

Who Wants Power More, Men or Women? A Cross-Cultural Comparison (U.S. V. Spain)

James Ike Schaap, PhD

Seminar Professor
School of Graduate and Continuing Studies
Norwich University
Northfield, Vermont

Miguel Blanco Callejo, PhD

Seminar Professor
School of Graduate and Continuing Studies
Norwich University
Northfield, Vermont

Abstract

These two studies examined gender differences of various types of leaders in the United States and Spain in acquiring and exerting power. This paper followed, at least obliquely, the format used by French and Raven (1959) when examining the impact of gender differences regarding the use of referent, expert, reward, coercive, and legitimate power. The research question, for both studies, was: Do men or women, from a cross-cultural standpoint, use power more; and what technique do they employ most often to achieve success? The results from both studies, suggest that women want power more than men do in order to make a positive contribution to the organization. The findings also indicate that a high percentage of people, at least in the United States, have witnessed leaders, when exerting power, use coercion, rewards, special knowledge, legitimacy, and respect to get subordinates to comply with their requests.

Keywords: Reward power, coercive power, expert power, legitimate power, referent power

1. Introduction

1.1 General Information

Gender can be defined as both men and women, and it is also a belief system. It is a principle about the characteristics of men and women. These convictions are powerful tools influencing how we perceive men and women, how we interpret what they do, and how we interact with members of both groups (Sultana & Lazim, 2011).

What is power? Is it influence over others? Is it the ability to be a strong and inspiring leader? Is power an attribute we possess naturally at birth, or is it acquired during a lifetime (Combs, 2006)? We believe that it is everywhere. You can see it, hear it, and feel it. The reality is that when we effect change, compete for resources, forge consensus, utilize relationships, and strengthen positions, we are engaging in acts of power and influence (Jacobs, 2007).

There are two types of power—socialized power and personalized power. Socialized power is used to persuade, to get things done, to achieve goals, and to meet the needs of others. Personalized power, in contrast, is used to gain power in order to satisfy a strong need for appreciation/esteem and status. An individual employing personalized power tends to exercise this power spontaneously, have little inhibition and self-control, and have a strong desire to dominate others (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2007). Therefore, it is personalized power on which the authors focused this study.

Historically, power received substantial attention during the metaphysical era of social psychology. The classic reference is Hobbes (1651), who analyzed the motivation for power and some of its social consequences. More recent discussions in the metaphysical era are those of Nietzsche (1912) and Adler (1917).

Fast forward a bit: Noted social psychologists French and Raven (1959), the godfathers of the five bases of power, specifically described five relevant but different sources of social power by which people wield power over one or more other people. The French and Raven power forms were introduced with consideration of the level at which they could be observed and the extent to which power is dependent or independent of structural conditions (Lazarsfeld & Herbert, 1961).

According to French and Raven's model (1959), the extent to which a person, P, may be swayed by another individual or group, O, depends on the relationship between the two individuals and the way P understands or comprehends O. The following example illustrates the usage of these five sources of power: reward, coercive, expert, legitimated, and referent. An individual possesses *reward power* when others believe that person can provide them with desired rewards, and *coercive power* when others believe that person can punish and/or reprimand them. Bosses, therefore, would have both reward and coercive power over their subordinates because of their apparent ability to provide rewards, such as giving workers raises and promotions, and providing punishments, such as firing or demoting workers. Individuals perceived to have expertise or knowledge in a specific domain or generally possess *expert power*. For example, physicians typically have expert power relative to their patients and lawyers relative to their clients, at least with regard to their knowledge of medicine and law, respectively. An individual possesses *legitimate power* to the extent that others believe that person has the right to wield influence over others. This may occur because that person holds a specific social role that commands respect or authority, or because others feel a certain obligation to defer to that individual. Parents typically have legitimate power with respect to their children, as do priests or ministers with respect to members of their congregations. Finally, *referent power* refers to an individual's or group's likeableness or social attractiveness to others. Friends have referent power in relation to each other, and a social group may have referent power with respect to a teenager who would like membership in the group (Carli, 1999).

1.2 Theoretical Review

In face-to-face interactions, people do not contribute to conversations equally. The leader, the one with the power, or one clique usually controls the discussion. In general, those with the higher status tend to talk more, even if they are not experts on the subject. Not surprisingly, leaders speak more than subordinates, and men speak more than women (Thompson, 2000).

Looking at the theoretical background of power, it can be seen that the concepts of power and leadership are closely linked. The French and Raven (1959) power forms are selected because, in addition to their level of observability, the extent to which power is dependent or independent of structural conditions is also critical. Dependency refers to the degree of internalization that occurs when a person is subjected to social control. Using these considerations, it is possible to link personal processes to structural conditions (Lazarfeld & Menzel, 1961).

Within this general conception of power, French and Raven (1959) were interested in the situation where a person's power consists of the ability to determine whether or not another person reaches an important goal. This ability to control another's means of goal attainment undoubtedly affects the powerful person's ability to influence the other's behavior in a wide realm of activities and, therefore, has broad repercussions. Thus, French and Raven (1959, p. 36) further defined power as: "The ability of one party of a relationship to determine whether or not the other party is carried toward his/her goals or away from them, over and above the second party's own efforts." This definition excludes power that derives from personal characteristics, power that is helpful, and power that aims to set up its own forces in the other person (French & Raven, 1959).

Lukes (2005, p. 30) maintains that power is one of those concepts that is "unavoidably value-dependent, that is, both its definition and any given use of it, once defined, are inextricably tied to a given set of value-assumptions which predetermine the range of empirical application." A more recent definition of power, as described by Johnson (2006) and cited by Kruse and Prettyman (2008, p. 454), is:

"As a social phenomenon, power is something that is exercised when two or more parties interact. Within the logic of social systems and structure, power can be thought of as the capacity of an individual or group to realize desired ends in spite of resistance offered by others."

Throughout human history, leaders have been responsible for helping groups attain important goals. Ideally, leaders use their power to steer groups toward desired outcomes. However, leaders can also use their power in their self-interest rather than effective leadership (Manner & Mead, 2010, p. 482). And quite apart from any real-world considerations, a social psychological theory without the concept of power or equivalent is inadequate. Such concepts as communications, role, attitude, expectation, and norm cannot, by themselves, account realistically for the processes of influence to which they refer, nor can they deal effectively with social change and resistance to change. Moreover, a concerted attack on the problem of coercive power should produce a major advance in the field of social psychology. Such a development will consist of an improved understanding of the proper subject-matter of social psychology and a reorganization of its conceptual systems (French & Raven, 1959).

As researchers, we had informal discussions with our prospective participants about the relationship of gender to power, especially as it related to French and Raven's (1959) five unconnected and distinctive forms of power. As a result of these casual conversations with prospective contributors, the authors decided to conduct these studies to determine who wants power more, men or women from a cross-cultural standpoint.

2. Review of the Current Literature

We based our two studies on French and Raven's (1959) five sources of power—reward, coercive, expert, legitimated, and referent—to examine how men and women relate to these forms of control, influence, and authority.

Much of the contemporary sociological debate on power revolves around the issue of the enabling nature of power. While almost 40 years old, a comprehensive account of power can be found in the discussion by Lukes (2006) of the three dimensions of power. Lukes wrote that power can be seen not only as various forms of constraint on human action but also as that which makes action possible, although in a limited scope. Much of this discussion by Lukes is related back to the works of the French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926–1984), who, following the principles of Italian political philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), saw power as "a complex strategic situation in a given society social setting." Being deeply structural, Lukes's concept involves both constraint and enablement (2006, p. 87).

Most of the following review of the literature was published in the United States because very little research has been performed in other countries about power that compares cross-cultural leadership/power discussions or encompasses a chronological series of top-level scholarly discussions about the topic of power that are directly and tangentially related. These works highlight development of the thinking of various writers about this stimulating and confrontational topic over the past 25 years. The authors approached the literature review from a chronological slant, even though it has time-line gaps, rather than a content-oriented format so that the reader can clearly understand the thinking of the various writers over this time period.

In a field study, Ragins (1990) posited that reward, legitimate, expert, and referent power were all inter-correlated—but unrelated to coercive power. Male and female managers studied, however, did not show the expected differences in combined reward, coercive, legitimate, and referent power. In addition, and contrary again to expectations of the author, female managers were observed having more expert power than male managers in like-kind positions. This could reflect, at least from this researcher's perspective, female managers' development of professional expertise as a means of overcoming organizational barriers to advancement as documented in other research by Ely (1995), Carli (1999), Nicolson (2000), and Kickul & Ingols (2005). Ragins's study (1990) illustrated the significance of equating power and using real managers in research on gender differences in perceived power in organizations.

Rosener (1990), in his field analysis within the United States, theorized that when it came to the sharing of power and information, women were willing share power and information rather than guard it. For example, although many leaders see information as power and power as a limited commodity to be coveted, women seem to be comfortable letting power and information change hands (Rosener, 1990). In addition, women believed that sharing power and information accomplished several things: it created loyalty, it enhanced the general communication flow, and it increased the odds that leaders would hear about, say, a threatening problem before it exploded. Finally, Rosener (1990) suggested that sharing power and information gives employees and coworkers the wherewithal to reach conclusions, solve problems, and see the justification for decisions.

That said, Rosener (1990) submits that allocating power and information has its risks because it allows the possibility that people will reject, criticize, or otherwise challenge what a leader has to say.

Ely (1995), who contacted just women in the United States, found that in power-based perspectives, women will evaluate women's attributes less favorably in relation to their firm's requirements for success than will male counterparts in sex-integrated firms. Furthermore, women in male-dominated firms will evaluate characteristics they attribute to men more favorably than those they attribute to women. In organizations in which women are better represented in powerful positions, women's evaluation of men and women will be comparable (Ely, 1995).

In a ten-year research investigation, Molm (1997) concluded that coercive power has many virtues, that the powerful can extract more value from their relationships.

Fennell (1999), as outlined by Grisoni and Beeby (2007, p. 195), discussed three types of power: "Power over," "power through," and "power with." "Power over" is the traditional view of power as domination that has winners and losers, "power through" is a conservative and masculine use of power, and "power through" is power that incorporates enabling negotiating and supporting the team. It is not surprising that Fennell (1999) suggested that women identify more with the actively exercised "power through" and "power with" forms of leadership. Several other authors also found that women in leadership roles are more readily associated with transformational skills and alternative power strategies (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Rosener, 1990).

Nicholson (2000) stated that men in power are wary of powerful women because when they were being groomed for power at school or university they found themselves in formal and informal decision-making contexts only with men. Nicholson (2000, p. 95) also affirmed that "women are unable to learn ways of behaving. This reinforces the notion that the senior woman had further to climb to reach the top than her male peers."

Groshev (2002) mentioned, in his article about gender perceptions of power, that power relations alter the individual's behavior. At the same time, new approaches about power are evolving in society, new interpretations, and new perceptions of it. The obscurity of power exists in people's perceptions side-by-side with individualized images and meanings. In the social sciences, a conceptual shift is taking place in the treatment of power that identifies fixed points where it comes into contact with the life of each individual and with the many differences between individuals. The characterizing features of this shift may be its emphasis on a phenomenological approach, which addresses the social, psychological, cultural, and gender prerequisites of people's interaction.

Groshev (2002, p. 19) concluded from his research that society gives more power to men while depriving or limiting the power of women and that "men and women perceive and define power differently."

O'Neil (2004) posited that gender differences do not affect the choice of tactics used to facilitate upward movement. In addition, however, a rich variety of measures of power predict the use of some upward-influence tactics (O'Neil, 2004). The more formal, static measures of power that are predictors include reporting relationship, employee support, organizational role, and the gender ratio of dominant coalition. The more informal measures of power that predict some upward influence tactics are participation in the networks of the dominant coalition and perceptions of value. That such a multitude of measures of power affect upward influence tactic usage supports the argument of structuralist theorist Kanter (1977), who contended that power results from multiple factors that are embedded within the overall organizational system.

Hede (2005), in a comparative management investigation performed in Australia, stated that women were more likely than men to exhibit the "No High Power" pattern and the "High Referent Power." He also found that women were more likely than men to use high referent power in combination with high expert power. However, males were more likely than females to rely on "High Position Power" and also to use both position and expert power (Hede, 2005).

In a study about women and power, Merrill-Sands, Kickul, and Ingols (2005) avowed that females were often undecided about power—but they were comfortable with power, respected it, and liked what they could accomplish with it. They also found that females were not shunning leadership and power. Moreover, the majority were exercising power and leadership in ways that are all-encompassing and collaborative, focusing on engaging and empowering followers to achieve organizational goals. Finally, Merrill-Sandset et al. (2005) found noteworthy interrelationships between how women were using power with others to obtain outcomes that benefited not only their organization and organizations' strategies, but also society more broadly.

Kinicki and Kreitner (2007) determined that the use of leadership power has three possible outcomes: compliance, resistance, or commitment. Compliance is gained through the use of reward, coercive, and negative legitimate power. Resistance on the part of another is usually a result of using coercive power. Commitment, however, is produced through the use of expert, referent, and positive legitimate power. Leadership, concluded Kinicki and Kreitner (2007), should strive for commitment from employees as it is intrinsically motivated rather than settle for compliance as it may be given grudgingly. This study is related, at least tangentially, to the original work of French and Raven (1959).

Kruse and Prettyman (2008, p. 457) argued, as a follow-up to Brunner's (2005, p. 131) work, that: "women often use their power different from men. This traditional feminine model casts power as power with instead of power over, focusing on connection and collaboration in the leadership process."

Schaap, Stedham, and Yamamura (2008), in a research paper that was conducted on whether male and female managers differ with respect particularly to the strategy implementation process, concluded that women used transformational leadership and an interactive management approach more than men for personal power. When looking at motivation, these same researchers found that men emphasized individual financial reward while women were rewarded not only by financial means but also through the management of subordinates and resources. Further, their results indicated that women consider task enjoyment, making friends, working with people, and helping others to be rewarding aspects of power. In contrast, men used a transactional approach to leadership with an emphasis on contingent rewards and focused on extrinsic factors such as monetary rewards. In addition, these writers felt that men tended to rely on position power as indicated by the factor they call "Need for Power." Schaap et al. (2008) also found that men preferred to base their influence on their position although this factor did not materialize for women. They concluded that the factors identified in their study supported the conclusion that men tend to be concerned with dominance and women with affiliation.

In a study performed about power and leadership in the United States and Latin America, Sen and Metzger (2010) suggested that women can emerge as effective leaders by setting their emotions aside and staying calm during decision-making. In addition, they said that women should be realistic with their goals, give themselves reality checks, and find an excellent mentor to turn to for help.

In a study of 431 participants, conducted in Spain, Lopez-Zafra, Garcia-Retamero, and Martos (2012) found important differences across the different disciplines and illustrated that emotional intelligence and gender roles can predict transformational leadership. In fact, their results showed that female participants showed larger scores in transformational leadership than male participants. Their results also demonstrated that femininity, emotional clarity, and emotional repair are predictor of transformational leadership.

In a study performed in Germany, Schuh et al. (2014) found that women consistently reported lower power motivation than men. Further, their results were robust in regard to several methodological variations including samples from different populations, diverse operations of power motivation, and leadership role occupancy as well as study design.

It appears, according to the review of recent literature performed in this study that the relationship of power and gender is a well-researched subject in the scholarly community. It is apparent, as stated in the authors' introduction, that power is everywhere.

3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this paper is threefold: (1) to review the present state of knowledge from cross-cultural/global articles in this research field, if possible; (2) to determine if the results from this study challenge some key assumptions already made by other researchers in this field; and (3) to situate the findings of this study in the existing scholarly research stream.

4. Research Question

As outlined above, in *Studies of Social Power*, French and Raven (1959, p.165) distinguished five key types of social power: "referent power, expert power, reward power, coercive power, and legitimate power."

We, in reviewing the work of French and Raven (1959), wanted to find out whether men or women, from a cross-cultural standpoint, use power more and what technique they employ most often to achieve this status.

5. Research Hypotheses

Based on the research question, we developed six hypotheses that are directly as well as obliquely related to the initial five separate and distinct forms of power identified by French and Raven (1969).

Hypothesis 1: Men, as leaders, are more likely than women to use coercion to get their subordinates to obey their instructions.

Hypothesis 2: Men, as leaders, are more likely than women to use rewards to get their subordinates to conform to them.

Hypothesis 3: Men, as leaders, are more likely than women to use their authority to get their subordinates to obey them.

Hypothesis 4: Men, as leaders, are more likely than women to use their special knowledge in order to influence subordinates.

Hypothesis 5: Women, as leaders, are more likely than men to get subordinates to comply with them out of respect.

Hypothesis 6: Women want power more than men do because they feel they can make a positive contribution to the organization.

6. Methods

6.1 Sample

The questionnaire, which was used both in the United States and in Spain, was based on the participants' own perspectives about this topic and was developed in two stages. First, a pilot study was performed in the United States using a convenience sampling approach. A self-designed survey was given to 26 adult men and women who worked in different types of organizations, and their comments were incorporated into the final instrument. A second but very similar self-designed instrument was then selected because we could not find an intact cross-cultural feedback form that was developed by another researcher(s) in the literature.

Data from this study were first collected from graduate students at one university who were about to graduate and their family members, who came from all over the United States, to attend commencement ceremonies. Then, we collected data from college undergraduate students in Spain who were just one year away of their graduation ceremony.

The intention of this feasibility investigation, which was based on the participants' perceptions, was to determine if there were any ambiguous or irrelevant questions as well as to establish the face validity of this instrument. Although the authors did not find any vague or irrelevant questions in the pilot study, they did change a few words to make them easier to understand.

Table 1, which is data from the United States, summarizes the statistics of the sample. The survey contributors ranged in age from 21 to over 60, with the highest percent (e.g., 35.1%) falling in the 31-40-year age group. Another 29.7% of the respondents fell in the 21-30-year age group. The remaining 35.2% of the participants were from the other three age group categories (e.g. 41-50, 51-60, and over 60). From an ethnicity standpoint, 76.6% of the participants were White; Latinos comprised 7.7% of the respondents, while Blacks and Asians each made up 5.9% of the total responses. The remaining participants made up 4.1%, all from different ethnic groups. Because of the authors' convenience sampling approach, the educational level was unusually high in that 72.1% of the participants had earned a master's degree, another 13.1% of the respondents had received a bachelor's degree, and the remaining 14.7% held other types of educational diplomas. From a job title standpoint, 18.5% of the respondents were middle-level managers, 17.1% of the participants were front-line employees, and another 12.6% were in the Armed Forces. The remaining 51.8% of the survey contributors held 14 other different types of jobs, including some being retired, unemployed, or unemployed because of a disability.

Table 2, which is data from Spain, also recaps that sample's statistics. All the survey contributors, unlike those from the United States, ranged in age from 21 to over 30. While only 7.7% of the respondents in the United States were Hispanic, 100% of the participants in Spain were Hispanic, 60.1% Latino and 39.9% Latina. Unlike the participants from the United States –all of the contributors in Spain had only *some* college involvement and were in the middle of their graduating studies.

From a job experience standpoint, 43.4% of the respondents in Spain were front-line employees, 49.4% were unemployed. According to Spanish Labor Survey *Encuesta de Poblacion Activa* data, the severe unemployment rate for people under 25 increased from 39.1% in 2009 to 55.1% in 2012. Only 2.4% of those employed held leadership positions. In comparison, only 4.9 of the participants in the United States were unemployed, while 48.8% held leadership positions, 17.1% were front-line employees, and 34.1% held other work titles.

6.2 Statistical Analysis

Expected frequencies were computed using the marginal totals for answers and for genders. For example, the expected frequency of responses for men choosing *answer 1* was the proportion of all respondents choosing *answer 1* multiplied by the number of men answering that question and divided by the total number of respondents for that question.

The adjusted frequency tables were tested for differences in response distributions between men and women using a chi-square (X^2) test of independence in Microsoft Excel 2010. The probability of the null hypothesis (H_0 : no difference in distribution by gender) was computed using $P(H_0) = CHISQ.TEST$ function. The actual chi-square value was computed from the resulting $P(H_0)$ using $CHISQ.INV(P(H_0),df)$ where degrees of freedom (df) = number of response categories – 1.

For verification of the calculations, the chi-square for independence was computed separately for each table as $X^2 = \sum(o-e)^2/e$ where o = observed frequency and e = expected frequency for each cell. Each X^2 was compared automatically to the previously computed value to identify any errors. The $P(H_0)$ for each X^2 was also independently computed as $P(H_0) = CHISQ.DIST.RT(X^2,df)$ and independently compared with the previously calculated $P(H_0)$ to identify any errors.

6.3 Results—Quantitative Analysis

Question 12 on the questionnaire, which sex pursues power more to make a positive contribution? showed statistically significant results for both the United States and Spain. All the others had $P(H_0) > 0.05$ and could, therefore, not be shown to have statistically significant differences in responses (e.g., at least by gender).

Question 12: Which Sex Pursues Power More to Make a Positive Contribution?

DESCRIPTION – UNITED STATES	MEN	WOMEN	TOTAL
Males	16	7	23
Females	31	48	79
Both males and females want power equally	67	30	97
Not sure	18	5	23
Total	132	90	222

Note: $X^2 = 21.463$ with 3 df $P(H_0) = 8.43E-05^{***}$

DESCRIPTION – SPAIN	MEN	WOMEN	TOTAL
Males	9	5	14
Females	13	34	47
Both males and females want power equally	32	38	70
Not sure	13	24	37
Total	67	101	168

Note: $P(0) = 1.2E-05$

DESCRIPTION – COMBINED (U.S. & Spain)	MEN	WOMEN	TOTAL
Males	25	12	37
Females	44	82	126
Both males and females want power equally	99	68	167
Not sure	31	29	60
Total	289	101	390

Note: $P(0) = 1.2E-05$

The results highlight that regardless of culture (e.g., at least in the United States and Spain), women are more likely to pursue power for its ability to make a positive impact. By combining both studies, the larger sample size now allows for a more accurate conclusion. In our combined analysis, the CHISQ-TEST still showed a significant difference ($P[H_0] = 0.000012$).

In our first study (e.g., the United States), Question 9 did not show a difference in gender perception. However, after combining both studies, it did (see below). With a CHISQ-TEST of 0.0169, men, more than women, believe leaders like to share their leadership with others.

Question 9: Do you believe your Supervisor Likes to share his/her Leadership with others?

DESCRIPTION – COMBINED (U.S. & Spain)	MEN	WOMEN	TOTAL
Always	4	4	8
Very Often	34	18	52
Fairly Often	35	38	73
Sometimes	43	40	83
Almost Never	56	66	122
Never	14	20	34
Not Applicable	10	5	15

And lastly, when comparing the perceptions of men and women from the United States to the ones in Spain, we saw significant discrepancies in almost all questions. The only question in which we do not see a major difference for was Question 7 (e.g., Do you believe that your immediate (first-line) supervisor likes to wield the power of his/her leadership position to influence or coerce subordinates?) ($P[H_0] = 0.2975$). This describes the significant difference culture makes toward perceptions on power.

6.4 Results—Descriptive Analysis

Where explanations (e.g., using Likert-scale responses) were provided by the participants, several questions provided the most interesting results.

For Q1, both set of participants were asked if they agreed with the Webster's definition of power. Twenty nine percent of U.S. men and 36% of U.S. women strongly agreed with Webster's definition of power, while only 18% of Spanish men and only 11% of Spanish women strong agreed with this definition.

In regards to Q2, 20.7% of the total U.S. participants said they have seen coercion used very often while only 8.3% of the Spaniards said they saw coercion used.

Looking at Q4, 41.1% of the Americans said that they have witnessed "very often" their leaders use their authority to influence others while only 24.4% of the Spaniards have observed the same.

For Q6, while only 9.5% of Americans stated that they have "never seen" their leaders use respect to influence others, 24.4% of the Spaniards stated the same.

Through our analysis of Q2, Q4, and Q6, American saw more incidents of their supervisors using power, leading us to conclude that Americans use power often than Spaniards.

Finally, when examining Q10, Q11, Q12, and Q13, 2.7%, 2.7%, 10.4%, and 4.5% of the U.S. participants answered "not sure", while 7.1, 11.9%, 22.2%, and 12.6% of the Spaniard chose "not sure," reaffirming Hofstede's (2001) dimensions that Spaniards are much more risk adverse.

7. Summary and Discussion

Over the past decade, women have made great strides to breakdown the "glass ceiling". While women are making great strides into management, the glass ceiling has been raised from the entry and staff levels but still remains intact at the highest levels in organizations (Castaño et al., 2010; De Cabo et al., 2011; Heard, 2001; Joanin, 2012). Although much progress has been made, scholars all over the world have been trying to explain why women are still being underrepresented in leadership roles. With no discrimination laws in Spain (<http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2013/07/08/2266831/number-of-women-ceos-at-major-companies-jumps-by-4-percent>) or even most of the world, why is this happening? There are several theories that try to describe the underlying reasons behind this unequal distribution. According to Eagly and Karau (2002), underrepresentation is due to social roles engrained throughout certain cultures.

They focus on two specific forms of prejudice: Women are perceived less favorably than men as potential leaders, and leadership qualities are perceived less favorably when enacted by a women. These explanations are, however, different from research by Colarelli et al. (2006) who described this phenomenon with evolutionary principles. Colarelli et al. (2006, p. 176) stated, “Sex differences in power are due to the differences in the way men and women use influence behaviors in small group, and these differences were sculpted in part by natural selection.”

Although work by Eagly and Karau (2002) as well as Colarelli et al. (2006) provide great explanations to this problem, Schuh’s et al. (2014) article has a direct correlation with our studies. In Schuh’s et al. (2014) research, it is shown that the intrinsic motivation for power is a key factor for holding a leadership role.

Our participants were specifically asked, “Based on what you have witnessed in the workplace, which sex has a stronger attitude towards wanting power?” We can perceive this question as a motivation for power. In both of our studies, men dramatically outscored women. There is, however, a silver lining because it is shown motivation can be altered through role models and classes. One technique, which has been confirmed through our studies, is that regardless of culture, women definitely want power more than men so that they can make a *positive* contribution to the organization. This was verified with both studies with a confidence level of 0.99.

This leads us to believe that if we can promote the fact that attaining power will allow women to make a positive contribution not only to the company but also society, this will increase their level of intrinsic motivation. Ultimately, this research helps reaffirm previous studies on motivation and highlights factors that can help lead to a more globally gender-diverse leadership workforce.

In performing a thorough literature review in this subject, one that spanned 25 years of publications, we found that prior research has devoted a fair amount of attention to further studying French and Raven’s (1959) five distinctive outlines of power. Still, little research has been performed about cross-cultural power relationships.

8. Limitations and Implications

After analyzing the data it is evident that Americans have witnessed more incidents of leaders using different forms of “power” to influence their subordinates than Spaniards. There could be many reasons for this. First, it may be because our Spanish sample population had significantly less work experience than our American participants. Second, culture could be the underlying reason, with the Americans being very outwardly direct and the Spaniards being more reticent. Third, this was a very practical method of collecting data, and the participants were not randomly selected. That said, with all of the Spanish participants being undergraduate college students, and a majority of the United States contributors being graduate students, this sample size might not accurately reflect the overall demographic. Also, our studies results must be interpreted with certain caveats in mind. First, survey data are prone to errors of leniency, acquiescence, and halo effects (Brownell, 1995). Biases related to such errors may be present in the data. Second, survey respondents were not randomly selected, thus possibly affecting the internal validity of this study—they were selected strictly out of convenience (e.g., the authors only interviewed, after the pilot study was completed, college students (e.g., and their friends/family members who attended the graduation ceremonies at one U.S. university). While this group was readily available, and while this is a very practical method for collecting data, the participants themselves may be unlike most of the constituents in a given target population (Fink, 2003). Third, the population of 222 responses, for the United States, and 168, for Spain, might be considered small and could still be perceived as significantly limiting. Nonetheless, we had replies that were larger in number than some of the other researchers cited in this study. And, fourth, our studies ‘survey questions did not really test reality because they were observations of behavior and/or perceptions used by the participants. As such, the data is based on subjective opinions of the participants and may/may not be authentic. Therefore, the survey instrument used in these studies only measured attitudes and were reflections of opinions. The outcomes, therefore, are considered generalizable and not necessarily conclusive.

Even though much more work needs to be pursued in this topic, these admonitions notwithstanding, the outcome of this report has some theoretical and practical implications.

9. Acknowledgments

Statistical analysis was performed by M. E. Kabay, PhD, CISSP-ISSMP, Professor of Computer Information Systems, School of Business and Management, College of Professional Schools, Norwich University, Northfield, Vermont. Additional statistical analysis was completed by a student researcher – Anthony Le, Senior, College of Business, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada.

10. References

- Adler, A. (1917). A study of organ inferiority and its psychic compensations. *Trans. Nerv. ment. DisMonogr. Ser.*
- Brownell, P. (1995). *Research methods in management accounting. Accounting Research Methodology Monograph No. 2.* Coopers & Lybrand, Melbourne, Australia.
- Brunner, C. (2005). Women performing the superintendency: Problematizing the normative alignment of conceptions of power and constructions of gender. In J. Collard & C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Leadership, gender and culture in education: Male and female perspectives*, (pp. 121-135). New York: Open University.
- Carli, L. L. (1999). Gender, interpersonal power, and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 81-99.
- Castaño, C., Martin, J., Vasquez, S., & Martinex, J. L. (2010, September). Female executives and the glass ceiling in Spain. *International Labour Review*, 149(3), 343-360.
- Colarelli, S. M., Spranger, J. L., & Hechanova, R. (2006). Women, power, and sex composition in small groups: an evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 163-184.
- Combs, E. 2006. *Women in power.* Stockton, CA: More Heart than Talent Publishing, Inc.
- De Cabo, R. M., Gimeno, R., & Escot, L. (2011). Disentangling discrimination on Spanish boards of directors. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 19(1), 77-95.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 807-834.
- Ely, R. J. (1995). The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 589-634.
- Encuesta de Poblacion Activa. Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). Retrieved from <http://www.ine.es>, January 18, 2015.
- Fennell, H. A. (1999). Power in the principalship: Four women's experiences. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37, 23-49.
- Fink, A. (2003). *How to sample in surveys* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fox, W. (2003). *Social statistics: A text using MicroCase®* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- French, R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Grisoni, L. & Beeby, M. (2007). Leadership, Gender, and Sense-making. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 14 (May), 191-209.
- Groshev, I. V. (2002). Gender perceptions of power. *Sociological Research* 41 (January-February), 5-20.
- Heard, M. (2001). Is the glass ceiling breaking for women? *The Practical Accountant*, 34(7), 56.
- Hede, A. (2005). White paper. Patterns of power and leadership: Understanding total behaviour leadership. The Australian Institute of Management – Qld&Nt, (June), 1-18.
- Hobbes, T. *Leviathan.* (1651). Reprint of 1st ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1904.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jacobs, D. (2007, September/October). Powerplay: Women, leadership, and the getting of power. *Ivey Business Journal*, online, p. 1).
- Joannin, P. (2012). Women in Europe: more women in leading positions. *European View*, 11, 163-174.
- Johnson, B. (2006). The political context of decision making in educational leadership. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Education Administration. San Antonio, Texas.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kinicki, A., & Kreitner, R. (2007). *Organizational behavior.* Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Kruse, S. D., & Prettyman, S. S. (2008). Women, leadership, and power revisiting the Wicked Witch of the West. *Gender and Education*, 20(5), 451-464.
- Lazarsfeld, P., & Menzel, H. (1961). On the relation between individual and collective properties. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *Complex organizations: A sociological reader.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Lopez-Zafra, E., Garcia-Retamero, R., & Martos P. B. (2012). The relationship between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence from a gendered approach. *The Psychological Record*, 62, 97-114.
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A radical View.* Basingstoke. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Lukes, S. (2006). Power: A radical view. *Crossroads*, 6, 87-95.

- Manner, J. K., & Mead, N. L. (2010). The essential tension between leadership and power: When leaders sacrifice group goals for the sake of self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(3), 482-497.
- Merrill-Sands, D., Kickul, J., & Ingols, C. (2005, February). Women pursuing leadership and power: Challenging the myth of the "Opt Out Revolution." *Insights*(February). Boston: MA.
- Molm, L. D. (1997). *Coercive power in social exchange*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nicolson, P. (2000, April). Barriers to women's success. *Psychology, Evolution & Gender*, 2(1), 91-96.
- Nietzsche, F. (1912). *Der wille zur macht*. Book 3, sec. 702. In *Nietzsche's complete Werke*, vol. 16. Leipzig: Alfred Kröner, 11912.
- O'Neil, J. (2004). Effects of gender and power on PR managers' upward influence. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, XVI(Spring), 127-144.
- Ragins, B. R. (1990). Gender and perceived power in manager-subordinate relations. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(December), 273-287.
- Rosener, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 119-125.
- Schaap, J. I., Stedham, Y., & Yamamura, J. H. (2008). Casino management: Exploring gender-based differences in perceptions of managerial work. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27 (March), 87-97.
- Schuh, S. C., Bark, A. S., Quaquebeke, N. V., Hossiep, R., Frieg, P., & Dick, R. V. (2014). Gender differences in leadership role occupancy: the mediating role of power motivation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120, 363-379.
- Sultana, A. M., & Lazim, A. S. (2011, December). Gender studies in teacher education: An empirical research. *Asian Social Science*, 7(12), 168-174.
- Think Progress. (2013). <http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2013/07/08/2266831/number-of-women-ceos-at-major-companies-jumps-by-4-percent>).
- Thompson, L. (2000). *Making the team*. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Table 1:U.S.A. Sample Statistics (N = 222)

Category	Male	Female	Total
AGE			
21-30	39	27	66
31-40	48	30	78
41-50	26	16	42
51-60	13	16	29
Over 60	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	132	90	222
ETHNICITY			
White	105	65	170
Latino or Hispanic	11	6	17
Black	7	6	13
Native American	3	2	5
Pacific Islander	0	1	1
Asian	4	9	13
Other	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	132	90	222
EDUCATION			
12 th Grade or Less	1	0	1
High School	2	1	3
Some College	5	6	11
Associate Degree	1	4	5
Bachelor Degree	17	12	29
Master Degree	93	67	160
Professional Degree	4	0	4
Doctoral Degree	9	0	9
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	132	90	222
TITLE			
Business Owner	5	5	10
CEO and/or President	1	1	2
GM or Assistant General Mgr.	1	5	6
Senior or Executive VP	1	0	1
Vice President	3	1	4
CFO, Controller, COO, CIO	3	1	4
Director	5	4	9
Senior-level Manager	9	2	11
Middle-level Manager	20	21	31
Supervisor	11	9	20
Front-line Employee	18	20	38
Armed Forces	22	6	28
Educator	9	8	17
Retired	3	1	4
Unemployed	7	4	11
Disabled – does not work	0	1	1
Other	<u>14</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	132	90	222

Category	Male	Female	Total
AGE			
21-30	101	67	168
31-40	0	0	0
41-50	0	0	0
51-60	0	0	0
Over 60	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	101	67	168
ETHNICITY			
White	0	0	0
Latino or Hispanic	101	67	168
Black	0	0	0
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	101	67	168
EDUCATION			
12 th Grade or Less	0	0	0
High School	0	0	0
Some College	101	67	168
Associate Degree	0	0	0
Bachelor Degree	0	0	0
Other Degrees	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	101	67	168
TITLE			
Business Owner	2	1	3
CEO and/or President	0	0	0
GM or Assistant General Mgr.	0	0	0
Senior or Executive VP	0	0	0
Vice President	0	0	0
CFO, Controller, COO, CIO	1	0	1
Director	0	0	0
Senior-level Manager	0	0	0
Middle-level Manager	0	0	0
Supervisor	1	1	2
Front-line Employee	35	38	73
Armed Forces	0	0	0
Educator	1	3	4
Retired	0	0	0
Unemployed	60	23	83
Disabled – does not work	0	0	0
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	101	67	168