opportunities women have to work in these environments. The gender bias resulting from role incongruity creates an impediment that undercuts the slight ‘female leadership advantage’ women should have in transformational environments, however transformational, participatory organizations are still a better option than transactional, hierarchical ones.

Of the four transformational styles examined, each has unique features: some create opportunities for transformational leadership to exist within hierarchies, some encourage the participation of other stakeholders, and some operate cross-functionally and on multiple levels. But the leadership style which shows the most promise for women is responsible leadership. If we accept the premise that higher education is becoming increasingly corporate, we can then apply the principles of business ethics to higher education and conclude that responsible leadership offers features and potential for the future that the other models do not. Since it is transformational, it better suits women’s ways of leading. It also best takes into account the effects of globalization on business because it recognizes the importance of external stakeholders and the need to
evolve dynamically with the times. Finally, it takes a cross-level approach to ensure that the needs and goals of the individual, the organization, and society will be met in an ethical way. Flying together does work best, but perfect formation and strict alignment are not necessary. Women in today’s organizations must recognize how they can effectively contribute to the common good while still taking advantage of opportunities to break formation and take flight in new directions.
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