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This study examines Chinese educators’ perceptions of effective leadership behaviors in order to determine how teachers in Chinese higher education define effectiveness and whether there is a correlation between this perception and leaders’ gender. Factors considered included conscious and unconscious gender bias, Chinese culture, historical background, and identity. As a male-dominated country, China has been deeply influenced by Confucianism; hence, limited attention has been drawn to female leadership. The author identified and reviewed three women’s revolutions and their positive and negative effects in the past century in order to predict the status of female leadership. The researcher modified the Chinese version of the LPI survey and conducted the investigation in more than 20 Chinese universities. The results indicate there is a significant difference between the perception toward male and female leaders.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

We cannot solve our problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we create them. (Albert Einstein, 1946)

Building on Einstein’s statement, it is time to use a different kind of leadership to address the challenges that face us today, rather than using the same type of leadership as we have for generations. In a similar vein, a Business Week cover story recently mentioned, “Men could become losers in a global economy that values mental power over might” (Conlin, 2003, p. 78). Men have dominated leadership roles in most cultures, but women have begun to occupy more leadership roles in most cultures over the past 50 years (Book, 2009; Chemers, 1997). There is little agreement regarding whether women actually lead different than men (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). Some women seem to be afraid to exhibit and utilize their talents and specialties when they are different from men (Rhode, 2003). This pattern is especially pronounced in China due to a cultural bias against women. This study examines how one segment of Chinese society, higher education, views the participation of women leaders.

The Problem Defined

For most of recorded history, women were excluded from formal management roles (Rhode, 2003). Even today, while the number of female leaders is increasing, conscious and unconscious biases produce double standards for male and female leaders. However, according to Rhode (2003), the lack of consensus about just what the problem is and how to solve it is a significant issue for this gender inequality situation. The reality of gender inequality in leadership opportunities is pervasive; however, the perceptions of gender inequality are limited from both male and female, and from both leaders’ and
followers’ perspectives. The equality gap between men and women in Chinese culture is even greater than elsewhere. As the most influential philosophy, Confucian ethics advocated the subservience of women to men as a natural rule for society. Women were generally regarded as incapable of education and viewed as insignificant members in the family (Davin, 1975).

**Gender Studies in Leadership**

Studies regarding gender and leadership since the 1970s have indicated a gradually increasing role for women and their importance in the workplace. The reports show there are significant differences between women and men (Book, 2009), such as different communication styles (Spender & Bardin, 1985). Every minor difference has a different impact on the interactions between leaders and followers and produces various outcomes. Even though such studies and reports help people to revise traditional gender stereotypes, new gender stereotypes seem to emerge. Research has revealed certain persistent and pervasive patterns that are caused by conscious and unconscious gender bias (Rhode, 2003); these are worse for older cultures. Each generation establishes new stereotypes belonging to their time, which also provide updated information about gender studies. It makes consensus more difficult regarding gender bias in the leadership field. In addition, the controversial results of diverse studies blur the focus from that which are female leaders’ advantages and potentials, to whether they have strength as leaders. This kind of thinking not only decreases the credibility of women leadership studies, but also weakens the influence of women leadership in society.

Compared to gender leadership studies in Western cultures, Chinese scholars have produced limited studies. Women’s leadership studies are limited in China for several
reasons. First, few scholars have investigated women’s leadership in China. Due to the short history of women’s leadership studies, only a few academic institutions are advanced enough to be aware of this gender issue (Sun, 2015). Second, there is a lack of academic methodology (Bai, 2014; Sun, 2015). The majority of Chinese scholars use traditional experience-based methods to conduct research instead of scientific methodologies, which include quantitative and qualitative research methods. Hence, most of the conclusions are from only Western studies, which may not adequately fit the Chinese context. Third, there is a lack of attention to following up on women leadership studies. Presently, Chinese scholars’ knowledge of gender differences in leadership is approximately at the point where Western research was in the 1980s-1990s. Research should be based on native culture, and studies should learn from developing areas within the specific culture (Sun, 2015). Fourth, there are limited sample types (Bai, 2014). The majority of Chinese women’s leadership studies target business fields, and only limited studies have been conducted in Chinese higher education. Due to these limitations, the perception of female leaders in China is more difficult to research and analyze, such as few reliable literatures to referent, limited understanding of leadership behaviors, and bare attention and cooperation about women leadership studies. Additionally, some particulars of Chinese culture and their profound influence reflect on the leadership process as well.

**Chinese Culture and Gender**

Statistics show that Chinese men outnumbered women by 33 million in 2017 after decades of gender bias and the One Child Policy (“Population of China,” 2017). Women face more difficulties, competition, and challenges in the workplace because of the
imbalance of gender, and this will be more acute for the next generation. Historically, culture has a significant impact on gender differences and bias.

China, as a country rooted in Confucianism, has developed a male-dominated culture. The philosophy of Confucianism for human relations situates males at the center of the world (Leung, 2003). One of the principles of Confucianism regarding the sexual division of labor is that men take roles outside the home, and women take those inside the home. According to Confucianism, virtuous femininity equates to being a good wife and mother inside the home. Women are not expected to have a role outside the home. This standard of virtuousness in Confucianism still deeply influences the Chinese definition of a “good woman” in modern times.

In recent Chinese history, women’s social and familial status have undergone major changes, especially after the Mao era and Deng’s Economic Reform. However, changes in women’s social status have not been discussed from a leadership perspective. A woman’s immediate concerns in the workplace conflict with an unconscious prejudice due to the ingrained paternalistic culture. The lack of studies may increase misunderstanding among male leaders, female leaders, and subordinates. Additionally, the recent social changes may influence people’s perception of female leaders as it has influenced women’s status.

The Purpose of the Study

This study investigates how teachers in Chinese higher education view their leaders’ effectiveness with regard to gender. This study focuses on whether gender has an impact on subordinates’ perceptions on leadership effectiveness in Chinese higher education. It examines followers’ perceptions of effective leadership behaviors in order to
determine how Chinese higher educators define effectiveness and whether there is a correlation between perception and leaders’ gender. Understanding gender’s impact in leadership roles will help leaders to acknowledge whether there are conscious and unconscious gender bias, how subordinates who have different identities view them, and how to be more effective in order to satisfy their subordinates. Awareness of perceptions can help Chinese women to develop their fullest potential and succeed in leadership roles. This also will help both men and women leaders emphasize their strengths and recognize their weaknesses, especially from the subordinates’ perspectives. A follower’s perceptions are important to determine whether a leader’s performance is effective. The study also provides a basic knowledge regarding gender differences of leadership roles in Chinese higher education and how Chinese higher educators perceive the gender difference.

**Hypotheses**

The research question was developed based on a selective literature review of the impact of gender on perceptions of effective leadership behaviors in Chinese culture. This study seeks to understand Chinese higher educators’ perceptions of leaders’ effectiveness with regard to gender. The research used an existing survey, the modified Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) survey, to gain insight into Chinese higher educators’ perceptions toward leadership effectiveness. The LPI was developed in 1988 by Kouze and Posner (2012) and includes five dimensions of leadership practices: (a) Modeling the Way, (b) Inspiring a Shared Vision, (c) Challenging the Process, (d) Enabling Others to Act, and (e) Encouraging the Heart.
The hypotheses are derived from the problem and purpose statements and include:

H1: Both male and female higher educators perceive male leaders as more effective than female leaders in general.

H2: In regard to specific leadership practices/behaviors, male leaders are perceived as more effective than female leaders at Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Challenging the Process.

H3: Female leaders are perceived as more effective than male counterparts only at Enabling Others to Act and Encouraging the Heart.

**Significance of the Study**

This study focuses on enhancing awareness of gender impact on higher educators’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness in China. The number of both female workers and leaders is increasing worldwide (MasterCard Index of Women’s Advancement [MIWA], 2016). In rapidly changing but conservative societies, an updated awareness has not always evolved. As an example of this, Chinese scholars have not yet seriously considered gender as an issue or a significant barrier to advancement and have not explored a woman’s potential in leadership roles. However, Chinese people may change their gender bias with an increase in women’s social status.

In Chinese academia, there is limited attention paid to women and leadership because people believe Chinese women have already achieved the highest social status in Chinese history. Although there exists obvious gender discrimination, people often refuse to acknowledge this discrimination. Additionally, there is only limited research on women and leadership in China. Leadership, as a new academic discipline in China, is still a vague concept to the majority of scholars. It will take time for people to determine
what leadership is and how studying leadership can help Chinese people advance their awareness to deal with invisible issues. The Chinese female population accounts for almost one fifth of the total female population in the world (“Population of China,” 2017). This limited awareness of Chinese women leadership could significantly influence the outcomes of this study. Any progress to increase awareness of perceptions of female leaders in China also will contribute to the studies regarding gender and leadership.

Chapter I provided the purpose and framework for this study; and Chapter II reviews the literature that has contributed to Chinese women’s social status past and present, as well as the study of gender and leadership effectiveness. Chapter III defines the methodology used to determine the different perceptions of Chinese higher educators toward their male and female leaders. Chapter IV describes the results of this investigation by interpreting the data; and Chapter V presents the data analyses, discussion, limitations, and conclusions.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

With the increasing percentage of females participating in various types of workplaces globally, authors in the mainstream press and scholars in academia have shown substantial interest in the topic of gender. A tremendous contribution for social development has been made by discovering the potential of women’s competency within the past few decades, especially in some countries in which women are particularly underestimated. The motivation for driving scholars to pay more attention to the research on female leadership and gender parity, on one hand, is because of the growing proportion of female workers and the increasing influence of women leaders in business, politics, and education. On the other hand, the undervaluation of women’s effectiveness as leaders is not based on their capability but their gender (Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, & Woehr, 2014).

Men are typically considered more appropriate and effective than women in leadership roles because of the cultural background in some male-dominated industries and countries. Traditions, social status, progress, and feminist revolutions in various cultures have influenced the images, perceptions, and expectations of female leaders. A review of the literature provides insight into the status of Chinese women from antiquity to the present and its association with leadership effectiveness between male and female leadership.

Women’s Status and Women’s Leadership in China

Women’s Status in History

In traditional Chinese society, the essential value system was influenced and shaped by a masculine ideology over thousands of years. The hierarchy of authority in
this system was based on so-called Ren Lún, or “relationship-defined obligations,” where there were expected obligations when people were involved in certain patterns of interactions. Based on a hierarchy of authority, this system defined relationships in five types: (1) the so-called Wu Lún, or the “Five Cardinal Relationships,” including the government and citizens (“ruler and subjects” in the olden days); (2) parents and offspring (“father and son”); (3) husband and wife; (4) siblings (“younger and older brothers”); and (5) friends (“male friends”). These were unequal dyadic relationships which indicated the absolute power and authority of the male in this particular value system. Women were considered temporary members of the household and had no rights to possess, inherit, or intervene. As temporary members of the family, women were considered unworthy or incapable of education (Leung, 2003). Confucius even stated, “Ignorance is the virtue of a woman.” This traditional ideology influenced the Chinese mindset and inwardly shackled Chinese women for hundreds of years (Wang & Chee, 2011).

In regard to the gender construction of labor, Confucians believed that men took roles outside the home and women were primarily to remain inside the home (Leung, 2003). This principle shaped a central standard of virtue for Chinese women: staying inside. Furthermore, women were not only restricted to living inside, but also asked to obey without questioning (Jaschok & Shui, 2012). A rule called the “Three Obediences” governed a woman’s behavior. The first obedience was a constraint for unmarried girls. They must obey their fathers and brothers. Second, as a married woman, she must obey her husband; third, a widow must obey her adult sons.
In general, the Confucian moralists established three standards of virtue for Chinese women: ignorance, remaining inside, and subservience. If a woman breaks any of these three rules, she is considered as not following Fùdào, which is the moral code for women (Jaschok & Shui, 2012). These standards also established a definition of a “good woman.” A woman who does not have much education, can do housework, takes care of her husband and sons, and obeys her husband is a good woman. However, none of these standards allow Chinese women to have power for controlling their own destinies, let alone for helping them to develop. Women are unequivocally followers in the family and could not take leadership roles in the family or society. Hence, traditional culture hinders the chance of Chinese women to be involved in leadership positions in both family and any social settings. This standard of virtuousness in Confucianism still deeply influences the definition of “good woman” in contemporary China.

**The First Women’s Revolution in China**

The first revolution for Chinese women was during the Mao era. Early communist leaders supported the first women’s movement, which was the May Fourth Movement (1915-1921). This movement indicated the first time Chinese women fought for their own rights and freedom (Leung, 2003) and brought a new kind of women in modern China, the so called “new women” (xīn nüxìng) (Chan, 1988). The new identity and image of women was created by some female icons in different professions. For example, Ding Ling was a famous female writer who broke traditional fetters. This profession was male dominated because most women were illiterate at that time. New women, like Ding Ling, encouraged women who thought they were incapable of studying and could only stay at home to explore their new life. Such attempts to provide examples for women’s
identity during the early stages of China’s modernization were influenced by female icons, but they were still overshadowed by males.

Mao Zedong advocated gender equality, offered equal opportunity for education and jobs, and admitted women’s values by saying that “Women can hold up half of the sky” (Leung, 2003). Since the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, greater attention has been paid to improving women’s political, economic, educational, and social status as well as creating opportunities for women (Qiang, Han, & Niu, 2009). Funü Jiefang (women’s liberation), which was strongly influenced by Western thought, set Chinese women free from doing only housework to working outside the home. This process propelled the development of Chinese women and helped them to have greater access to pursue leadership positions.

**The Second Women’s Revolution in China**

In the early 1980s, the second revolution to promote women’s status in China was brought about by the Deng’s Economic Reform. In the new socialist market economic era, in order to facilitate open markets, exploring women’s capabilities and equal opportunities could potentially assist development. A supporting and developing environment was established for women to participate in professional workplaces by implementing new policies (Qiang et al., 2009). A series of the supportive reforms and open policies issued since the early 1980s includes the Labor Insurance Regulations of 1984; the Labor Prohibition Regulations of 1990 (Rosen, 1993); and the Law of the People’s Republic of China on the Protection of Rights and Interests of Women in 1992.

These new national laws placed great emphasis on improving women’s political, economic, and social status as well as creating conditions for social awareness and
consciousness of women’s value in constructing and developing a new China. The protection of women’s equal opportunities and social status was provided by the government in the domains of laws and national policies; i.e., at the 5th Session of the 7th National People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China on April 3, 1992, the Law of the People’s Republic of China on the Protection of Rights and Interests of Women was adopted. This law prohibits discrimination against women. Under this law, Article 2 states that “Equality between men and women is a basic State policy. The State takes the necessary measures to gradually improve the systems for protecting the rights and interests of women, in order to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women.” In addition, the law regulates that, as citizens with a vital role in this society, women’s voices and opinions should be heard and taken into account when the issues are related to women.

The purpose of this new national legislation was to ensure that all women enjoy equal rights with men in all aspects of political, economic, cultural, social, and family life and to guarantee that all women have equal opportunities to be recruited, trained, considered, and paid. On the bright side, supportive conditions have been created for women’s participation and advancement by the Chinese government. However, as a country which has been influenced by male-dominated culture, not everyone has been able to accept these changes in women’s status. The new dramatic change and special attention to women in the workplace has raised dissatisfaction not only from male counterparts, but also female peers. The reform increased a type of invisible discrimination against women in terms of hiring and promotion; e.g., when companies
had a good excuse to fire employees, they laid off female employees first in order to avoid the potential cost and punishment from the new policies (Rosen, 1993).

Another kind of discrimination occurred when women were promoted to higher or even leadership positions; then people perceived they were promoted because of their gender instead of their competence. There is currently only a limited perspective and studies to identify the discrimination that came from the new gender construction and which part was influenced by traditional culture and should be modified. After these policies, the boom period of women’s liberation slowed and a retrogressive stage began (Barlow, 2004). Chinese women began to become satisfied with their status and did not to seek promotions. However, from a leadership perspective, female leaders should have been more valuable in leadership roles in all professions than at any other period of Chinese history, given the boosting process of social democracy (Bai, 2014).

**The Third Women’s Revolution in China**

The third revolution upgraded national support for gender equality in Chinese society. In 1995, President Jiang Zemin represented the government of the People’s Republic of China and announced at the Fourth World Women’s Congress of the UN that China would carry out the principle of gender equality as a Fundamental State Policy. He also indicated the purpose for implementation of the policy of gender equality was to fully support and promote social development (Qiang et al., 2009). To make an announcement in front of the world illustrated the Chinese government’s determination to put its promise into effect.

In order to implement a gender equality policy, two significant national plans for women’s development were structured and put into effect. One plan was called the First
Plan for Chinese Women’s Development, which was carried out from 1995 to 2000. The other plan was the Second Plan for Chinese Women’s Development, which was implemented from 2001 to 2010 by the Chinese government. The defined goal of the First Plan was to increase the extent of women’s participation in making decisions and policies regarding social affairs and to extend women’s involvement in the management of national issues. Furthermore, the policy was formulated to pay more attention to seeking more women in leading groups, especially appointing female leaders in male-dominated fields such as industries and enterprises (Selection and Compilation of Important Literature Since the 14th National Congress [SCILSNC], 1997).

However, negative side effects occurred when trying to guarantee the increase of both women participants and female leaders. According to Qiang et al. (2009), combining the new dual retirement policy for men and women with gender equality policy produced inequality. In 1958, “Temporary Guidelines Handling the Retirement of Workers and Professionals,” which was issued by the Chinese government, initially set the different retirement ages for female and male laborers. By mandating a five to 10 year earlier retirement age for women, as it has been since the late 1950s, the Chinese government established the regulations in order to protect women in the workplace. However, the special treatment for women built an image of frail women as being not capable to work as hard or long as their male counterparts (Webster, 2011).

In 1978, the Chinese State Council Circular issued "State Council Temporary Measures on Providing for Old, Weak, Sick, and Handicapped Cadres" and "State Council Temporary Measures on Workers' Retirement, Resignation.” In file 104 of the "State Council Temporary Measures on Workers' Retirement, Resignation," it stated that,
if one works more than 10 years, men could retire at age 60, but women could retire at age 50. In 1999, the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security of the People’s Republic of China issued a revised retirement policy which stipulated that male employees could retire at 60, female workers could retire at age 50, while female leaders could retire at age 55.

This unfair regulation regarding the retirement age of different genders created a passive atmosphere in institutions. First, retirement five to 10 year earlier than men in the workplace weakened women’s image in the workplace (Webster, 2011). People would believe that, in the same situation and position women need special treatment but require equal opportunity with men. The poor image of women’s capacity caused them to be less competitive. The China Women’s Federation and the National Bureau of Statistics conducted national surveys on women’s employment and social status in 1990 and 2000. Women’s took 56% of the total amount (as cited in Webster, 2011, p. 17). However, at the same time this government policy required organizations to increase the number of female employees. This has created a negative attitude in employers.

Furthermore, the retirement policy stipulated an earlier retirement age for women, hampering women from being promoted and shortening a woman’s career life. This regulation made it difficult for women over 45 to be promoted to middle-level positions and impossible for those over 50 to be promoted to senior leadership positions (Qiang et al., 2009). Before making a promotion decision, the leadership must consider how long those being promoted may stay in that position. Because of the limitation of the retirement policy, a great majority of women lost their opportunity for promotion and
were deprived of access to senior leadership positions, despite their rich working and life experiences.

Another side effect caused by the retirement policy created a vague leader selection system and poor professional development process for women. In order to endorse the government’s gender equality plan, many organizations appointed more women leaders who were not ready to be leaders. They might have been qualified by their competence, but their mindset was not ready to meet group expectations. Specifically, every leadership position had at least one or two potential candidates. They should have been those that either had good relationships with other peers and potential followers or had outstanding technical and leadership capacities. However, this new women’s development policy might have incentivized company leadership to promote women instead of the original candidates. This bias may have caused others within the organization to view the selected women leaders as incompetent. Additionally, the promoted woman may have been the first female leader their subordinates’ had experienced. The negative effects of this new policy without a standard process was considered an unfair and unprofessional decision resulting in a less capable image of female leader.

The Second Plan for Chinese Women’s Development, which was carried out from 2001 to 2010, upgraded the mission based on the previous five-year plan. The vision of the second 10-year plan was formulated to promote women’s leadership in general. The goal was not only to raise the proportion of female leaders in administrative positions, but also to increase the number of females in all management roles (SCILSNC, 1997). With
the upgraded mission and national support, a series of national laws were amended in response to this update.

At the 17th Session of the Standing Committee of the 10th National People’s Congress on August 28, 2005, the amendment of the Law of the People’s Republic of China on the Protection of Rights and Interests of Women was issued based on the 1992 version. The second paragraph of the original Article 11, which became Article 12 in the new version, was revised as follows: “State organs, public organizations, enterprises and institutions shall, in training, selecting and appointing cadres, adhere to the principle of equality between men and women, and there shall be an appropriate number of women leading members.” Furthermore, Article 10 was changed to Article 11, and the second paragraph was amended to read: "Among deputies to the National People’s Congress and local people’s congresses at various levels, there shall be an appropriate number of women deputies. The State takes measures to gradually increase the proportion of the women deputies among deputies to the National People’s Congress and local people’s congresses at various levels." These changes emphasized the rights and interests of women to be advanced in leadership and decision-making positions.

The amended laws indicated the attention the Chinese government gave to women in leadership, and how the government had endorsed women’s development. The ultimate goal for gender equality was to improve social development by fully discovering women’s talent and potential. With such support, the gender equality policies brought dramatic improvements.

The first women’s revolution allowed women to explore more possibilities for higher social status and dignity in society. The second women’s revolution confirmed the
vital role of women in the workplace. The third women’s revolution upgraded national support for female leaders. Women’s social position, family status, income, opportunities, and education have dramatically improved in the past four decades. The three moral codes for women promulgated by Confucianism in premodern times indicate how low Chinese women’s social status was, whereas the three women’s revolutions illustrated how hard they fought for equal rights and professional development in modern times. Nevertheless, limited research on the current situation of Chinese women has provided little evidence of conscious and unconscious awareness of women leadership.

**Current Women’s Status in China**

MasterCard Index on Women’s Advancement (MIWA) is an annual index research for female workforce and leaders in the Asia Pacific region for the past 10 years (2007-2016). This annual investigation undertaken by the MasterCard Company tracks women’s progress across 11-14 markets in Asia Pacific by analyzing three main components: capability (education), employment, and leadership.

The first component, capability, serves as an indicator of Female-to-Male Secondary and Tertiary School Gross Enrollment Rate (GER) ratio and supports a positive relationship with the possibility for women’s access to higher education and knowledge to compete with their male counterparts in 2016. According to the Global Education Monitoring Report (2016) from the *United Nations Economic and Social Commission*, the enrollment rate of females in secondary education measures access to basic knowledge assets for women. The enrollment rate of females in tertiary education measures access to advanced knowledge assets for women. Of the three index components, capability is the strongest indicator of women’s improvement and
advancement based on the 10-year study period. The increasing female-to-male Secondary and Tertiary School GER ratio may indicate the improvement of women’s capability and advancement.

In 2011, the female GER in the six markets of Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Malaysia, Philippines, and China outnumbered that of their male counterparts in both secondary and tertiary education (MIWA, 2011). China’s GER ratio was 103.5 in secondary and 115.3 in tertiary education. Scores are indexed to 100 males to indicate how close or how far women are in parity with men. A score under 100 indicates gender inequality in favor of number of males, while a score above 100 indicates inequality in favor of females.

In this MasterCard database, the other five countries were higher on this women’s enrollment since the survey started in 2007. China was the newest country to rank on the list since 2010. The improvement reflects increased equal education opportunities for both males and females in China. The increasing number proves the significant contribution and achievement of supportive policies for women’s development and advancement. Through this consecutive 10-year investigation, gender gaps in access to both secondary and higher education have narrowed.

The second component of the MasterCard survey report is employment. According to the 2016 index report, the score of Female-to-Male Regular Employment ratio was 84.1 (84.1 women for every 100 men), which indicated the number of female regular employment in China was similar to male regular employment. The score of workforce participation was 83.2, which indicated the percent of Chinese women working normally or informally divided by the total amount of female population. This
data illustrate the improvement of female participation compared to the results from the national survey conducted by the China Women’s Federation and the National Bureau of Statistics. The statistics show that, in 1990, 76% of women were employed, while only 64% were employed in 2000 (as cited in Webster, 2011, p. 17).

According to the International Labour Organization (ILO, 2014), female workforce participation measures the bias against women in the workforce. The results demonstrate that the proportion of female and male employees is relatively similar. Although a gap still exists, the work opportunities for both male and female laborers are moving toward equality. However, these data indicate only workforce and not leadership opportunities. The MasterCard research group’s third component, leadership, measures the bias against women as leaders in different work fields (ILO, 2014).

From the theoretical perspective, education and employment are two vital indicators and preconditions for access to leadership positions. These two components should have a positive relationship with the leadership element. This prediction does not surface in the Chinese situation. According to the 2016 index report from MasterCard investigation, the overall score of leadership in China is 34.7 (34.7 women for every 100 men). The score of business owners is 40.5 and business leaders is 33.4. Female political leaders rank 30.9 compared to 100 males.

From the results of these three components to measure women’s advancement, the opportunities to access basic and advanced knowledge assets for Chinese women compared to their male counterparts are equal. The bias against women in the workforce exists, but the gap tends to be narrow. However, the bias against women as leaders, especially in business and politic areas, is obvious and significant. It may include both
conscious and unconscious bias. While Chinese society is getting closer to gender parity, awareness of women’s advancement to leadership is still far behind. The social expectations for women seem focused on their roles at home and playing followers in social relationships that are still influenced by traditional culture.

The Chinese Women Living Situation Annual Report (CWLSAR, 2015) determined seven first-level indicators that measure Chinese city women’s life quality. The CWLSAR also shows the social perception of women influenced by socialization based on the past 10 years (2005-2015). The seven indicators measure maintaining a happy and harmonious family life, developing healthy bodies, possessing love of life, having a secure and stable place to live, having a job that exemplifies personal values, increased family’s income, and living in a pollution free environment. It is not difficult to determine that five of seven indicators are related to a female participant’s family life, while only one item is connected with their life in the workplace. This indicates that investigators or the society believe success or failure in the workplace does not influence the quality of life for Chinese city women.

The report (CWLSAR, 2015) mentioned only the seven items used in previous annual investigations, but did not explain how they were chosen. It is difficult to tell whether these indicators are thought to be standards for all Chinese city women to evaluate their happiness level or whether they indicate social expectations of the “standard woman.” The discussion of Chinese city women’s stressful work life illustrates the limitation of these standards of a woman’s happiness level in this study.

Interestingly, the CWLSAR (2015) lists nine sources of stress for Chinese city women: employee reduction, intense workplace competition, inability to demonstrate
potential, uncertainty of promotion, salary not matching qualification, antagonism among co-workers, unrealistic production expectations, doubtful workplace prognosis, and difficulty in balancing career and family. These 10 sources of stress for Chinese women prove they are committed to the work, they want to earn recognition by their competitive performance, and they can gain satisfaction from successful work. However, none of these characteristics fit the expectation from society. The social expectation of a woman’s development and performance reveals the limited awareness of women’s potential and equal treatment.

**Chinese Higher Education**

**Historical Context of Chinese Higher Education**

Chinese higher education has diverse historical roots and unique patterns of development that have evolved along with Chinese civilization and its revolution. In premodern China, institutions of higher education were for only the children of royal families and senior officials to attend (Min, 2004). It was not a learning institution for the public but was a precursor of later higher education organizations. The teachers in ancient higher education taught mainly the classical texts of Confucianism. These texts also were the content of the imperial qualifying examinations for senior civil service positions. This connection between the educational content and the standard to be a senior official shows the evidence of a positive relationship between education and leadership. The tradition of considering education as one of the qualifications for being a leader can be traced back thousands of years. What’s more, this pattern of Chinese higher education institutions existed until the late 19th century.
Confucius (551—479 B.C.) introduced a kind of private higher education institution during the Eastern Zhou dynasty. However, only sons went to study in the institution. Paying for daughters to study was considered wasting money because, according to the traditional Wu Lún relationship mentioned in the previous section, daughters were perceived as temporary members in the family. Traditional Chinese culture held that when daughters married, the family decreased by one member; when sons married, the family added one more member (daughter-in-law). Hence, people believed it was not necessary to pay tuition for a person who would eventually become the member of another family.

Based on historical records, Confucius had more than 3000 students during his life. Later, during the blossom of the private schools, many scholars operated their own institutions in different places (Min, 2004). Hence, Chinese indigenous higher education, both public and private, has had two and a half thousand years of history, and it shows evidence of Confucianism influencing not only Chinese higher education institutions, but also Chinese people’s minds for thousands of years.

Although the indigenous tradition has had a significant impact on Chinese higher education, modern Chinese higher education reformation has been influenced by the European, American, and Soviet models. When Western powers forcefully opened China’s doors with the Opium War in 1840, Chinese intellectuals realized Western advancements in science and technology and were aware that China was not the “Central Kingdom” of the world anymore. Changes from the European higher education model were brought to China by study abroad programs begun in the late 19th century. Through
these programs, Western missionary colleges and the modern reformation was established in Chinese higher education (Min, 2004).

**Modern Higher Education in China**

In 1922, new education reform legislation was carried out and influenced by the American university model. By 1949, there were 205 higher education institutions, including 124 public universities and colleges, 21 missionary universities and colleges, and 60 private universities and colleges (Min, 2004). However, all the universities and colleges became national institutions after the founding of the People’s Republic of China. The central government took over all higher education institutions and restructured them according to the Soviet model until the 1980s.

With the rapid development of a market economy, flourishing improvements in science and technology, and the fast growth in individual living standards, the government recognized that higher education was the most important foundation for long-term economic success. A series of reformations has since been implemented. The old structure of the higher education system, which nationalized all institutions by the central government, did not fit in the dramatically changing society. Enrollments in the early 1980s were one million compared to 13 million in 2001. To adapt to this new reality, the Provisional Stipulations for the Establishment of *Minban* Higher Education Institutions were issued in 1993. The *Minban* (non-state-run) Higher Education Institutions were then allowed to legally open.

The current Chinese higher education system is one of the largest in the world. There are 2824 universities and colleges, including 1202 regular full-time universities, 465 private universities, 295 adult higher education institutions, and 1327 higher
vocational schools. The system encompasses 32.01 million students and 1.57 million faculty members (Ministry of Education, 2014).

**Gender Equality in Chinese Higher Education**

With the rapid expansion of Chinese higher education since the 1980s, the number of higher educators has increased sharply (Qiang et al., 2009). On the one hand, the supportive national policies of gender equality expanded social awareness and consciousness of women status in society. More conscious and unconscious inclusion helped to create a more open environment for women in the workplace. On the other hand, the *Minban* (non-state-run) Higher Education Institution was established in 1993. The extension of the whole higher education industry and rapid enrollment growth demanded more professional faculty and staff participation in the tertiary education domain. The number of full-time female higher educators increased from 119,000 in 1993 to 364,500 in 2004 (Qiang et al., 2009). The number of female higher educators has tripled within 10 years, while their proportion of all faculty members expanded from 30.96% to 42.46% (Wei, 1995).

According to Zhu, Sun, and Zhao (2007), there is considerable variation between male and female recruitment. Certain job sectors require hiring men instead of women. Education is one of the few sectors that prefer female participation rather than male by a ratio of 33% to 6% (as cited in Webster, 2011, p. 14). The percentage and number of female higher educators does not reveal the whole picture of women’s status in higher education. Among female faculty in 2004, a large proportion were entry-level professors (teaching assistants) and lecturers (assistant professors). These two groups of female faculty represented 67% of the total number of female higher educators. In both junior-
level teaching groups, the number of female faculty approximated the amount of male counterparts and presented the largest percentage of female faculty in 2004 (see Table 1).

From 1993 to 2004, the number of middle-level female higher educators increased by almost five times, while the percentage grew nearly 200%. Although the middle-level teaching group expended rapidly, it remained a relatively small percentage of female faculty. A similar situation existed for high-level female faculty, which present the smallest group (see Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of female professors and percentage</th>
<th>Number of female associate professors and percentage</th>
<th>Number of female lectures and percentage</th>
<th>Number of female teaching assistants and percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2,929 12.01%</td>
<td>20,921 21.93%</td>
<td>53,145 32.69%</td>
<td>34,667 41.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16,045 19.28%</td>
<td>95,220 39.25%</td>
<td>127,825 45.50%</td>
<td>93,756 52.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Despite the rapid growth in the number of high-level female professors, the percentage does not match their male counterparts and directly affects the rate of women’s advancement to become leaders in higher education. According to Qiang et al. (2009), there are two types of leadership in Chinese higher education structure: academic and administrative. The small proportion of high-level professional female educators puts women at a disadvantage to compete for academic leadership positions. For
administrative leadership, the proportion of female supervisors also is very small and has increased slowly. From 1993 to 2004, the proportion increased from 13.7% to 21.7%.

Similar to the situations in business and other Chinese sectors, changes in law after decades of revolution bring improvements, but culture still heavily influences leadership roles for women. There exists limited research on Chinese women’s leadership, especially in higher education, a traditional organization system. Within existing research regarding women’s leadership, according to Bai (2014), the primary focus is on women’s leadership characteristics, women’s leadership styles, and strategies to improve female leaders’ advancement. However, the results of the research are based on the review of Western literature, which may not apply to the Chinese context. Additionally, scholars have not concentrated on studying gender leadership. Some scholars have found the emergence of gender issue while they research about business, politics, or psychology. They write one paper about this gender topic, but no continuative or deeper studies follow. However, as a current and controversial topic, women’s leadership has been comprehensively examined in Western cultures. Some of these results provide a helpful direction for research in China.

Gender and Leadership Effectiveness

The first generation of women laborers officially reckoned as entering the workforce in the 1970s, as reflected the U.S. (Book, 2001). The number increased from 18 million in 1950 to 42.1 million in 1978 (National Commission on Working Women, 1978). Women laborers endeavored to become more qualified at various professions by imitating their male counterparts’ performance and characteristics, but a huge gap continued to exist between payment and treatment of females and males. Women not
only failed to receive equal pay for equal work, but also their work was devalued (Book, 2001). According to Book (2001), in 1979, women’s income accounted for only 59% of their male counterparts for similar jobs and positions. Furthermore, only 5% of all working women reached the managerial positions, which represents only 18% of all managers (Baron, 1977).

This inequality did not have solely negative consequences, but drew more public attention. On the bright side, with the increasing number of women in the workforce and even in managerial positions, the aggravating issue of gender inequality was finally apparent enough to draw the scientific leadership community’s attention. According to Chemers (1997), due to the limited research methodologies and statistical techniques, it was difficult to recognize the low base rate phenomena in existence for female leaders. To conduct a measureable research design, the researchers needed a large enough sample size. Unfortunately, this kind of research design was costly to implement. Furthermore, predominately male researchers’ disinterest may be another cause for the lack of investigation of gender issues until the 1970s. In academia, male researchers assumed there was no difference between male and female laborers and nothing worth exploring. In reality, women were treated different by companies and even society during that period. As the increasing number of female scholars entered academia, they provided more attention and channels for raising the consciousness and awareness of gender inequality in the workforce and in the selection of women into managerial positions. Even today, this controversial topic is discussed and debated.
Research in Gender and Leadership Effectiveness

As Chemers (1997) stated, “Careful scientific research of women in leadership roles did not begin to appear until the 1970s” (p. 135). The earliest question 40 years ago was: Can women lead (Northouse, 2015)? Today, the answer to this question is positive and clear. Especially with the increasing presence of women leaders in business and politics all over the world, including the former United Kingdom Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and former President and Chief Executive Officer of eBay and the Chairwomen of Hewlett Packard Meg Whitman. The successful and effective female leaders in various domains proves that women can lead.

During the past four decades, the primary research questions on women and leadership have been extensively researched. More comparison studies between male and female leaders have been conducted. Thousands of articles and studies have been written about gender and leadership effectiveness in the workplace. Three frequently posed questions in leadership studies of gender differences include: (1) How is female leadership style different from male leadership? (2) Are female leadership styles less or more likely to be effective than men? and (3) Is the determination of women’s or men’s leadership effectiveness as leaders fact-based or a perception influenced by socialization? (Appelbaum, Audet, & Miller, 2003). Numerous studies have been conducted to answer these three questions (Book, 2001; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Van Engen, Leeden, & Willemsen, 2001), but the conclusions of the studies conducted around the 1970s provide varying viewpoints.
The first question, which scholars have investigated for decades, is whether female leadership style is different from male leadership. Chemers (1997) stated gender, as an individual difference variable, is mostly separated into male and female based on research by demographic and psychological approaches in regard to the biological attributes of gender. Among the many studies investigating the differences of gender, some found significant differences between men and women based on their natural intuition, inclination, social characters, behaviors, and expectation. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) found that men tend to be better at math and spatial memory, while women tend to be better at using verbal communication. Deaux (1984) found that women are more likely to attribute external factors to successful performance and to ascribe to internal factors to blame for failure. Scholars have argued that differences exist between men and women in the ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. However, when it comes to the differences in leadership styles between the two sexes, varying conclusions emerge.

Rhode (2003) stated that, besides an even greater amount of journalistic and psychological articles, over 200 empirical studies have been conducted to explore the gender differences in leadership styles. According to Eagly and Johnson (1990), meta-analysis indicates evidence for both the presence and the absence of gender differences in leadership styles.

In an early study, Nieva and Gutek (1981) concluded that “Contrary to notions about sex specialization in leadership styles, women leaders appear to behave in similar fashion to their male colleagues” (p. 91). Several studies have determined there are no differences between male and female leaders in people-oriented leadership style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Van Engen et al., 2001); task-oriented leadership (Eagly & Johnson,
or transformational leadership styles (Van Engen et al., 2001). Some studies have provided a reason why the evidence indicates there is no difference between women and men leadership styles. Book (2001) said the early generations of women laborers entering the workforce imitated their male counterparts’ performance and characteristics. When women first participated in professions or positions that were previously never occupied by females, women thought the only way to survive was to take on male behaviors to get work done. Hence, women did not act by following their first reaction and intuition. They behaved by what they thought others would expect and what they should do at that position. In this case, it would be difficult to determine the difference between men and women leadership styles.

In more current studies, scholars have examined gender differences in other leadership styles. Eagly and Johnson (1990), as well as Van Engen and Willemsen (2004) in their meta-analysis research, determined that women adopted more democratic and participative leadership styles, whereas men adopted more autocratic and directive leadership styles. Women learned to advance their leadership skills by exploring their own strengths in practice and establishing their own leadership styles. Currently, with a new paradigm of women leadership emerging in organizations, some investigators have argued no evidence exists to indicate men cannot learn from women and adopt a woman’s leadership style (Appelbaum et al., 2003). Compared to women who imitated men’s behaviors to adapt to the workplace in the 1970s and 1980s, it is interesting to observe the dramatic change and how male leaders are now asked to learn from female leaders in order to be more effective.
Although earlier research often has found no difference between male and female leadership styles, present research has illustrated that differences exist between men and women leadership styles. Potential differences in leadership style based on gender has been discussed in Western cultures for decades; such studies in China are rare; thus, further research is needed toward an answer for this question of gender differences in leadership style in Chinese culture.

Women have demonstrated they act different compared to males in some aspects of leadership practice. The second question, which is based on the outcomes of studies on gender differences in leadership styles, is whether women’s leadership styles are less or more likely to be effective than men. Numerous research studies have compared the outcomes of various leadership styles and evaluated which leadership style can motivate better performance or gain greater satisfaction from the followers. Using a variety of methodological approaches to investigate leader behaviors, traits, and diverse generations over several decades, research studies have drawn conclusions that provided insights into these issues.

Earlier studies have supported a view that women are inferior to men. Hennig and Jardim (1977) found women lacked requisite managerial skills and traits compared to men in leadership roles. In other words, the skills and traits that women possess put them at a disadvantage to compete in leadership positions with men. Hennig and Jardim further explained that men’s inclination is to relate current tasks or problems to future goals, so they treat risk as a potential opportunity to succeed or fail. Women link achievement to immediate situations, so they consider risk as a potential loss. From this study, women appear to be less competitive than men. Hennig and Jardim also found that women’s
performance and characteristics are shaped by their socialization experiences, such as working experience as well as social environment. Thus, women’s decreased competitive drive may not have come from inner qualities but, rather, may have been formed by their working environment and social expectations.

During the 1970s and 1980s, certain tasks and occupations that were traditionally completed by women would be considered less valuable in the field (Book, 2009). These jobs included so-called low-status jobs such as clerical, sales, and service (National Commission on Working Women, 1978). Because of a woman’s low social status at that time, some women became supervisors but still had less influence than their male counterparts in an organization (Terborg, Peters, Ilgen, & Smith, 1977). Based on social psychology and sociology studies, Chemers (1997) defined status as the differentiation between power and responsibility. Women, as a social group, were treated different, with low power and responsibility within society. This differentiation discouraged their leadership performance and prevented them from wielding any influence within organizations. Conversely, subordinates would criticize a female supervisor’s inability to increase their influence instead of considering the negative situational factors they faced (Terborg et al., 1977).

As Riger and Galligan (1980) stated, what society expected and/or encouraged women to develop was contrary to the demands for being promoted into management. Homer’s (1969) research discovered that women fear success as much as failure for the same reason, which is living up to other people’s different expectations. The fear of failure is because of their own performance expectations. The fear of success is because of societal negative expectations associated with being female. This paradoxical
perception of women’s low social status, being inexperienced working in the field, and limited expectations constrained development of women’s leadership. All of these factors have changed dramatically since the 1970s.

In more recent studies, some scholars have begun to hold the viewpoint that women are inferior to men, while another group of studies have insisted that there is no difference between effectiveness of female and male leaders. Taylor, Morin, Cohn, Clark, and Wang (2008) found the public rated women superior to men from a leadership traits perspective. Women were rated higher in five of eight leadership traits, which included being honest, intelligent, decisive, compassionate, outgoing, and creative. In two of eight leadership traits, hardworking and ambitious, women were rated the same as their male counterparts. Men prevailed over women only on decisiveness.

Taylor et al. (2008) conducted an experiment to investigate two hypothetical candidates for U.S. Congress based on their profiles. One group read profiles of two candidates with their gender identities hidden, while the other group read the profiles with their gender disclosed. The results showed that gender does not matter. Each group received approximately the same ratings.

Third is the determination that a woman’s or man’s effectiveness as a leader is fact-based or a perception influenced by socialization. Eagly and Johnson (1990) and Eagly and Wood (1991) determined in several meta-analytic studies that some predictions about different leadership styles between male and female are based on gender stereotypic expectations and not male or female leaders’ actual behaviors. Deaux (1984) also pointed out that both men’s and women’s behaviors and performance are
moderated by expectations, which include their own expectations and what they perceive others expect from them.

From culture to culture, generation to generation, and profession to profession, it is difficult to achieve consensus on the perception toward women leaders. One reason preventing scholars from achieving consensus is the diversity of the investigations. When scholars have discovered a pattern of gender and leadership in Western cultures, they test those patterns in other cultures, finding new and different values that define women in leadership. Few studies exist on the general perception toward Chinese female leaders in higher education.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Overview

This study was designed to investigate and determine Chinese higher educators’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness in regard to gender. This chapter includes research questions, design, population and sample, instrument, procedures, and limitations.

The research will provide an understanding of whether the gender of the leader has an impact on Chinese higher educators’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness. The awareness and consciousness of women in leadership have been studied in Western academia for decades; however, consensus around a series of women leadership topics is not easy to make because of various methodologies, professions, generations, and perspectives. Yet, both male and female leaders seem to garner information about themselves and learn from each other to improve their leadership skills and effectiveness.

In China, status differentiation between males and females has existed for thousands of years. Even today, Chinese people are heavily influenced by a male-dominated culture and Confucianism, which value the males more than females. After several important gender equality revolutions and government supported policies, women’s social status has increased rapidly, evidenced by a rise in female higher education enrollment, employment, and income. However, the growth of females in leadership roles is relatively slow in China when compared to Western cultures. Furthermore, Chinese higher education institutions have a unique structure and context that continue to be heavily influenced by three thousand years of tradition.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether gender, as a traditional factor to demarcate social status, influences Chinese higher educators’ perceptions toward
leadership outcomes. Will Chinese higher educators evaluate leaders’ effectiveness by examining their actual behaviors or by their general perception with or without bias toward male and female leaders? From subordinates’ perspectives, is there a difference among effective leadership practices of male leaders and female leaders?

**Hypotheses**

H1: Both male and female higher educators perceive male leaders as more effective than female leaders in general.

H2: In regard to specific leadership practices/behaviors, male leaders are perceived as more effective than female leaders at Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Challenging the Process.

H3: Female leaders are perceived as more effective than male counterparts only at Enabling Others to Act and Encouraging the Heart.

**Research Design**

Non-experimental quantitative research was conducted in this study without any control group and intervention. The research used an existing survey, the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) survey, to gain insight into Chinese higher educators’ perceptions toward leadership effectiveness. The LPI was developed in 1988 by Kouzes and Posner. It is a valid and reliable leadership survey that has been used in hundreds of research studies for decades.

**Study Participants**

The population in this study consisted of 603 higher educators from approximately 26 universities in China. The study targeted all levels of professors. Convenience sampling and snowball sampling were used in this study. Convenience
sampling means the researcher selects those participants who are convenient to contact and reliable to obtain a response (Keyton, 2010). In this case, the investigator contacted Chinese higher educators she knew in China and asked them to complete the survey. In addition to convenience, snowball sampling was conducted. Snowball sampling not only occurs when participants can assist in research exploration, but also when they can assist by identifying other similar participants (Keyton, 2010). In this case, the investigator asked the participants she contacted to complete the survey and to also send the survey to other educator colleagues.

**Instrumentation**

One instrument was utilized throughout this study: the modified Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) Observer survey. The LPI survey was developed by Kouzes and Posner (2012) in 1988 and was used in this research with permission from the developers (Appendix B). One of the most widely used leadership development instruments, the LPI has been used by over 350,000 leaders from various disciplines for 30 years (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). The LPI survey was originally developed by Kouzes and Posner in the early 1980s and was revised in the second edition of the LPI. There are 30 questions in the LPI Observer survey that were translated into Chinese by the experts. The survey was designed to gain insight into effective leadership behaviors by measuring leadership competencies when the leaders were leading at “their personal best” (p. 5). There are six detailed questions for examining each of five leadership competencies: (a) Modeling the Way, (b) Inspiring a Shared Vision, (c) Challenging the Process, (d) Enabling Others to Act, and (e) Encouraging the Heart. According to Kouzes and Posner (2012), these practices can serve as guidance for leaders to achieve their best and to get
things done efficiently. The practices were developed through intensive research on leadership practices. Many researchers have shown that these five categories leadership competencies can truly represent highly effective leadership practices (Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, & Jinks, 2007).

The LPI is a valid and reliable survey; the internal reliabilities of the self-report version of LPI are between 0.75 and 0.87. Reliabilities of the LPI-Observer scales range from .71 to .85 (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Kouzes and Posner (2012) have identified that the LPI has concurrent validity by using factor analysis and meta-review.

**Modeling the way.** In order to effectively lead followers, leaders need to first discover their own principles, beliefs, and values. They need to understand the reasons and motives behind the decisions they make, the standards they set up, and the ways they act. These leaders clarify the values they advocate and set the example by their actions. The consistency between words and actions can build credibility between leaders and followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

**Inspiring a shared vision.** As a vital leadership practice to hold group members together and to foster a commitment to a common goal, inspiring a shared vision is applied by creating an exciting and enabling possible picture to appeal to people to achieve. Leaders who can envision such a future with a hopeful and attractive image can encourage people to move forward and tackle current issues effectively and positively (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). According to Hennig and Jardim (1977), male leaders tend to relate current issues to a future mission. They confront the challenge for reaching potential opportunities through a long-term vision. From subordinates’ perspectives, they may hear a lot from male leaders about the big picture in the future for inspiring them and
motivating them. Hence, male leaders may be perceived as better at inspiring a vision than female leaders.

**Challenging the process.** By either creating new ideas for exploring opportunities or fostering a supporting environment for innovation, effective leaders can turn new ideas into actions, products, or improvement. Challenging the status quo in this rapidly changing world is crucial for a leader to guide followers to adapt and develop (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). According to Taylor et al. (2008), male leaders are rated high in ambition, while female leaders are rated high in working out compromises. Male leaders may be perceived as better at challenging the process than female leaders.

**Enabling others to act.** By involving others in planning and decision making, effective leaders foster trustworthy relationships and empower others. By exploring others’ full potential and strengthening them, leaders help followers practice and develop their skills. Enabling others to act effectively increases the competence of the whole group (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). According to Taylor et al. (2008), female leaders are rated high in the leadership traits of honesty, compassion, and outgoingness. Honesty helps them respect others’ rights when they deal with their subordinates. Compassionate and outgoing performance lead them to listen to diverse opinions and develop cooperative relationships, while male leaders are more decisive, which may not provide the freedom needed to empower others. Female leaders may be perceived as better than male leaders at enabling others to act.

**Encouraging the heart.** Recognizing people’s contributions by positive feedback and public praise effectively encourages and rewards people to continue positive behavior. Encouragement also sets up a clarification and high expectations for people to
achieve. Leaders can increase follower motivation by showing appreciation and creating ways to celebrate their accomplishments (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). The compassionate, outgoing, and relationship-oriented characteristics may assist female leaders to recognize others’ contributions and help others build confidence. Hence, female leaders may be perceived as better than male leaders at encouraging the heart.

**Research Procedures**

This section explains the procedures followed to obtain permission to conduct this study in China from the Western Kentucky University Institutional Review Board (IRB), permission to use the LPI survey from Kouzes and Posner, and the process of collection and data analysis.

**IRB and Instrument Approval**

IRB Permission was granted through the Institutional Review Board of Western Kentucky University (see Appendix A). Permission for using the LPI survey in this study was granted through the Wiley Publishing Company (see Appendix C). There was no charge to use the LPI due to the non-profit nature of this study.

**Process**

In the survey, the participants used a 10-point Likert scale to respond to each question and rate leadership practices (1 = Almost never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Seldom, 4 = Once in a while, 5 = Occasionally, 6 = Sometimes, 7 = Fairly often, 8 = Usually, 9 = Very frequently, and 10 = Almost always). The sum of the scores of the six questions for each of the five leadership practices represented the score of each participant.

Each participant was requested to respond to two LPI surveys. Each was asked to identify one most effective male leader and one most effective female leader, then
complete the LPI survey on each. The order of assessing male or female leader was set up to shuffle automatically to avoid bias. Additionally, demographic information collected from each participant provided descriptive data. Demographic data included age, gender, organizational division, academic discipline, and years of working in higher education (see Appendix D). No specifically identifying information and personal information were collected from the participants at any time during this study. Participants also rated these two leaders using a 10-point Likert Scale (1-least effective leader, 10-most effective leader) on their overall leadership effectiveness to create a dependent variable. LPI survey requires 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

The researcher imported the LPI survey into Qualtrics software, edited the title questions, and added demographic questions. Qualtrics produced a scan code which was delivered through a cellphone app. The author then contacted her personal contacts in China and asked them to complete the survey. The author explained to each contact that the survey was voluntary. After obtaining participant agreement, a Qualtrics scan code was sent through a popular social app in China named WeChat. Participants received the code, scanned it, and opened the survey through WeChat. All participants were asked to share this survey to their higher educator colleagues. After data were collected, they were imported into an Excel spreadsheet and transferred into the software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis.

Data Analysis

For the first hypothesis regarding the gender of a leader having an impact on Chinese higher educators’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness, both male and female participants perceived male leaders to be more effective than female leaders in general. A
2 (gender of participant) x 2 (gender of leader) MANOVA was conducted with the overall rating of leadership effectiveness. A 2 X 2 MANOVA was utilized to correlate between male Chinese higher educators’ perceptions with male leaders, male Chinese higher educators’ perceptions with female leaders, female Chinese higher educators’ perceptions with male leaders and, female Chinese higher educators’ perceptions with female leaders. Repeated Measures GLMs were conducted with Leader Gender as the within-subjects independent variable (IV) and Participant Gender as the between-subjects independent variable (IV); the dependent variable was the overall rating of leadership effectiveness.

For the second hypothesis in regard to specific leadership practices/behaviors, analyses were conducted to test whether male leaders were perceived as more effective than female leaders at Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Challenging the Process. Three of the five independent variables resulted from summing the responses to the six questions assessing each leadership practice. The summed independent variables identified significant leader practices for both male and female leaders. Repeated Measures GLMs were conducted with Leader Gender as the within-subjects independent variable (IV) and Participant Gender as the between-subjects independent variable (IV). The dependent variables (DVs) included the three specific leadership practices: Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Challenging the Process.

For the third hypothesis, analyses were conducted to test whether female leaders were perceived as more effective than male counterparts only at Enabling Others to Act and Encouraging the Heart. Repeated Measures GLMs were conducted with Leader Gender as the within-subjects independent variable (IV) and Participant Gender as the
between-subjects independent variable (IV). The dependent variables (DVs) included the other two specific leadership practices: Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Introduction

This study investigated whether there are different perceptions of Chinese higher educators on the effectiveness of their male and female leaders, what the differences are among leadership practices, and what demographic factors influence higher educators’ perceptions. It is important for scholars to understand and establish a reliable and measurable baseline of the views of Chinese subordinates toward different gender of leaders in different professions, to determine whether a certain gender of subordinates believe a certain gender of leaders is more effective, rather than evaluating their leadership practices, and to examine on which types of leadership practices Chinese subordinates think one gender of leaders is more effective than the other.

This study is necessary and important because the research of two crucial themes in worldwide academia, gender and leadership, is not well studied in China. Research deficiencies, such as the shortage of attention to these themes, the narrowness of the research perspectives, the limitation of methodology, and so few scholars participating these areas, exist in both themes in Chinese academia. Less attention does not indicate the issue does not exist but, rather, that the thousands of years of Chinese history, its masculine cultural background, and a general suspicion of social science have led to this issue being under studied.

This researcher used higher education as the first field to investigate the women’s leadership situation in China. The revised English and Chinese versions of LPI (see Appendices D & E) were created to measure Chinese higher educators’ views of their leaders’ leadership behaviors. The scale was comprised of two sets of 31 Likert items that
rated higher educators’ responses to the five subscales of exemplary leadership practices, plus one overall rating. One set was conducted to evaluate male leaders, while the other was used to evaluate female leaders. The responses ranged from 1 to 10 (almost never to almost always). Participants rated six detailed leadership behaviors in each subscale. The sum of six items was the score of each exemplary leadership practice. A higher score indicated a higher evaluation of leadership practices. The range of each leadership practice score was 6 to 60. The sum of the five subscales was the total score of a leader. The range of each total score was 30 to 300. The five sub-dimensions were (a) Modeling the Way, (b) Inspiring a Shared Vision, (c) Challenging the Process, (d) Enabling Others to Act, and (e) Encouraging the Heart. The 31st item for both sets of scales was “overall, this leader is effective.” The range of this overall score was 1 to 10, with 1 indicating the worst leader and 10 indicating the best.

Surveys were sent out via a Chinese social app called WeChat. The author sent the link to about 40 people in the contact of WeChat. Because the snowball samples were applied in this survey, it was difficult to identify how many people exactly received the link. From the Qualtrics record, 603 participants logged in to the survey; the survey netted 314 responses; 275 participants completed all questions. The data were exported into an Excel spreadsheet and entered into SPSS for analysis. In order to keep the validity of the results, the researcher deleted the participants who responded with all 10s or all 1s. A demographic survey of participants consisted of 9 questions (see Table 2).
Table 2

Demographic Information of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reveal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Doctorate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive University</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal Arts of University</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science University</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology University</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 *Demographic Information of Sample* (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-tier City</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-tier City</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-tier City</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth-tier City</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Chinese women experienced three main revolutions and greatly increased their social status in the past century, Chinese people still perceive males as more qualified to lead due to the rooted culture and the influence of Confucianism. Hence, Hypothesis 1 was designed to analyze the perception of both male and female higher educators toward the effectiveness of their male and female leaders in general by measuring and comparing the overall scores of the 31st items for both male and female leaders. The first 30 questions in each set of surveys asked participants to evaluate their leaders’ specific leadership behaviors, while the 31st question asked the participants’ general perceptions about the leaders they rated. The 31st item was designed to evaluate a subordinate’s overall feeling and observation about this leader.

Hypothesis 2 posited that Chinese higher educators would evaluate male leaders as more effective than female leaders at Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Challenging the Process by summing up the scores of six questions in each of the three leadership practices and comparing male and female subordinates, and male and female leaders. Hypothesis 3 posited that female leaders would be rated higher than male leaders at Enabling Others to Act and Encouraging the Heart. In this part, the comparison was conducted among the two specific leadership behaviors by summing the six items in
each of those dimensions. For all hypothesis testing, a $p < .05$ level of significance was set.

**Findings for Hypothesis One**

Hypothesis 1 predicted that both male and female higher educators perceive male leaders as more effective than female leaders in general. In order to test the differences of the perceptions of male and female higher educators toward male and female leaders’ overall effectiveness in Chinese higher education, Repeated Measures GLMs was considered suitable for measuring both Leader Gender and Participant Gender as independent variables (IVs). The Leader Gender was the within-subjects IV; the Participant Gender was the between-subjects IV; the Overall Effectiveness was the outcome factors as the dependent variable (DV).

The Overall Effectiveness was measured by using the score of the 31st item in the survey. Results showed that Leader Gender did not affect participants’ perceptions of overall leadership effectiveness, $F(250) = 2.27, p = .133$. That is, male and female leaders were perceived to have similar levels of overall effectiveness. Participant Gender also did not affect perception of overall leadership effectiveness either, $F(250) = 1.17, p = .28$. Last, the Leader Gender x Participant Gender interaction did not reach statistical significance, $F(250) = .38, p = .53$.

**Findings for Hypothesis Two**

Hypothesis 2 predicted that, in regard to specific leadership practices/behaviors, male leaders would be perceived as more effective than female leaders at Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Challenging the Process. In order to analyze the differences between the perceptions of the male and female participants’ evaluation of
male and female leaders’ leadership behaviors of Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Challenging the Process, the distribution of summing six items in each dimension was measured by Repeated Measures GLMs. Results show that Leader Gender affected participants’ perceptions of Modeling the Way practice, $F(250) = 4.20, p = .041$. That is, male leaders were perceived more effective than female leaders at Modeling the Way. Participant Gender did not affect perception of Modeling the Way, $F(250) = 3.89, p = .50$. Last, the Leader Gender x Participant Gender interaction did not reach statistical significance, $F(250) = .22, p = .64$. To be specific, as it shown in Table 3, the male leaders received higher scores from both male ($M = 41.73; SD = 13.33$) and female ($M = 44.83; SD = 11.08$) participants.

For Inspiring a Shared Vision, results indicate that Leader Gender affected participants’ perceptions, $F(250) = 12.12, p = .001$. That is, male leaders were perceived more effective than female leaders at Inspiring a Shared Vision. Participant Gender did not affect perception of Inspiring a Shared Vision either, $F(250) = 2.69, p = .10$. Lastly, the Leader Gender x Participant Gender interaction did not reach statistical significance, $F(250) = .37, p = .55$. To be specific, as it shows in Table 4, the male leaders received higher scores from both male ($M = 41.68; SD = 13.17$) and female ($M = 43.71; SD = 12.16$) participants.

For the Challenging the Process aspect, results demonstrated that Leader Gender affected participants’ perception, $F(250) = 7.39, p = .007$. That is, male leaders were perceived more effective than female leaders at Challenging the Process. Participant Gender did not affect perception of Challenging the Process, $F(250) = 1.76, p = .19$. Last, the Leader Gender x Participant Gender interaction did not reach statistical significance,
\( F(250) = .058, p = .81. \) To be specific, as seen in Table 5, the male leaders received higher scores from both male (\( M = 40.83; SD = 13.22 \)) and female (\( M = 43.04; SD = 12.72 \)) participants.

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Modeling the Way*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participants</th>
<th>Male Leaders</th>
<th>Female Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.73</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Inspiring a Shared Vision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participants</th>
<th>Male Leaders</th>
<th>Female Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.68</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>12.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Descriptive Statistics for Challenging the Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participants</th>
<th>Male Leaders</th>
<th>Female Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.83</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.04</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings for Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis 3 predicted that female leaders would be perceived as more effective than male counterparts only at Enabling Others to Act and Encouraging the Heart. In order to identify the differences among the perceptions of Chinese higher educators to leaders’ two aspects of leadership practices, the six questions in each category were summed. Results showed Leader Gender affected participants’ perceptions of Enabling Others to Act, \( F(250) = 5.87, p = .016 \). That is, female leaders were perceived less effective than male leaders at Enabling Others to Act. Participant Gender did not affect perception of Enabling Others to Act either, \( F(250) = 2.52, p = .11 \). Last, the Leader Gender x Participant Gender interaction did not reach statistical significance, \( F(250) = .001, p = .98 \). To be specific, as shown in Table 6, the male leaders received higher scores from both male (\( M = 42.44; SD = 12.91 \)) and female (\( M = 44.81; SD = 11.65 \)) participants.

For the other leadership practice, Encourage the Heart, results showed that Leader Gender did not affect participants’ perceptions, \( F(250) = 2.19, p = .14 \). That is, male and female leaders were perceived to have similar levels of Encouraging the Heart. Participant Gender did not affect perception of Encouraging the Heart, \( F(250) = 1.65, p = .20 \). Last, the Leader Gender x Participant Gender interaction did not reach statistical significance, \( F(250) = .71, p = .40 \). Hence, the difference between male and female leaders on Encouraging the Heart was not significant.
Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Enabling Others to Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participants</th>
<th>Male Leaders</th>
<th>Female Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.81</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Encouraging the Heart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participants</th>
<th>Male Leaders</th>
<th>Female Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.91</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td>11.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This chapter reported quantitative results of this study regarding the perceptions of Chinese higher educators toward the effectiveness of their leaders. Comparison between perceptions toward male and female leaders indicated there were statistically significant differences among the leadership practices. The differences among five exemplary leadership practices were illustrated not only between male and female leaders, but also among five aspects of behavior. Therefore, the findings indicate that, no matter whether male or female, higher educators believe male leaders are more effective than female leaders. However, the statistics did not prove the results related to leaders’ gender. Additionally, the results illustrated male leaders are rated higher in Model the
Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, and Enabling Others to Act than female leaders.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Discussion of Findings

The following section discusses the results of this study.

Hypothesis One

This study failed to determine a difference between the perceptions of Chinese higher educators toward their male and female leaders’ effectiveness in general. In other words, male and female leaders were perceived to have similar levels of overall effectiveness. In Western literature reviews, debates exist regarding gender and leadership effectiveness (Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Taylor et al., 2008). However, in general there was a consensus in the results of this study, as both Chinese male and female higher educators rated male leaders the same as their counterparts, supporting Hypothesis 1.

Before discussing other hypotheses, only analyzing the results of Hypothesis 1, it is a good sign to demonstrate there is little gender bias toward leaders’ effectiveness in Chinese higher education. Subordinates evaluate their male and female leaders equally and similarly.

Hypothesis Two

This study supported that, in regard to specific leadership practices/behaviors, male leaders are perceived as more effective than female leaders at Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Challenging the Process. The results indicated that subordinates’ gender did not affect the results; i.e., no matter male or female, higher educators rated male leaders more effective than female leaders at the three dimensions of exemplary leadership practices of Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and
Challenging the Process. This consistency could demonstrate only that male leaders received higher ratings because of their performance, but could not indicate the scores were due to their gender.

From the literature review, several possible reasons explain the finding. One of the possible reasons could be that women leaders indeed perform poorly in higher education. However, the feedback of the participants indicated some had never experienced a female leader, some had female leaders before, but none of these female leaders had real power to enact leadership behaviors. If this is the case, the background of participants and their lack of experience with female leaders may have affected the survey results in unintended and unknown ways.

Second, although three women’s revolutions have occurred in China in the past century, the Chinese culture continues to be influenced by thousands of years of Confucian ideals. The social expectation for women is still to obey men and to balance all their social roles, wife, daughter, mom, and employees. The expectation puts women in the follower place instead of a leader position. Hence, even when a woman is in an authority position, she may feel she has less power to act and to influence.

Third, due to denying the existence of gender inequality, both women and men paid little attention to how to develop male and female leaders in different ways. People pretending there is no difference between the genders undermines the opportunities to discover women’s strengths in leadership positions and to further improve them.

Fourth, higher education is one of the most traditional professions in China. Confucianism has influenced Chinese culture for thousands of years through the original classroom. This philosophy has been delivered generation by generation through
education. Hence, educators are the people who received the influence of this traditional philosophy the most. They view the philosophy as moral standards and teach the students based on their moral principles. Hence, it may explain why both males and females believe males can be the better leader in general.

Last, beside the people working in higher education being very culturally influenced, there are also an internal factor of these groups of people which is they are less ambitious. The primary purpose of most female high school students who choose to go to a teaching university is to have a stable job in the future. A stable job for a girl in China means one that is not too dangerous, not too tiring, not too challenging, earns a fairly good salary, and allows her to easily find a husband. Thus, their career decision predicts that this group of females will likely be less ambitious to advance and compete. The characteristics and personality of this group of females have laid the foundations of female leaders in this field. Hence, it would be understandable why both male and female subordinates have lower perceptions regarding the effectiveness of women leaders in higher education.

The lowest score shown was Challenging the Process, which may be related to the traditional atmosphere in higher education. Compared to other professions, higher education may appear as having a very stable status and developing slowly both in performance and mindset. The main work content of higher educators is to teach, research, and publish academic papers. Some of the participants even mentioned they do not have or need their offices anymore. They meet their leaders only in their weekly or monthly meetings. Hence, Challenging the Process is less likely to apply in the higher education field.
Hypothesis Three

This study failed to support a significant difference among the leadership practices of Chinese higher education leaders based on gender: female leaders are perceived as better than male counterparts at Enabling Others to Act and Encouraging the Heart. The results did not show that female leaders are perceived as better than male leaders in these two aspects but, rather, male leaders are perceived as more effective than female leaders in Enabling Others to Act. Although the score of male leaders at Encouraging the Heart was higher than female counterparts, the $p$-value was not significant, which means there is no difference between male and female leaders at Encouraging the Heart.

Based on the literature review, the researcher predicted that female leaders would be perceived as more effective in Encouraging the Heart. The data failed to support that, but also indicated that males are not more effective either. There are two possible assumptions to explain the results. The situation of female leaders in Chinese context may be very different from the situation from Western literature review. Female leaders in China may not have the specific and practical power to apply although they are in the leadership positions. As leaders who were used to not acting like leaders, do not know how to act like other male counterparts, or even not sure about their own leadership styles, females may have limited knowledge of what they can do as leaders, what are their strengths, and how to utilize them. Hence, the Chinese female leaders may not fit the leadership practices pattern from the literature.

Based on the question items included in Encouraging the Heart and the researcher’s personal experience, another possible reason is participants’ poor
understanding of what is Encouraging the Heart and how it feels. China, as a typical high power distance culture country, holds an unequal relationship between high power and low power in the hierarchy social system. Power distance is one of four well-known cultural value dimensions identified by Hofstede (1980). People in high power distance culture accept a higher degree of unequally distributed power from people who are older, wiser, or in the higher position than people in low power distance culture. Hence, Chinese leaders may not feel the need to make much effort to receive respect, loyalty, and commitment. The culture inherently influences people to obey, respect, and believe those who are older, wiser, or higher positioned. Hence, Chinese people may have a very low social expectation for their leaders to encourage their hearts in order to motivate them since they are used to follow the order from higher position without question.

Additionally, this result may relate to the cultural difference. Because the hypothesis was made based on Western studies, it may be very different from leadership styles in China.

The results also presented the general rating of the five exemplary leadership practices (see Figure 1). Leaders in higher education were perceived best at Enabling Others to Act. The results may relate to the high power distance culture in China, which may encourage leaders to coerce subordinates to do what they want them to do because of their unquestioned power and authority. In Chinese higher education, all public schools are government owned. If employees sign a contract, the regulations are very strict and defined, such as the number of hours they need to work at least for each semester, the number of papers they must publish a year, the frequency of studying abroad as a visiting scholar, or the length of time have to go abroad to study. All work performance relates to their salary, evaluation, and promotion. This system makes the
relationship and interaction between the superior and the subordinate very clear. The leaders do not need to utilize various methods to motivate their subordinates because the subordinates know what they have to do without question.

Comparing the results of the five leadership practices and overall effectiveness, male leaders were perceived as more effective than female leaders in four of five dimensions of leadership behaviors, while male and female leaders were perceived to have similar levels of overall effectiveness. These inconsistent results may show more potential gender bias.

In research by Taylor et al. (2008), the results of evaluating specific leadership characteristics were different from the outcomes of the general overall score. Women were rated higher than male counterparts on their leadership performance; however, women were rated lower in regard to the overview effectiveness question. The phenomenon was possibly caused by a gender bias. This study showed similar inconsistencies between the evaluation of specific behaviors and general overview toward male and female leaders, which indicated the existence of the gender differences. These results also consist with what the author heard in China while she prepared this study. People kept denying the existence of any kind of gender bias in the Chinese workplace. They were unwilling to admit there was any kind of gender differences in the workplace, and they tried to convince the author that leaders are different because of individuals’ personality, not gender. Here, the results show people do hold different opinions about leaders’ behaviors and general perception toward gender.

One possible reason for this result may be due to information about the purpose of the study. The researcher was asked to inform the participants of the purpose of the
survey. When participants read about the topic of women leadership, they could have felt vigilance for this sensitive theme. From the raw data, the researcher noticed that quite a few participants rated behaviors of female leaders in the middle level, yet suddenly rated them 10 for the overall score. This inconsistent rating is a sign that participants may have chosen to hide their real feeling about male and female leaders’ effectiveness in order to avoid suspicion of gender bias.

On the other hand, the overall rating may show the real insight of subordinates’ perceptions by considering the feeling toward male and female leaders. The reason that the outcomes of overall scores were different from the five practices could be because the female leaders do not have enough opportunities to use those leadership behaviors with their limited power. Subordinates may have good impression of their female leaders, however, when it comes to the specific leadership practices, they have difficulties to relate those behaviors to their powerless female leaders.

![Figure 1. Descriptive Statistics.](image-url)
Limitations

Limited research has been conducted in China about women’s leadership. As a relatively early study, there are quite a few limitations that can be averted in future research. First, the lack of female leaders was the primary limitation that impacted the results of this study. In the survey, there are two sets of questions: one set for evaluating male leaders, and the other for rating female leaders. However, from the feedback and suggestions at the end of survey, many participants had never experienced a female leader. They had to think back to their high school or college female teachers to complete the survey. Some participants mentioned their concerns regarding limited female leaders to rate in their feedback. They indicated that most of their female leaders did not have legitimate power, but only a title; i.e., these female leaders did not have the authority to apply leadership behaviors in their positions. Some felt it was unfair to evaluate female leaders who they felt did not have the same power as their male counterparts in their management position. It also is possible that people who believe female leaders are less effective than male leaders may not recognize their female leaders have less power to influence compared to their counterparts.

The second limitation in this study was the limited amount of Chinese leadership literature and research. There is no leadership major in Chinese education institutions, which means the participants did not have any training or education about leadership concepts and behaviors. Although the five exemplary leadership practices in the LPI survey discussed general leadership behaviors, such as listening to diverse opinions, sharing vision with followers, and finding ways to obtain feedback, Chinese higher educators may have a very limited and narrow understanding about those leadership
practices. The lack of conceptual mindset could influence participants’ perceptions. From the feedback, some participants thought the survey was testing the leaders in an ideal world.

Due to the lack of leadership knowledge, it is difficult to discern whether the leaders acted as described in the five practices or whether subordinates had not observed their interactions with the leaders from a leadership perspective. Some participants mentioned they felt the majority of questions were similar, which confused them and made an evaluation difficult. Actually, in the LPI survey each item measures specific and detailed behaviors. Overall, the understanding of Chinese people to the science of leadership is still developing. They do not have enough information and knowledge to understand that social science may help them determine social issues. One participant suggested the researcher should not only conduct the survey, but also do something practical for society because he or she did not believe the survey would help female leaders to be more advanced.

The third limitation was related to the second about understanding of the survey. The translated Chinese version LPI survey was provided by Kouzes and Posner through the Wiley Publishing Company. The author was not authorized to modify the words in the survey. However, based on the feedback, the language used in the Chinese version was too simple to understand accurately, especially to people who do not have leadership knowledge background. The short and simple descriptions seemed concise but did not provide a vivid situation for participants to imagine and relate to their own experience. Additionally, the 10-point Likert scale is not often used in Chinese surveys. Also, some measurement words were very similar in Chinese; e.g., “fairly often” and “usually” are
barely different in Chinese. Participants complained about this confusion. It should be noted that the 10-point Likert scale version survey was revised from a 5-point Likert scale by Kouzes and Posner in the second edition of LPI due to higher reliability (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

The following limitations are from the author’s perspective. The survey was too long for people who do not have a leadership background. They needed to put a concerted effort to consider things they barely know. Normally, the survey would take 10 to 15 minutes; however, for this group of participants, it took at least 20 minutes, especially when they found out that they needed to answer another survey on another leader, likely causing some participants to lose patience and focus. This was the place at which most participants who did not finish the survey gave up. In addition, the survey was created and sent through Qualtrics software. Because Qualtrics is an English software company, the format is not very suitable to Chinese characters, and it was very inconvenient to read. Participants had to keep moving the screen to read the whole question and the 10 Likert points.

Fifth, the research context (higher education) also created limitations. The main reason for choosing higher education as the research field was ease of sampling in this cross-country study. It is difficult to obtain permission to gather data on a large scale in China. Chinese higher education exists in a very traditional atmosphere due to its thousands of years of background and high power position in the society. The conceptual transition also has changed gradually, but slowly in higher education. The results in this study may represent only the opinions of groups who are deeply influenced by conventional culture and not modern China. It is very possible that, in business, politics,
and other fields, there may exist distinguishable opinions and debates regarding the effectiveness of male and female leaders.

From the outcomes of the survey, the way of asking the overall evaluating question was difficult to translate. Future researchers should consider other ways to ask about overall perception from various perspectives. All the limitations provide potential for future research in this area.

**Implications for Further Study**

The results of this research offer a basic understanding of how subordinates perceive their male and female leaders’ leadership behaviors different in Chinese higher education. With the interest of the current situation of women leaders in China, this study provides insight in identifying how people reflect on their female leaders compared to their male leaders in higher education. As one of the most traditional professions, higher education may be influenced by the culture and constrained by social norms. People who work in higher education may hold a relative point of view. On the other hand, this profession plays a vital role in Chinese society because the perception of higher educators will influence future generations. What happens in higher education may be very different from what happens in other professions, such as business and politics, but it definitely indicates a basic condition of women leadership in China. Hence, a comparison of perceptions in higher education, in business, and in other professions can be conducted in future studies. Female leaders’ power and performance may vary due to the professional requirements and social expectations. It also may help to illustrate how the differences emerge in various professions.
An evaluation to determine the important leadership characteristics and behaviors in China also would benefit future research. The results of this study indicate a general Chinese understanding of leadership behaviors when they observe their leaders’ practices. The LPI survey, as a very simple, detailed, and basic survey in the leadership field in the past three decades, bewildered several participants in this research. From the feedback, there were some who could not complete the survey because they did not understand the descriptive items. Research that investigates leadership characteristics and behaviors of Chinese people based on Chinese culture and social development would add to the body of Chinese leadership understanding. According to the results of this study, a localized leadership practices questionnaire translation would provide more accurate survey results.

A further qualitative study can be conducted based on the outcomes from this study. The results create a primary and basic understanding about the status of women leadership in China. Follow-up, one-on-one, or focus group interviews could illustrate the reason behind the differences between the scores. Additionally, the interview questions could be asked based on the results of this study rather than on the Western studies. The open-ended questions could provide a detailed interpretation of the quantitative outcomes in this study. The inconsistent results of the five leadership practices and overall effectiveness indicate that there is potential and possible reason to make people have two different answer. Further interview may help to reveal the reasons behind the results.

This study also find out the people may have little knowledge about what are the strengths of female leaders in the workplace. In order to explore Chinese female leaders’ leadership styles, more studies are needed. Since the difference between male and female
leaders on Encouraging the Heart was not significant, it is possible that women are actually superior in this aspect. Future studies could investigate the influence of gender on this leadership practice, especially in other professions.

In this study, marriage status significantly influenced subordinates’ perceptions on Modeling the Way. Unmarried participants rated male leaders as more effective than female leaders, while married participants believed there is no significance between male and female leaders. A study regarding how marriage influences people’s perceptions about gender in the workplace may be prove important in furthering leadership understanding in China.

**Conclusion**

This study has increased the knowledge of Chinese leadership, especially in regard to gender in higher education. It has added knowledge to a better understanding of the social phenomenon of leadership effectiveness and gender and will aid in future studies. The expanding knowledge will not only draw Chinese people’s attention to gender issues and leadership, but also on leadership learning and development. Understanding will guide actions to enhance leaders’ performance and practice. Finally, it is hoped the results of this research will create more awareness regarding the existence of inequality in Chinese leadership opportunities for women and will help to shape the future of leadership education and training in China.
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**APPENDIX D: Revised LPI Survey**

Think of the most effective male leader you have observed in higher education, and answer the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Very frequently</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>He sets a personal example of what he expects from other people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>He looks ahead and communicates about what he believes will affect us in the future.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>He looks around for ways to develop and challenge his skills and abilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>He fosters cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people he works with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>He praises people for a job well done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>He spends time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>He describes to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>He looks for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>He actively listens to diverse points of view.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>He encourages others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>He follows through on the promises and commitments he makes in this organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>He talks with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>He keeps current on events and activities that might affect our organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>He treats others with dignity and respect.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>He gives people in our organization support and expresses appreciation for their contributions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>He finds ways to get feedback about how his actions affect other people’s performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>He talks with others about how their own interests</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
can be met by working toward a common goal.

18. When things do not go as we expected, he asks, “what can we learn from this experience?”

19. He supports the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.

20. He makes it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.

21. He builds consensus on an agreed-on set of values for our organization.

22. He is upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.

23. He makes sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.

24. He gives others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.

25. He finds ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.

26. He talks about the values and principles that guide his actions.

27. He speaks with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.

28. He takes initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.

29. He provides opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.

30. He makes sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.

31. Please rate this leader from one to ten on their leadership effectiveness (one means the worst leader, ten means the best leader)
Think of one ideal female leader you have ever experienced before, and answer the following questions.

1. She sets a personal example of what she expects from other people.  
2. She looks ahead and communicates about what she believes will affect us in the future.  
3. She looks around for ways to develop and challenge her skills and abilities.  
4. She fosters cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people he works with.  
5. She praises people for a job well done.  
6. She spends time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.  
7. She describes to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.  
8. She looks for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.  
9. She actively listens to diverse points of view.  
10. She encourages others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.  
11. She follows through on the promises and commitments she makes in this organization.  
12. She talks with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.
13. She keeps current on events and activities that might affect our organization.

14. She treats others with dignity and respect.

15. She gives people in our organization support and expresses appreciation for their contributions.

16. She finds ways to get feedback about how his actions affect other people’s performance.

17. She talks with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.

18. When things do not go as we expected, she asks, “what can we learn from this experience?”

19. She supports the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.

20. She makes it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.

21. She builds consensus on an agreed-on set of values for our organization.

22. She is upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.

23. She makes sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.

24. She gives others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.

25. She finds ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.

26. She talks about the values and principles that guide her actions.

27. She speaks with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.

28. She takes initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.

29. She provides opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.
30. She makes sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

31. Please rate this leader from one to ten on their leadership effectiveness (one means the worst leader, ten means the best leader)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**Influence Survey Demographic Information**

Please provide the following information. You are not required to answer any question that you find inappropriate.

**Age:**

**Gender:** M ____ F____

**Highest Level of Education:** High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent________Bachelor’s degree_______Master’s degree_______Professional degree_______Doctorate degree______

**Marital Status:**-Married_______Single_________Divorced___________________

**The University You Teach at Is:** Comprehensive University_______Liberal arts University_______Science University___________________

**You Live in A:** First-level City_____Second-level City_______Third-level City_______Fourth-level City_____Rural Area________

**Academic Discipline:** - __________________________

**Years of Working in Higher Education:** - __________________________

**Suggestion to This Survey:** __________________________
回想您见过并经历过的最有效率的一位男性领导，请结合他的行为回答以下问题。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>几乎从未</td>
<td>极少</td>
<td>很少</td>
<td>一段时间一次</td>
<td>偶尔</td>
<td>有时</td>
<td>经常</td>
<td>通常</td>
<td>非常频繁</td>
<td>几乎一直</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 他会用自己的行为展示他对别人的期待。

2. 他看得很远并跟大家沟通他为什么会在未来影响大家。

3. 他会思考什么方法可以提高和挑战他的技术和能力。

4. 他在团队里营造一个合作而非竞争的关系。

5. 他会给予表扬当人们优秀完成工作的时候。

6. 他会花时间和精力去确认在团队中人们是否遵守着我们共同同意的原则和标准。

7. 他会描述团队里其他人能够胜任的才能。

8. 他用不同方式帮助他人尝试新想法。

9. 他积极聆听不同的想法。

10. 他鼓励他人当人们做项目的时候。

11. 他给出的承诺会一一做到。

12. 他会跟其他人分享团队会变得更好的愿景。
13. 他会对当下的活动负责。

14. 他尊重别人。

15. 他会给予团队成员支持并对他们的贡献表示感激。

16. 他会想不同的方法去获取人们对行为的反馈。

17. 他会同他人谈论如果在达成团队目标的同时实现自己的利益。

18. 当事情不如我们所预期，他会问“我们从这次经验中学到什么了呢”

19. 他支持我们集体中的人做他们自己的决定。

20. 他会公开示意谁对组织有承诺。

21. 他会建立一定的统一对于企业的价值观。

22. 当说到企业的会完成的目标，他很积极正能量。

23. 他会确认我们设定好目标并根据目标制定具体的计划。

24. 他给大家很大的自由度去决定。

25. 他会找不同的方法让大家庆祝成就。

26. 他会讲述引导着他的行为的价值观和原则。

27. 他会讲述我们当前做的事情的更高一层目标和意义来说服。

28. 他会开始试验式的开启我们可以做的事情。

29. 他会给他人机会去接受领导层责任。
30. 他会确定成员们的贡献被认可。

31. 请您整体为这位领导评分 (一是最差的领导，十是最好的领导)
回想您见过并经历过的最有效率的一位女性领导，请结合他的行为回答以下问题。

1. 她会用自己的行为展示他对别人的期待。
2. 她看得很远并跟大家沟通他认为什么会在未来影响大家。
3. 她会思考什么方法可以提高和挑战他的技术和能力。
4. 她在团队里营造一个合作而非竞争的关系。
5. 她会给予表扬当人们优秀完成工作的时候。
6. 她会花时间和精力去确认在团队中人们是否遵守着我们共同同意的原则和标准。
7. 她会描述团队里其他人能够胜任的才能。
8. 她用不同方式帮助他人尝试新想法。
9. 她积极聆听不同的想法。
10. 她鼓励他人当人们做项目的时候。
11. 她给出的承诺会一一做到。
12. 她会跟其他人分享团队会变得更好的愿景。
13. 她会对当下的活动负责。
14. 她尊重别人。
15. 她会给予团队成员支持并对他们的贡献表示感激。
16. 她会想不同的方法去获取人们对他行为的反馈。
17. 她会同他人谈论如果在达到团队目标的同时实现自己的利益。
18. 当事情应不如我们所预期，她会问“我们从这次经验中学到了什么？”
19. 她支持我们集体中的人做他们自己的决定。
20. 她会公开示意谁对组织有承诺。
21. 她会建立一定的统一对于企业的价值观。
22. 当说到企业的会完成的目标，她很积极正能量。
23. 她会确认我们设定好目标并根据目标制定具体的计划。
24. 她给大家很大的自由度去决定。
25. 她会找不同的方法让大家庆祝成就。
26. 她会讲述引导着他的行为的价值观和原则。
27. 她会讲述我们当前做的事情的更高一层目标和意义来说服。
28. 她会开始试验式的开启我们可以做的事情。

29. 她会给人机会去接受领导层责任。

30. 她会确定成员们的贡献被认可。

31. 请您整体为这位领导评分 (一是最差的领导，十是最好的领导)

描述性信息

年龄: __________

性别:  男  ___  女____

最高学历: 高中_________本科 ________ 研究生_________荣誉学位 ________ 博士学位____

婚姻状况: 已婚______  单身______  离异

您教书所在大学类型: 综合类大学______ 文科类大学 _________ 理科类大学 _________

生活所在城市属: 一线城市______ 二线城市______ 三线城市______ 四线城市______ 乡村______

教学系别: -________________________

在大学工作年份: ____________________