WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP: CHANGING PERSPECTIVES AND REAL-WORLD SITUATIONS

Dr Zoofishan Hayat

School of Computing, Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of the West of Scotland. United Kingdom, zoofishan.hayat@uws.ac.uk

Abstract

Women have progressively gravitated towards achieving enhanced gender parity in their households and professional settings. However, women remain inadequately symbolised in leadership positions and are still regarded as an exception compared to men, particularly in high-level leadership posts inside educational institutions. When comparing the leadership approaches of men and women, the focus should be on the contrasting challenges they encounter rather than their specific actions. Conventional gender-based norms can limit their expression of leadership behaviours. The perception of a mismatch between women and leadership positions creates barriers to leadership and leads to situations where women face conflicting expectations, receive more unfavourable evaluations of their accomplishments, and are held to different criteria than males. It is becoming evident that a perspective on leadership that does not differentiate between genders is insufficient. We must consider the impact of cultural beliefs and the process of socialisation in forming leadership approaches. There is substantial evidence to indicate that feminist approaches to leadership are deliberately distinct, emphasising greater collaboration and development than men. The situation becomes more intricate when we incorporate the aspects of ethnic and cultural variation. We must revise our perspectives on leadership to encourage the adoption of more comprehensive theories and varied approaches to successful leadership. Contemporary leadership concepts prioritise revolutionary and interactive leadership approaches. However, organisational cultures frequently reflect societal conventions about ethnicity and race. In the realm of higher education institutions, there is frequently a conflict between hierarchy and participatory approaches of leadership, which is seen in contrasting sets of procedures. Although women leaders may possess certain advantages in such situations, they also encounter challenges when transforming organisational structures that reflect societal prejudices against women in leadership positions.

Keywords: Women, Leadership, World perspective, Higher education

Lack of adequate Representation:

Women have progressively gravitated towards enhanced equal opportunity in domestic and professional settings. Men's involvement in domestic tasks and parenting has increased due to modifications to gender stereotypes and behaviours. The social norms dictating proper behaviour and the expectations of gender categories have become more adaptable, allowing for greater fairness and equality within the context of marriage. Women possess a greater capacity to manage

both domestic and societal spheres with ease and autonomy. A significant number of women are currently employed outside their homes, accounting for more than 45% of the workforce in the United States (Krefting, 2003). Significant alterations have occurred, while several aspects have remained unchanged. The presence of women in senior positions in enterprises, organisations of higher educational institutes, and the political sphere remains insufficient, particularly considering the shifting population demographics (Kelly, 2014).

Women constitute 22% of CEOs in the United States (Mathe, Michie and Nelson, 2016). Despite the growing number of women entering academics, only a tiny proportion of them achieve top positions in educational institutions (Van der Lippe and Van Dijk, 2002). Currently, more than 400 women serve as presidents of U.S. colleges and universities, which accounts for 15 per cent of all administrators. Over the past 20 years, the number of women in these leadership positions has increased more than threefold (Chin, 2011; Hoyt, 2010; Bowles and McGinn, 2005; Hill et al., 2016). In 2006, more than 85% of the presidents were of white ethnicity, while 24% were women. Many female administrators were in charge of tiny, privately owned higher education institutions or community colleges (Kerr, Kerr and Miller, 2014; Kazak, 2022; Zheng and Carpenter-Hubin, 1999). Women are still regarded as an exception in comparison to men while occupying senior leadership positions. The presence of conflicting depictions of women in leadership roles creates barriers to their leadership and frequently leads to using different criteria compared to men. Female leaders are often seen as either ineffectual and gentle or authoritarian and cunning (Kark and Eagly, 2010; Eagly, 2007; Appelbaum, Audet and Miller, 2003). The complexity of this image is heightened by its engagement with differences in race and ethnicity (Carli and Eagly, 2011).

Does leadership differ between men and women?

The answer to this question is nuanced; it is both affirmative and negative. Theories of Leadership often overlook or disregard the influence of gender, treating all leaders as equal (Appelbaum, Audet and Miller, 2003). Additionally, research on leadership tends to neglect gender disparities or primarily focus on the experiences of white men. Conventional beliefs and women's accounts frequently point out specific approaches to leadership and traits linked to ethnicity. However, scientific research on gender and leadership, such as the study by Carli and Eagly (2011), often reveals that men and women leaders exhibit more similarities than differences when they hold identical jobs. What is the reason for the enduring robustness of these opinions? Leaders often exhibit attributes that are not necessarily indicative of outstanding leadership, yet they tend to appreciate these qualities. Terms such as "he possesses the qualities of a leader; he exudes leadership qualities"; charm, inspiring, are all terminology employed to delineate leaders (Kawakami, White and Langer, 2000). Leaders typically embody the desires of their subordinates, which are subsequently shaped by societal perceptions of leadership that are linked to gender stereotypes and their consequent effects on approaches to leadership. The systematic review conducted by Snaebjornsson and Edvardsson (2013) found no gender disparities in organisational research on the relational vs task-driven management approach.

Nevertheless, distinct gender disparities did arise in controlled laboratory tests and evaluation studies, specifically in investigations where participants were not specifically chosen for their leadership roles. It appears that interpersonal beliefs and standards have an impact on the leadership habits of women. Specifically, women tend to adopt more interpersonal leadership approaches when evaluating themselves or when they are assigned leadership positions in research settings (Rowley, Hossain and Barry, 2010). Men adhered more closely to cultural norms by displaying more excellent task orientation, self-assertiveness, and motivation to dominate their surroundings, while women adhered more closely to societal standards by displaying more incredible communication abilities, selflessness, and care for others. This is commonly recognised as a focus on individuals rather than tasks, with women being perceived as having a favourable position (Keup et al., 2001; Chugh and Sahgal, 2007). Compelling data indicates that women tend to exhibit a mode of leadership that tends to be interactive, supportive, or accessible, whereas males tend to exhibit an approach that is more controlling, aggressive, or authoritarian. Various investigations have observed this pattern (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Jackson, 2001). While hiring requirements for leadership roles may mitigate gender disparities, women appear to actively exhibit distinct traits, such as more collaboration, stemming from variations in character and interpersonal abilities. Incorporating an interactive method is becoming increasingly vital in the perception of successful Leadership (Elmuti and Davis, 2009).

Do women leaders face discrimination?
Leaders are frequently attributed with attributes that are unique to their personality. Leaders are often seen as individuals who motivate their followers to align their behaviour with the leader's objectives. This can be achieved through various means, such as 1) serving as a role approach by setting a positive example, 2) possessing specific skills that benefit the organisation, 3) demonstrating initiative and a strong drive for innovation, 4) having charisma, which entails being attractive to others and using this appeal to motivate them, 5) being inspirational by instilling passion and creating an environment that brings out the best in individuals, and 6) displaying commitment and vision by having a clear sense of purpose or being driven by a mission. Nevertheless, it remains uncertain how gender, colour, and ethnicity complicate these evaluations of leadership and the bestowal of leadership positions (Kiamba 2009).

Pervasive racism and aversive femininity
Johnson et al. (2008) propose that when there is an apparent disparity between the traditional female position in society and leadership positions, it results in biased evaluations of women in posts of leadership. The presence of women in leadership roles can be seen as contradictory. Cuadrado, Morales and Recio (2008) discovered that women leaders were assessed distinctly and less favourably compared to men, even though they exhibited the same leadership characteristics. Consequently, women and ethnic minorities are frequently subjected to higher standards and demands due to societal beliefs, which are more demanding compared to those imposed on white men. Dovidio, Kawakami and Gaertner (2013) have also described these prejudices as reactive

discrimination, which refers to unintended or unintentional discriminatory assessments of racial/ethnic minority individuals due to fundamental concern about racial or ethnic origin. Women and racial preconceptions about social positions have been observed to impact the abilities of women and individuals belonging to racial or ethnic minorities. According to Steele, Spencer and Aronson (2002), these individuals may also perform poorly when faced with circumstances being assessed in a field where they are considered substandard based on assumptions. This is referred to as generalised risk. Assessments of leaders frequently encompass traits linked to leaders and leadership; however, they have minimal correlation with productivity. Due to the historical dominance of white males in leadership roles, assessments of leadership efficiency tend to prioritise traits associated with males, such as tall stature, whiteness, and masculinity. As a result, the presence of masculine norms and the assumptions about the appearance of a leader creates biased settings that work against women and leaders from racial/ethnic minority backgrounds. It presents unique obstacles that are not encountered by white Anglo-Saxon guys.

Authoritative Leadership

Expresses similar apprehensions regarding appearance, as well as in the recommendation to dress for achievement. Although this is relevant to both men and women, an individual's physical traits and conduct can convey pictures and impressions that are not frequently connected with leadership based on gender and race. Women face greater complexity due to the tendency to characterise them based on their dress choices. The attire they choose to wear may serve as an interruption or reinforce stereotypical notions of being too feminine or ethnically specific, thereby undermining their perceived leadership qualities. Another factor that can undermine trust is the communication habits of women, characterised by softer and higher-pitched opinions, which may be interpreted as less authoritative compared to the solid and resonant voices typically associated with men. This is seen in the frequent observation of women being disregarded or denied the opportunity to speak among others, which serves as a means of disempowering them.

Outcomes evaluations

Women are subject to more unfavourable evaluations than men, even when they exhibit the same leadership traits. Women leaders face prejudice in assessments of their performance and perspectives on their leadership practices (Keohane, 2020). This frequently puts individuals in a dilemma where they feel obligated to adhere to conflicting responsibilities linked to leadership and gender. Should they conform to traditional gender roles and be seen as submissive, or assert themselves as influential leaders and be seen as too dominant? While contemporary firms generally adhere to standards that are more aligned with men, women leaders may face disadvantages when they exhibit actions that defy these standards or are forced to adapt to these practices (Bowles and McGinn, 2005).

Diverse and overlapping Identities

Modern leadership theories support the idea of authenticity in leaders, which means they should clearly understand their own identity, beliefs, and values (Youssef and Luthans, 2012; Mendenhall et al., 2012; Cohen, 2010). Hartung et al. (2009) advocate for a high degree of integration in leadership theory and research that examines the dynamic interaction between leaders and supporters. This approach considers the past, present, and future context to articulate the factors that genuinely enhance or cultivate leadership. Luthans and Avolio (2003) refer to this as authentic leadership growth. Although approaches to leadership suggest that race and ethnicity have little bearing on leadership, it is evident that cultural perspectives, gender role socialisation, and diverse lived experiences influence an individual's perspective on leadership and approach. The task of maintaining authenticity as a leader becomes more complicated when one has to navigate and reconcile various overlapping characteristics. Women belonging to different ethnic and racial communities may exhibit distinct leadership approaches that are more in line with their distinctive worldviews and cultural backgrounds (Ely and Rhode, 2010). They could think of themselves not only as leaders but also as women, as individuals of specific racial or ethnic backgrounds, as moms, and so on, all of which overlap and influence each other. These problems encompass the need to combine jobs and relatives, fulfil monitoring duties, meet standards for gender roles, and maintain connections and affiliations with multiple groups, all while expressing their Leadership (Porterfield and Kleiner, 2005). The existing body of scholarship on discrimination based on gender in leadership has demonstrated that the divergence lies not primarily in the actions performed by women and leaders from racial/ethnic minority backgrounds in their leadership roles but instead in the distinct challenges they encounter while assuming leadership positions. Due to the inclination to perceive characteristics of women and racial/ethnic minority groups as unfavourable or lacking, as they are seen as anomalies or distinct, leadership becomes a distinct encounter (Gipson et al., 2017).

The study Women and Leadership (Chandler, 2011) analysed the leadership qualities of over 100 feminist women who held positions of authority. Although a significant number of individuals favoured a feminist leadership approach that emphasised collaboration and inclusivity, they believed that such an approach was not officially supported throughout the organisations they were in charge of. Feminist women frequently pursued leadership roles to accomplish social justice objectives, aiming to be visionary in their approach, powerful in their acts, and committed to moral principles (Adler and Osland 2016). These ideas were frequently perceived as conflicting with the pursuits of position and authority that are usually connected with men. A significant number of women experienced limitations in adhering to organisational rules shaped by masculine standards and had to make concessions in their leadership approaches to achieve effectiveness, even if it meant compromising their feminist values. The practice of leadership gets more intricate when we include inclusion, encompassing factors such as ethnic background, capability position, and gender identities (McEldowney, Bobrowski and Gramberg, 2009). In order to have a more thorough knowledge of how diversification affects crucial phenomena like leadership, it is necessary to go above considering only one aspect of an individual's personality and instead explore the various and interconnected identities that individuals possess (Levitt, 2010). Case studies indicate that

African American women may exhibit a leadership approach characterised by directness and self-confidence, while Asian American women may exhibit a leadership approach characterised by dignity and respect (Sales, Burke and Cannonier, 2020). However, some individuals may interpret the assertive and direct approach of an African American woman as threatening, while others may view the deferential and instructive approach of an Asian American woman as submissive.

These criteria are expected to impact the ability to attain roles of leadership and evaluations of their efficacy as leaders. McLane-Davison (2013) define black feminist leaders as individuals who, from the overlapping perspectives of gender and racial background, create opportunities, establish guidance, and amplify the voices of black women. In their conversations, Parker (2004) discovered that Asian American women leaders embraced a collectivistic perspective in their leadership approaches and employed multifaceted concepts to attain their leadership objectives. According to Fox, Luna-Firebaugh and Williams (2015), Native American women perceive their leadership as rising with their males rather than being subordinate in order to protect their communities and uphold the terms of their treaties. They will not disassociate from their male counterparts] due to the inherent peril posed by the broader society towards their male counterparts if they were to disassociate. These case examples warrant additional scrutiny since they indicate varying leadership approaches influenced by cultural disparities. Chin et al. (2007, p. 57) argue that African American women have demonstrated strong leadership abilities while facing adverse circumstances and navigating structures of authority that often exclude their perspectives. African American women leaders often employ straightforward approaches and harness our frustration as a tool to express reality, even if it goes against common opinion. Within a framework of persistent discrimination and hierarchical authority, the African American perspective emphasises the significance of respect and equity in embracing leadership. This method prioritises equality and fairness. According to Helgesen (2017), Asian American women may employ a greater degree of informal interaction in their leadership approaches (Nguyen, 2020). Asian cultures prioritise the equilibrium of opposing forces and place importance on incorporating diverse viewpoints, which enhances Leadership (Ashkanasy, 2002).

Researchers examine the impact of hierarchical structures on communication approaches among leaders and authoritative individuals in Asian cultures. This leads to the assumption and inclination of Asian leaders to use communication as a means of imparting knowledge or expressing ethical messages. In Asian culture, leaders are attributed with benign leadership when communications take place in an environment that emphasises familial connections and seniority (Arun and Kahraman Gedik, 2022). These examples indicate that women leaders from different backgrounds may have varying perspectives on confidence and demonstrate their leadership through distinct approaches. However, their leadership competency and efficiency might be determined by societal preconceptions and standards associated with their social responsibilities. Asian American women may benefit from acquiring the skill of self-promotion while maintaining their self-respect or from developing assertiveness despite the cultural emphasis on attention in Asian cultures (Almandrez, 2010). Native American women may need to acquire the skills necessary to assert their presence and influence in decision-making settings rather than passively waiting for an invitation.

Multicultural female executives face the problem of understanding that they operate within a distinct set of norms and dynamics as they work to change the company environment.

Advancing leadership ideas for increased resilience

The increasing demographic variety and more inclusive boundaries in our interconnected world necessitate a focus on the inclusion of women and different leaders in our managerial role frameworks. Traditionally, literature on leadership has tended to consider leaders as unique groups, but the field of leadership research has not addressed this issue. It is becoming evident that a leadership perspective that does not take into account gender and racial background overlooks the impact of societal perspectives and socialisation on the development of an individual's leadership approach (Kawahara, Esnil and Hsu 2007). An examination of leadership only based on the incumbents of leadership positions has resulted in a prejudiced and inadequate depiction of leadership and the efficacy of leaders. While women and minority leaders may have distinct situations, these variations might contribute to the broadening of perspectives represented in current leadership theories. The subsequent strategies outline methods for integrating diversity and gender bias into our leadership philosophies.

Trait theories

While the notion of trait theory has lost popularity, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) contend that leadership qualities and characteristics do hold significance. Zaccaro thinks a mixture of several personality traits and characteristics is more effective in predicting leadership. However, it remains uncertain whether the spectrum of attributes currently being examined accurately represents the characteristics exhibited by various leaders or if it mainly reflects those of Anglo males who currently dominate leadership positions. Furthermore, it remains unclear how these characteristics are influenced by prejudices stemming from social norms regarding one's function. The majority of research that employs trait theories has failed to investigate the convergence of ethnicity or racial background, gender, or other facets of diversification with leadership attributes. Research on charismatic management, for instance, has primarily concentrated on attributes that are closely associated with male qualities. While theories about traits typically attribute leadership qualities to fundamental attributes, such as being a born leader, they overlook the impact of societal and external factors that have prevented women and ethnic or racial minorities from attaining these roles. Trait theories have neglected to account for the notion of concept comparability when assessing personality characteristics in various societies. When aggression is defined using only one measure, it may appear that women lack this trait. However, if we broaden the definition to encompass several forms of confidence, we may reduce the perceived discrepancies between men and women. Leaders with different origins possess unique knowledge that can impact their leadership approaches across various situations, even though the other factors remain consistent (Janson, 2008). Measuring these attributes utilising bipolar categories (such as aggressive vs. submissive and job-focused vs. relational) is a widespread practice, which can lead to the elimination of disparities compared to rating each feature alone.

Contingency theories

The contingency planning or situational leadership theory provides an alternate perspective to the challenges presented by trait theories. It is based on the belief that various scenarios require different leadership qualities. Therefore, there is no singular characteristic that defines a leader. Contingency theories analyse the specific circumstances and environments in which leadership takes place, as well as how leaders' conduct and traits influence their followers' qualities. Although these investigations are suitable for incorporating the intricacies of variation, they primarily focus on the environment within which leadership is practised (Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy and Stogdill, 1974). Expanding the notion of settings to encompass ethnic and social settings would enhance its strength, particularly when examining leadership in a globalised and diversified environment.

Sharing Leadership and Empowerment

Leadership entails an empowering dynamic wherein one possesses the authority to direct and influence others. Andersen and Hansson (2011) conducted research on the psychology related to authority and accomplishment and viewed leadership qualities as a configuration of reasons rather than a collection of characteristics. The focus on power has become less popular since there has been an adjustment towards independence when leaders delegate authority to their subordinates. Contemporary leadership structures have transitioned from categorising leadership approaches as autocratic or democrat (which were more prevalent after World War II) to emphasising the concepts of collaborative power and the servant leader as typical types of present-day leaders. The literature has yet to investigate the extent to which the utilisation of authority by leaders is influenced by factors such as ethnic background, gender, and disabilities. For instance, feminist leaders commonly stress justice goals rather than power objectives when seeking leadership roles. The study has not investigated the potential impact of cooperative and communal environments on leadership practices. Organisations worldwide have started transitioning from merely implementing Conventional management concepts and methods to valuing the distinct social and cultural components found in other cultures. This involves modifying Conventional management concepts (Lowe, Kainzbauer, Tapachai and Hwang, 2015).

Leadership approach

Leadership concepts frequently mirror the broader social circumstances under which they were formulated. Post World War II, leadership research focused on top-control-oriented leadership approaches. However, due to the swift cultural and technical developments in today's globalised world, there has been a trend towards more cooperative and revolutionary forms of leadership. Leadership research has transitioned from analysing authoritarian versus democrat Leadership approaches to evaluating revolutionary versus transactional management approaches. Contemporary leadership approaches have shifted towards prioritising principles, morals, and social transformation. This shift is a reaction to significant activities like the Enron affair, which represented deliberate organisational corruption and fraud, as well as the economic downturn in the banking sector and the demise of the real estate and dot-com rise at the start of the 21st century.

According to Schreiber and Shannon (2013), transformational leadership is an approach in which individuals in leadership positions mutually elevate each other's levels of ethics and drive. Burns added the idea of a common goal that brings leaders and supporters together towards a shared objective. Leadership is often defined as the ability to have a clear vision and provide guidance, influence others, and direct efforts towards obtaining an optimal future state while also motivating supporters (Leithwood and Jantzi, 2005). This has been a fundamental aspect of transformational leadership approaches, necessitating the leader to effectively convey that vision to followers, encouraging them to adopt it as their own. Transformational leadership approaches are increasingly recognised as crucial for modern leaders due to their focus on defining leadership as an approach that promotes change (Bass, Bernard and Ronald, 2006). It is deliberate, aimed at achieving a desired outcome or state, follows a specific purpose, and is naturally based on values. The extent to which changing trends in work environments have added to this transformation is a matter of inquiry. While it has been observed that women tend to exhibit more transformational leadership approaches, there is a need for additional research to determine how they might enhance their effectiveness as leaders (Riggs, 2013).

Context of Higher Education
Higher education is significant in shaping the capacity for leadership in modern society. The institutions of higher education reflect the fast-paced and varied global culture we live in presently. This poses problems in terms of how we engage and develop students to become future leaders (Spendlove, 2007). The concept of transformational leadership aligns with the objectives of contemporary higher education. Its aim is to facilitate and motivate faculty, students, executives, and other staff members to bring about changes and improvements in facilities (Muijs et al., 2006). These changes aim to improve pupil achievement, foster the creation of novel information, and encourage students to actively contribute to a beneficial shift in society in general.

Nevertheless, institutions of higher education adhere to two conflicting sets of standards. The administration structure typically follows a top-down approach. Finances at the president's level in such organisations usually have restricted spending authority, with staff expenses, which constitute most of the budgets, typically managed by the leadership team (Brungardt, 1998).

Simultaneously, faculty members occupying the lower levels of this hierarchy possess significant authority due to factors such as tenure, unions, and the ideals of academic freedom. Faculty members possess a significant level of independence in their primary responsibilities of instructing and doing studies. The existing system of duration and career advancement at higher education institutions is designed to prioritise individualism. In contrast to equitable and collaborative systems, the existing organisational structures in higher education institutions foster a culture of competition for funds, the most talented students, and the recruitment of top teachers. Peer assessment, a possible method for fostering collaboration and teamwork, can be hindered by faculty members who perceive themselves solely as reviewers for evaluation rather than as colleagues who provide helpful suggestions. Additionally, it can be disrupted by individuals with personal motives who perceive future advancements as challenges or competitors. The

administrative method in higher education coexists with the faculty panel system, which is characterised by a more collaborative nature (Richmon and Allison, 2003). Typically, committees mainly provide advice and have limited leadership responsibilities. Higher-level authorities must review and approve any goods or proposals they generate. Although committees provide potential for collaborative or cooperative leadership, it is not certain that leadership chances will be fully utilised (Channing, 2020).

Leadership for Higher Education Today

The capacity for revolutionary innovation and cooperative leadership within higher education institutions resides in clearly expressing their fundamental principles and future aspirations. Individuals who unite with a common objective in a setting that allows for respectful disagreement have the potential to bring about significant and profound change inside the organisation. Contemporary higher education institutions must possess agility and adaptability to effectively respond to swift and constant transformations. Nevertheless, preconceptions and power structure may hinder or diminish the possibility of such reform (June 2007).

The potential for transformation is frequently hindered by bureaucracy and organisational structures that allow institutions to function smoothly, occasionally even in the absence of leaders. The combination of leadership concepts and higher education institutions that support transformational leadership approaches may provide women leaders with an edge in the current context. In order to achieve revolutionary change, it is necessary to first modify the corporate culture, even if the organisation's objectives, standards, and values are already congruent. What is the procedure for accomplishing this task? Here are some subsequent concerns.

Leadership Concept

Taylor and Machado (2006) argue that higher educational institutions make applying executive power more complex and problematic. According to him, the primary sources of impact for academic administrators do not come from their administrative authority but rather from the opportunity it offers to collaborate with the faculty as an ideological and pedagogical partnership. The real strength of the office lies in having the chance to construct wide organisational perceptions. Morrill's statement links him with other scholars, such as Safty (2003), who acknowledge the importance of narratives as crucial leadership tools for establishing a cultural environment. Executives who possess the skill to present challenges and express the ideals of their organisation through persuasive stories and their honesty (authenticity) will be able to foster a shared sense of direction and influence the long-term path of their intricate organisations (Morrill, 2010).

Strategic Leadership

Morrill (2010) similarly expresses the worry that the purposes of higher education institutions may be perceived as more like tentative hypotheses to be examined rather than fixed goals to be attained. He connects the conceptual aspects of leadership, such as strategic thinking, with the

practical aspects of administration, such as financial budgeting and planning, considering them essential components of good leadership.

Effective and Covert Leadership

When we include various aspects of diversity in our comprehension of leadership, we must additionally consider various approaches. Although the charm of a leader can be an observable characteristic that helps facilitate effective revolutionary change, other less apparent leadership approaches can be equally powerful. Effectiveness is commonly considered a crucial trait for effective leadership. However, it is essential to acknowledge that assertiveness can take on various forms within different cultural communities. For instance, in Native American communities, competence may be demonstrated by discreetly influencing others from behind, as described by Mejias (2010). Similarly, in Asian American groups, inaction can be used as a form of determination, specifically by selecting not to communicate when appropriate, as discussed by Yabusaki (2007).

Compassionate Leadership

Ayman and Chemers (1983) discovered empirical support for a Benevolent Paternalistic leadership factor in Iran; Shahbazi, Naami, and Aligholizadeh (2013) found that it has been substantiated in other Asian cultures. In contrast to position, this aspect originates from Communism in Asian cultures and embodies a patriarchal framework for managing social structures and leadership. It highlights the importance of ethical behaviour, praises the ideal qualities of the male scholar-leader, and emphasises his compassionate authority within the framework of filial devotion. The leader's benevolence towards his followers and readiness to enable them to gain prominence is shown in this. It stands in contradiction to the idea that followers must grab their authority and power. Current leadership concepts lack the inclusion of benevolent authority, as they predominantly represent prejudices from North American and Western perspectives.

Collective or Cooperative Leadership

The concepts of collaborative management are fundamental to contemporary conceptions of leadership in higher education organisations. Groups that employ a cooperative approach might serve as the means to bring about transformation and offer guidance. This aligns with the current focus on teamwork in leadership. Nevertheless, organisational cultures can hinder true cooperation when competing goals (such as balancing faculty individual pursuits with student objectives) or hostile divisions between "us" and "them" mindsets exist or when deep-rooted suspicion of administration persists. To achieve transformative change, it is essential to identify methods for rebuilding confidence and fostering a sense of shared mission and shared principles.

Leadership possibilities for women in higher education

Bryman (2007) characterises the current journey towards leadership for women as a labyrinthine road, compared to an invisible barrier that completely blocks access. The analogy implies the

necessity for many leadership approaches and acknowledges that a female leader may approach it distinctly. Women can enhance their ability to navigate the complex maze by carefully assessing their best qualities and leveraging the benefits they possess. When analysing the perspectives of women leaders in higher education, specific recommendations arise for effectively dealing with this complex situation (Cloud, 2010; Kezar, 2023; Gmelch, 2013). Express your objectives clearly and concisely and harmonise your declaration of personal principles with the organisations to collectively have a meaningful impact.

• Embrace authenticity—by being genuine and firmly rooted in your identity, you effectively convey these principles to the organisation; ethics, honesty and transparency are essential.
• Possess the ability to adapt—by sustaining intellectual adaptability, you can effectively lead from various opinions and adjust your leadership actions according to the situation.
• Cultivate an encouraging network—to engage in discussions about the challenges and problems encountered.
 • Leverage your advantages and demonstrate resilience.
• Recognise change-related challenges and establish a leadership group to facilitate an interactive procedure.

References

1.   Adler, N.J. and Osland, J.S., 2016. Women leading globally: What we know, thought we knew, and need to know about leadership in the 21st Century☆. In *Advances in global leadership* (pp. 15-56). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

2.   Ashkanasy, N.M., 2002. Leadership in the Asian century: Lessons from GLOBE. *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, *5*(3), pp.150-163.

3.   Arun, K. and Kahraman Gedik, N., 2022. Impact of Asian cultural values upon leadership roles and styles. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *88*(2), pp.428-448.

4.   Appelbaum, S.H., Audet, L. and Miller, J.C., 2003. Gender and Leadership? Leadership and gender? A journey through the landscape of theories. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *24*(1), pp.43-51.

5.   Andersen, J.A. and Hansson, P.H., 2011. At the end of the road? On differences between women and men in leadership behaviour. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, *32*(5), pp.428-441.

6.   Almandrez, M., 2010. History in the making: Narratives of selected Asian Pacific American women in leadership.

7.   Bowles, H.R. and McGinn, K.L., 2005. Claiming authority: Negotiating challenges for women leaders. *The psychology of Leadership: New perspectives and research*, pp.191-208.

8.   Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J., 1994. Shatter the glass ceiling: Women may make better managers. *Human resource management*, *33*(4), pp.549-560.

9.   Bowles, H.R. and McGinn, K.L., 2005. Claiming authority: Negotiating challenges for women leaders. *The psychology of Leadership: New perspectives and research*, pp.191-208.

10.	Bass, Bernard M., and Ronald E. Riggio. "Transformational leadership." (2006).

11.	Bryman, A., 2007. Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in higher education*, *32*(6), pp.693-710.

12.	Brungardt, C.L., 1998. The new face of Leadership: Implications for higher education. *Leadership Studies, Fort Hays State University*.

13.	Chin, J.L., 2011. Women and Leadership: Transforming visions and current contexts. In *Forum on Public Policy Online* (Vol. 2011, No. 2). Oxford Round Table. 406 West Florida Avenue, Urbana, IL 61801.

14.	Carli, L.L. and Eagly, A.H., 2011. Gender and Leadership. *The Sage handbook of leadership*, pp.103-117.

15.	Chugh, S. and Sahgal, P., 2007. Why do few women advance to leadership positions? *Global Business Review*, *8*(2), pp.351-365.

16.	Cuadrado, I., Morales, J.F. and Recio, P., 2008. Women's access to managerial positions: An experimental study of leadership styles and gender. *The Spanish journal of psychology*, *11*(1), pp.55-65.

17.	Cohen, S.L., 2010. Effective global leadership requires a global mindset. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, *42*(1), pp.3-10.

18.	Chandler, D., 2011. What women bring to the exercise of leadership. *Journal of strategic Leadership*, *3*(2), pp.1-12.

19.	Cloud, R.C., 2010. Epilogue: Change leadership and leadership development. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2010*(149), pp.73-79.

20.	Channing, J., 2020. How Can Leadership Be Taught? Implications for Leadership Educators. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *15*(1), pp.134-148.

21.	Dovidio, J.F., Kawakami, K. and Gaertner, S.L., 2013. Reducing Contemporary Prejudice: Combating Explicit and Implicit Bias at the Individual and Intergroup Level 1. In *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 137-163). Psychology Press.

22.	Eagly, A.H., 2007. Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*(1), pp.1-12.

23.	Elmuti, D., Jia, H. and Davis, H.H., 2009. Challenges women face in leadership positions and organisational effectiveness: An investigation. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *8*(2), pp.167-187.

24.	Ely, R.J. and Rhode, D.L., 2010. Women and Leadership. *Handbook of leadership theory and practice*, pp.377-410.

25.	Fox, M.J.T., Luna-Firebaugh, E.M. and Williams, C., 2015. American Indian female leadership. *Wicazo Sa Review*, *30*(1), pp.82-99.

26.	Gmelch, W.H., 2013. The development of campus academic leaders. *International Journal of Leadership and Change*, *1*(1), p.7.

27.	Gipson, A.N., Pfaff, D.L., Mendelsohn, D.B., Catenacci, L.T. and Burke, W.W., 2017. Women and Leadership: Selection, development, leadership style, and performance. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *53*(1), pp.32-65.

28.   Helgesen, S., 2017. Gender, communication, and the leadership gap. *Gender, communication, and the leadership gap*, pp.3-11.

29.   Hoyt, C.L., 2010. Women, men, and Leadership: Exploring the gender gap at the top. *Social and personality psychology compass*, *4*(7), pp.484-498.

30.   Hill, C., Miller, K., Benson, K. and Handley, G., 2016. Barriers and Bias: The Status of Women in Leadership. *American Association of University Women*.

31.   Harung, H., Travis, F., Blank, W. and Heaton, D., 2009. Higher development, brain integration, and excellence in leadership. *Management Decision*, *47*(6), pp.872-894.

32.   Jackson, J.C., 2001. Women middle managers' perception of the glass ceiling. *Women in Management Review*, *16*(1), pp.30-41.

33.   Johnson, S.K., Murphy, S.E., Zewdie, S. and Reichard, R.J., 2008. The firm, sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on evaluating male and female leaders. *Organisational behaviour and human decision processes*, *106*(1), pp.39-60.

34.   June, A. W. (2007). Presidents: Same Look, Different Decade. The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 16, 2007.

35.   Janson, A., 2008. Extracting leadership knowledge from formative experiences. *Leadership*, *4*(1), pp.73-94.

36.   Kerr, B., Kerr, G.R. and Miller, W., 2014. Bureaucratic, leadership, and workforce representation among female administrators, principals, assistant principals, and classroom teachers in U.S. school districts, 2002-2008. *Public Administration Quarterly*, pp.371-404.

37.   Kazak, E., 2022. To be or not to be an administrator: The tale of female teachers and administrators. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, *6*(5), pp.104-129.

38.   Kark, R. and Eagly, A.H., 2010. Gender and Leadership: Negotiating the labyrinth. *Handbook of Gender Research in Psychology: Volume 2: Gender Research in Social and Applied Psychology*, pp.443-468.

39.   Kawakami, C., White, J.B. and Langer, E.J., 2000. Mindful and masculine: Freeing women leaders from the constraints of gender roles. *Journal of Social Issues*, *56*(1), pp.49-63.

40.   Keup, J.R., Walker, A.A., Astin, H.S. and Lindholm, J.A., 2001. Organisational Culture and Institutional Transformation. ERIC Digest.

41.   Keohane, N.O., 2020. Women, power & leadership. *Daedalus*, *149*(1), pp.236-250.

42.   Kirkpatrick, S.A. and Locke, E.A., 1991. Leadership: do traits matter? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *5*(2), pp.48-60.

43.   Kezar, A.J. ed., 2023. *Rethinking Leadership in a complex, multicultural, and global environment: New concepts and models for higher education*. Taylor & Francis.

44.   Kawahara, D., Esnil, E. M., & Hsu, J. (2007). Asian American Women Leaders: The intersection of race, gender, and leadership. In Chin, J. L., Lott, B., Rice, J. K., & Sanchez-Hucles, J. (Eds) Women and Leadership: Transforming Visions and Diverse Voices. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, p. 297-313.

45.   Krefting, L.A., 2003. Intertwined discourses of merit and gender: Evidence from academic employment in the USA. *Gender, Work & Organisation*, *10*(2), pp.260-278.

46.   Kelly, G.P., 2014. Women and higher education. In *International Higher Education Volume 1* (pp. 297-323). Routledge.

47.   Kiamba31, J.M., 2009. Women and leadership positions: Social and cultural barriers to success. *Wagadu Volume 6 Journal of International Women's Studies Volume 10: 1*, p.89.

48.   Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C.A., Murphy, C.J. and Stogdill, R.M., 1974. Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. *Organisational behaviour and human performance*, *12*(1), pp.62-82.

49.   Luthans, F. and Avolio, B.J., 2003. Authentic leadership development. *Positive organisational scholarship*, *241*(258), pp.1-26.

50.   Levitt, D.H., 2010. Women and leadership: a developmental paradox? *Adultspan Journal*, *9*(2), pp.66-75.

51.   Lowe, S., Kainzbauer, A., Tapachai, N. and Hwang, K.S., 2015. Ambicultural blending between Eastern and Western paradigms: Fresh perspectives for international management research. *Culture and Organization*, *21*(4), pp.304-320.

52.   Leithwood, K. and Jantzi, D., 2005. Transformational Leadership. *The essentials of school leadership*, *31*, p.43.

53.   Mendenhall, M.E., Reiche, B.S., Bird, A. and Osland, J.S., 2012. Defining the "global" in global leadership. *Journal of World Business*, *47*(4), pp.493-503.

54.   McEldowney, R.P., Bobrowski, P. and Gramberg, A., 2009. Factors affecting the next generation of women leaders: Mapping the challenges, antecedents, and consequences of effective leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *3*(2), pp.24-30.

55.   McLane-Davison, D., 2013. Chapter Nine: The Art of Activist Mothering: Black Feminist Leadership & Knowing What To Do. *What the village gave me: Conceptualisations of womanhood*, p.137.

56.   Mejias, U.A., 2010. The limits of networks as models for organising the social. *new media & society*, *12*(4), pp.603-617.

57.   Morrill, R.L., 2010. *Strategic Leadership: Integrating strategy and leadership in colleges and universities*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

58.   Mathe, K., Michie, S. and Nelson, D.L., 2016. Women in management in the USA. In *Women in Management Worldwide* (pp. 223-240). Gower.

59.   Muijs, D., Harris, A., Lumby, J., Morrison, M. and Sood, K., 2006. Leadership and leadership development in highly effective further education providers. Is there a relationship? *Journal of further and Higher Education*, *30*(1), pp.87-106.

60.   Nguyen, D., 2020. Asian American women in the academy: Multiple success case study of their leadership labyrinths and practices. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, *4*(3), pp.14-44.

61.   Porterfield, J. and Kleiner, B.H., 2005. A new era: Women and Leadership. *Equal Opportunities International*, *24*(5/6), pp.49-56.

62.   Parker, P.S., 2004. *Race, gender, and Leadership: Re-envisioning organisational leadership from the perspectives of African American women executives*. Psychology Press.

63.   Riggs, D.E., 2013. The crisis and opportunities in library leadership. In *leadership in the Library and Information Science Professions* (pp. 5-17). Routledge.

64.   Rowley, S., Hossain, F. and Barry, P., 2010. Leadership through a gender lens: How cultural environments and theoretical perspectives interact with gender. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *33*(2), pp.81-87.

65.   Richmon, M.J. and Allison, D.J., 2003. Toward a conceptual framework for leadership inquiry. *Educational Management & Administration*, *31*(1), pp.31-50.

66.   Snaebjornsson, I.M. and Edvardsson, I.R., 2013. Gender, nationality and leadership style: A literature review. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *8*(1), p.89.

67.   Steele, C.M., Spencer, S.J. and Aronson, J., 2002. Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 379-440). Academic Press.

68.   Schreiber, B. and Shannon, J., 2013. Developing library leaders for the 21st century. In *leadership in the Library and Information Science Professions* (pp. 35-57). Routledge.

69.   Safty, A., 2003. Moral Leadership: Beyond management and governance. *Harvard International Review*, *25*(3), p.84.

70.   Shahbazi, G., Naami, A. and Aligholizadeh, S., 2013. An empirical study of the relationship between three components of paternalistic leadership and workplace bullying: The case of an Iranian bank. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, *22*(12), pp.1814-1821.

71.   Sales, S., Galloway Burke, M. and Cannonier, C., 2020. African American women Leadership across contexts: Examining the internal traits and external factors on women leaders' perceptions of empowerment. *Journal of Management History*, *26*(3), pp.353-376.

72.   Spendlove, M., 2007. Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *21*(5), pp.407-417.

73.   Taylor, J. and Machado, M.D.L., 2006. Higher education leadership and management: From conflict to interdependence through strategic planning. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *12*(2), pp.137-160.

74.   Van der Lippe, T. and Van Dijk, L., 2002. Comparative research on women's employment. *Annual review of sociology*, *28*(1), pp.221-241.

75.   Youssef, C.M. and Luthans, F., 2012. Positive global leadership. *Journal of World Business*, *47*(4), pp.539-547.

76.   Yabusaki, A.S., 2007. Diverse feminist communication styles: Challenges to women and leadership. *Women and Leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices*, pp.55-68.

77.   Zheng, H.Y. and Carpenter-Hubin, J., 1999. Exploring Gender Differences in America's School Administrator Workforce: Statistical Evidence from National Surveys.