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Managerial stereotypes may be one of the largest barriers to attaining leadership positions in sport organizations. Consistently, researchers have found managerial stereotypes are associated with masculine characteristics (see Eagly & Karau, 2002 for review), thereby limiting women’s ability to break through the “glass ceiling.” For instance, Acosta and Carpenter (2008) found the percentage of women directing women’s National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) athletic programs has decreased from 90% to 21.3%, and women head coaches of women’s teams has dwindled from 90% to 42.4%. Whisenant’s (2003, 2008) investigations into interscholastic athletics found women are underrepresented in similar areas: 14% of athletic director positions and 50% of head coaching positions for girls’ teams were filled by women. Internationally, Shaw and Hoeber (2003) presented evidence demonstrating women’s underrepresentation in management positions among national sport organizations in Australia, Canada, and England.

Women’s underrepresentation in intercollegiate athletics has received considerable attention in the literature. For instance, researchers have established women receive less for their human and social capital investments (Cunningham & Sagas, 2002; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004), and also face access and treatment discrimination that limit their access to leadership positions (Aicher & Sagas, 2009; Knoppers, 1992; Lovett & Lowry, 1994). From a different perspective, researchers have also found women leave the coaching profession sooner than men (Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, & Forrest, 1991), express less interest in becoming a head coach (Cunningham, Doherty, & Gregg, 2007), and have established differences in self-efficacy (Cunningham et al., 2007). Additionally, women anticipate lower outcomes associated with being a head coach, perceive less support from administrators (Dixon & Sagas, 2007), and perceive fewer opportunities in the profession (Knoppers et al., 1991).

Collectively, this research has contributed much to the understanding of the under-representation of women in leadership positions. However, one area receiving little attention in the literature is the impact a key organizational vari-
able, diversity culture, may potentially have on gendered leadership stereotypes. Indeed, a number of studies and theoretical frameworks have touted the benefits of a culture that promotes diversity and inclusion (DeSensi, 1995; Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999; Fink & Pastore, 1999; Fink, Pastore, & Riemer, 2001, 2003). For instance, Fink et al. (2001, 2003) found proactive diversity cultures were positively associated with a number of desired outcomes, including the attraction of a diverse fan base and overall departmental diversity. The purpose of this study was to extend this understanding by examining the potential impact of an organization’s culture on gendered leadership stereotypes. To do so, we drew from the social identity theory of leadership to examine the collective influence of leader sex, organizational culture, and the interaction between those two constructs on two key outcomes: leadership prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. The underlying theoretical tenets and our specific hypotheses are presented in the following space.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social Identity Theory of Leadership

Utilizing social identity theory and self-categorization theory, Hogg (2001) developed the social identity theory of leadership (SITL). Social identity affects leadership views through the notion of prototypicality and directly attributes leadership categorizations to social influence processes. The strength of the group’s saliency and a group member’s identification with the group may affect leadership perceptions, leadership evaluations, and perceived leadership effectiveness (Hogg, 2001). The main premise of SITL is that, as group membership becomes psychologically more salient, leadership endorsement and effectiveness become products of group identity: defined as prototypicality (Hogg, Abrams, Otten, & Hinkle, 2004).

Hogg (2001) defined leadership as “how some individuals...have disproportionate power and influence to set agenda, define identity, and mobilize people to achieve goals” (p. 188). Therefore, a leader possesses disproportionate influence over attitudes, beliefs, and vision for the group through consensual prestige or power (Hogg, 2001). In this regard, leadership is viewed as relational, in that it identifies a relationship in which individuals are able to influence others to embrace new beliefs, goals, and values as if they were their own (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003). This is comparative to charismatic (i.e., proactive, motivating, inspiring) or transformational (i.e., change-oriented, innovative, mission and vision oriented) leadership views. Finally, SITL posits leadership is a relational property within groups because a leader only exists when followers are present and vice versa (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003).

Prototypicality, social attraction, and information processing are three core processes operating simultaneously to influence leadership perceptions (Hogg, 2001). Prototypicality is the basis for perception and evaluation of self and
others, and group members are differentiated within the group based on prototypicality through the depersonalization process (Hogg, 1993). Social attraction is prototype-based and implies group members like prototypical members more than non-prototypical members. Therefore, a prototypical group member may actively influence others within the group and gain acceptance of her/his ideas more readily (Hogg, 2001). Finally, attribution and information processing translate group prototypes into leadership expectations or stereotypes.

Hogg (2001) argued the "central prediction from the SITL is that as people identify more strongly with a group, the basis for leadership perceptions, evaluations, and endorsement becomes increasingly influenced by prototypicality" (p. 191). Moreover, prototypical members are more likely to emerge as leaders, and these prototypical leaders will be evaluated more favorably (Hogg, 2001). Hogg and Reid (2006) suggested this occurred because followers adjust their behaviors to the leader’s behavior when the leader is perceived as prototypical. Moreover, followers prefer prototypical leaders because (a) they embody the group prototype, (b) prototypical leaders behave in a group-serving manner, (c) prototypicality generates more trust in the leader, and (d) prototypical members are considered the best information source about the group prototype.

A group member’s identification to the group and the importance of the group identity to the individual’s self-esteem functions as a leadership effectiveness measure (Hogg et al., 2006). Under low salient conditions, individuals evaluate the task nature to establish leadership expectations, and under high salient conditions, leaders who display prototypical group attributes were rated as more effective (Hogg et al., 2006). Reicher, Haslam, and Hopkins (2005) suggested leadership is contingent upon leaders being perceived as a group’s prototypical member, and in order to be influential and effective, “leaders need to represent and define the social identity context” (p. 552). Berscheid and Reis (1998) supported this assertion in their findings when they found that people are more likely to agree with others who are similar, comply with similar others’ requests, and less likely to disagree with those who they like.

**Leadership and Sex**

Social identity theory of leadership may explain the perceived “glass ceiling” considered to be present in most organizations for nontraditional leaders (e.g., women). The SITL predicts that as group membership becomes more salient, the level of congruency between the leader’s characteristics and the group’s prototype will affect leadership endorsement and perceived leadership effectiveness (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003). Thus, a mismatch between the leader’s demographic characteristics compared to the group prototype may impact her/his effectiveness and endorsement ratings (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003).
In terms of the demographic relationship with prototypicality, most researchers have focused on sex because organizational prototypes are believed to favor men (i.e., persons stereotypically more masculine) over women (i.e., persons stereotypically more feminine; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003). For instance, Hogg et al. (2006) found a relationship between the task’s nature, group saliency, sex, and leadership endorsement. This interaction showed women were perceived as more prototypical leaders for expressive tasks, and men were more prototypical for instrumental tasks. Additionally, as the group’s saliency level increased, the sexing of the position also increased, thus suggesting group members with high identification working on an instrumental task would endorse a man as leader, while high identifying members in an expressive task would endorse a woman leader.

Hogg et al. (2006) also evaluated the effects of traditional values had on leader selection. Their results illustrated prototypical leaders were considered more effective than non-prototypical leaders. Additionally, more traditional participants indicated a man was more prototypical for instrumental tasks, a woman was more prototypical for expressive tasks, and nontraditional members felt men and women were less prototypical for their respective tasks. This study extends STTL in that it demonstrated individuals use their own stereotypes of social categories to indicate a match between leader selection and group norms (Hogg et al., 2006).

**Diversity Culture**

In addition to leader sex, the organization’s culture might also impact perceptions of the leader. Fink and Pastore (1999) developed a comprehensive diversity management model that has been tested empirically in a number of studies (Cunningham, 2009; Fink, et al., 2001, 2003). They proposed organizations adopt one of three approaches to managing diversity: compliance, reactive, or proactive. In subsequent research, Fink et al. discovered compliant and proactive were the most common strategies in Division I and III institutions. Therefore, in this study we will concentrate on compliant and proactive cultures.

Compliant organizations view diversity as a liability; however, they bring in diverse individuals to curb law suits (Fink et al., 2003). In doing so, compliant organizations do nothing to benefit from the positive outcomes a diverse organization may engender, nor do they support diverse individuals (Fink & Pastore, 1999). Rather, they assimilate different individuals into the majority culture (Fink et al., 2003), and fail to assist diverse individuals with succeeding within the organization (Golembiewski, 1995). Due to the lack of diversity management, this organizational type may engender negative employee attitudes and behaviors, group processes, and overall performance (Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003; Mannix & Neale, 2005; Webber & Donahue, 2001).

Proactive organizations employ broader views of diversity (e.g., values,
beliefs, socioeconomic status, sexuality; Holladay, Knight, Paige, & Quinones, 2003), and diversity is believed to be an asset to the organization (Fink & Pastore, 1999). Leaders within this type of organization have developed an appreciation for the individuals’ uniqueness (Fink & Pastore, 1999). Value in diversity becomes a part of the organization’s missions, goals, policies, procedures, and practices, and personnel and financial resources are utilized to ensure the commitment to the diversity initiative (Allen & Montgomery, 2001; Cunningham, 2009; Thomas 1991). In a proactive culture, diversity issues are proactively addressed, diversity is viewed as a social justice issue, and employees at different levels are involved within the organization decision-making process (Fink & Pastore).

Proactive diversity management strategies have been related to positive individual (e.g., satisfaction) and organizational level (e.g., creative workplace) outcomes (Fink et al., 2001, 2003). Additionally, Cunningham (2009) found racial diversity’s effect on performance was moderated by a proactive diversity management strategy. These findings further bolstered the arguments of Kochan et al. (2003) who put forward that organizations who will truly receive the benefits of diversity will do so only when the organization entrenches diversity into the organization’s mission, policies, and practices.

Study Overview and Hypotheses

In the current study, we considered the effects of leader sex and organizational culture on subsequent perceptions of the leader. Participants took part in an experiment where they role-played being members of an athletic department. We varied the diversity culture and the athletic director’s sex. Participants read about a decision the athletic director made concerning budget cuts within the department, and then rated the director’s prototypicality and effectiveness.

Based on this literature review, we advanced several hypotheses. First, we expected men would be considered more prototypical than women. Leadership positions in sport organizations are dominated by men, and thus, a sport organization’s leadership prototype may have become consistent with masculine characteristics (Knoppers, 1992; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). This position is consistent with SIT’s underlying tenets. For instance, Hogg and van Knippenberg (2003) suggested a mismatch in demographic characteristics might impact a group members’ perception of the leader. This would suggest a group with a higher percentage of either men or women would consider the dominant sex as more prototypical. Men’s domination of sport organizations (Aitchison, 2005) further adds credence to the hypothesis that masculinity will be consistent with prototypicality. Therefore, we hypothesized:
Hypothesis 1: Men will be considered more prototypical of leadership compared to women.

The culture type present in sport organizations may affect a leader’s evaluation, particularly if the leader’s sex is not prototypical of the organizational culture. For instance, the SITL predicts that as group saliency levels increase, the congruency level between the leader’s characteristics and the group’s prototype would affect leadership endorsement and perceived leadership effectiveness (Hogg and van Knippenberg, 2003). Therefore, in cultures where diversity is not valued (i.e., compliant), homologous reproduction and discrimination is prevalent, and the traditional majority hold power, people might hold traditional leadership views: “think manager, think male.” Conversely, in cultures where diversity is valued (i.e., proactive), a multicultural group holds the power, and discrimination is challenged, persons might view women as prototypical leaders.

In drawing from SITL and the Fink and Pastore (1999) framework, we expected individuals within a compliant culture would consider men as congruent with leadership prototypicality, but not women. In proactive cultures, women and men would be perceived as consistent with leadership prototypicality because neither sex would depart from the group prototype.

Hypothesis 2: Culture will moderate the relationship between leader’s sex and leadership prototypicality.

In terms of leadership effectiveness, we expected individuals who considered the leader as prototypical of the group would rate the leader higher than individuals who do not denote the leaders as prototypical. Previous research supports this assertion. For instance, De Cremer and van Knippenberg (2002) demonstrated prototypical leaders were rated more effective than non-prototypical leaders. Prototypical leaders are also afforded a greater amount of leeway with their actions and behaviors with little impact on their effectiveness rating (Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001). Influential tactics did not affect leadership effectiveness ratings for prototypical leaders (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2001), and self-sacrificing behavior combined with prototypicality increased leadership effectiveness rating (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). Thus, we hypothesized:

Hypothesis 3: Leadership prototypicality will positively affect effectiveness ratings.

Method

Sample

Students (N = 278; 140 male, 102 female) enrolled in physical activity classes at a large public university in the Southwest United States voluntarily participated in the study. The majority of the respondents were White (63.90%), followed by Hispanic (19.50%), Asian (6.90%), other (3.60%), African American (2.50%), and Native American
(1.40%). The mean age was 20.75 years (SD = 1.61). Most participants actively participated in sports (84.50%).

Procedure and Materials

In order to test the hypotheses, we employed a 2 (organizational culture: compliant, proactive) x 2 (leader’s sex: female, male) experimental design. First, participants read a vignette describing the athletic department’s organizational culture in which they were recently hired. Participants were randomly assigned to either a proactive culture or a compliant culture. The foundation for the scenarios was based on the main tenets of Fink and Pastore’s (1999) diversity management strategies scale and Cunningham’s (2009) study. The proactive scenario read as follows:

This athletic department has flexible work hours and schedules and attempts to make everyone feel as if they contribute to the department. Building and managing diversity is included in the department’s mission, and there are open lines of communication aimed at gleaming the advantages of diversity. Strategies, policies, and procedures are in place in order to capitalize on individual differences. The department also manages diversity by anticipating problems and initiating incentives to prevent problems.

Participants assigned to the compliant culture read the following text:

This athletic department fails to provide similar salaries for similar positions, and does not provide clear performance standards for promotion and/or merit pay. Different forms (e.g., race, gender, age, etc.) of discrimination are present, and some local and state mandates, which relate to the rights of gays and lesbians are not always followed. The department fails to comply with Title IX, or follow the posted information on the Family Leave Act. The department relies upon “word of mouth” recruiting initiatives to find job applicants, and is likely to hire individuals who are most similar to the organization.

Once participants read through the organizational culture description, they read a short description of a randomly assigned female or male leader. The vignette depicting the leader altered only the discussion of the leader’s sex, and read as follows:

The declining national economy has reduced the level of donations your athletic department has received, and ticket and gate day revenues were much lower than budgeted as well. The athletic director, (Jennifer Wilson/Christopher Jones), has decided to make some drastic changes to the organization. First, (s)he cut two teams completely from the budget. Next (s)he asked the remaining team’s head coaches to decrease their budget by 15%. However, (s)he has increased the budget allocation for a few revenue generating teams.

To measure the effectiveness of the manipulations, respondents were asked a single item: “Is the leader of your organization male or female?” to measure if respondents were aware of the sex manipulation. The culture manipulation was checked with a single item, which asked respondents to answer on a seven-point scale from 1 (not supportive of diversity) to 7 (very supportive of diversity) “How would you characterize the department’s culture of diversity?”

Participants then completed a series of items designed to measure prototypicality and leadership effectiveness.
Leadership prototypicality was assessed with a six item scale first used by Platow and van Knippenberg (2001). Sample items include (“Overall, I would say that the leader represents what is characteristic about the athletic department”, “…is a good example of the kind of people who work within this athletic department”). The respondents indicated their agreement level on a 7-point scale anchored with 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree). The measure was reliable (α = .89).

Leadership effectiveness was measured utilizing van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg’s (2005) leadership effectiveness scale. This scale consists of four items (e.g., “I would put my trust in this leader”), and asked respondents to indicate their agreement level on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The measure’s reliability was high (α = .95).

Data Analysis

Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations were calculated for culture, leader’s sex, prototypicality, leadership effectiveness, and agreement with culture (Table 1), and were employed in the following analyses. Chi-square analysis was conducted to test the sex manipulation, and an ANOVA was used to determine the culture type manipulation. To test the hypothesized relationships in this study, we employed structural equation modeling (SEM). We included the main effects of culture (0 = compliant; 1 = proactive) and leader sex (0 = female, 1 = male) and the culture × sex interaction term. A fully-mediated model and a partially-mediated model were tested using these constructs.

Following the recommendations of Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (2006), three fit indices (absolute, incremental, and parsimonious) were examined to determine the goodness of fit for the model. Comparative fit index (CFI) was analyzed as the incremental fit index, and the parsimonious fit index (PFNI) was utilized to measure parsimonious fit. Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and χ² statis-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Culture</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader’s Sex</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership Prototypicality</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Culture coded as 0 = compliant, 1 = proactive.
Leader Sex coded as 0 = female, 1 = male.
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
tics were used as absolute fit measures. According to Hair et al., CFI values greater than .90, PNFI values greater than .60, and RMSEA values less than .07 are indicative of a close model fit. A chi-square difference test was used to determine if the two models were significantly different. If a significant difference occurs between the two models, then the model's fit was compared using Akaike’s information criterion (AIC) of model evaluation: lower values indicates a better fit to the data. Once the model has been selected, we analyzed the beta coefficients to test the hypothesized relationships.

RESULTS

Chi square analysis revealed 21 respondents incorrectly identified a man as the leader in the male scenario, and ten respondents incorrectly denoted a woman was the leader in the male condition: $\chi^2 (1, N = 275) = 1.66, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .78$. Consistent with previous research (De Cremer & Van Dijke, 2008), we removed these participants’ responses from further analysis because they failed the first manipulation check. An analysis of variance indicated the culture manipulation was successful. Participants indicated proactive athletic departments were more supportive of diversity ($M = 4.33, SD = 1.34$) than were compliant organizations ($M = 2.51, SD = 1.41$), $F (1, 274) = 120.83, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .86$.

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1: Results indicated only culture and effectiveness ($r = .21$) and prototypicality and effectiveness ($r = .49$) were significantly associated with one another. Leaders in proactive athletic departments were seen as more effective than were those in compliant departments.

Results of the fully-mediated SEM indicated the model was a close fit to the data: $\chi^2 (df = 33, n = 247) = 86.32, p < .001$, RMSEA (90% CI .06, .10) = .08, CFI = .97, PNFI = .57. The partially-mediated model (Figure 1) was also a close fit to the data: $\chi^2 (df = 30, n = 247) = 68.80, p < .001$, RMSEA (90% CI = .05, .09) = .07, CFI = .98, PNFI = .52. The chi-square difference test indicates the models were significantly different, $\Delta \chi^2 (\Delta df = 3) = 17.52, p < .001$. Analysis of the AIC value established the partially-mediated model as the better fit (AIC = 138.84) when comparing it to the fully-mediated model (AIC = 150.32), and therefore, was used in the remaining analyses.

With Hypothesis 1, we predicted that men would be considered more prototypical than women. Results indicated this was not the case. The leader’s sex ($\beta = -.10, p > .05$) had no effect on leadership prototypicality.

We further hypothesized organizational culture would moderate the relationship between leader’s sex and leadership prototypicality (Hypothesis 2). This hypothesis was not supported, as culture ($\beta = -.08, p > .05$) and the inter-
action between culture and sex ($\beta = .28$, $p > .05$) were not significantly related to prototypicality. Sex ($\beta = .06$, $p > .05$) and the interaction between culture and leader's sex ($\beta = -.03$, $p > .05$) were not significantly related to effectiveness.

Finally, supporting the third hypothesis, leadership prototypicality possessed a significant positive relationship with leadership effectiveness ($\beta = .74$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, culture was significantly related to leadership effectiveness ($\beta = .59$, $p < .01$). The nature of the relationship suggested leaders of proactive athletic departments are viewed as more effective, irrespective of other characteristics, than are leaders of compliant departments.

**DISCUSSION**

In this study, we explored the potential impact of organizational culture on leadership stereotypes. We expected men would be considered more prototypical compared to women, but we observed no significant differences between the women and men's prototypicality ratings. Thus, women and men were perceived as equally prototypical. Hogg (2001) suggested the person who best represents the traits most consistent with the group identity develops prototypicality, and therefore, individuals may attribute such characteristics to someone who is perceived as the leader. For instance, Reicher et al. (2005) found leaders are able to define, control, and inform others about what should be considered the group's most important characteristics. Moreover, Hogg (2001) stated prototypical members actively define what is prototypical about the group, and in doing so, actively influences others behaviors and perceptions within the group. Finally, leaders are viewed as individuals who supply a vision, create social power, and direct
power to realize the vision (Reicher et al., 2005). Given this information, it may be plausible the respondents attributed prototypical group qualities to the leader because in general, leaders are the greatest source of information about the group's identity. Furthermore, with the limited knowledge about the group's traits and the composition of the group, participants may attribute group characteristics to the leader, and therefore, establish the leader as the prototypical member.

Though prototypicality ratings did not vary, women and men were evaluated differently in other, more subtle ways. Specifically, our manipulation checks indicated that participants were twice as likely to incorrectly identify the leader's sex in the woman leader condition than they were in the man leader condition. Implicit stereotypes about who is a leader in the athletics setting likely resulted in this misidentification. Specifically, as sport is oftentimes considered a masculine endeavor best led by men (Knoppers, 1992; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003), these participants might have formed implicit assumptions about the leader's sex, despite reading information that clearly provided information to the contrary. Thus, although prototypicality ratings did not vary, there is still evidence of stereotypes associated with sport organization leaders.

Furthermore, while diversity culture did not moderate the relationship between the leader's sex and leadership prototypicality, it did influence effectiveness ratings, as there was a positive relationship between culture and effectiveness. This pattern could be due to participants attributing positive characteristics of the organization (i.e., it promotes a diverse and inclusive environment) to the leader. This perspective is consistent with that of Schein (1990), who argued leaders define an organizational culture, and therefore, if individuals' positive identification with and support of a workplace that culture will be transferred to the leader as well. There is some support for this relationship. For instance, Kwantes and Böglarsky (2007) found organizational cultures that employed a constructive style (i.e., focus on achievement, self-actualization, humanistic encouragement, and interpersonal relationships) also had leaders with high effectiveness ratings (see also Jamal & Baba, 1992, for a similar pattern).

Kwantes and Böglarsky's (2007) findings have implications for the current study, too. Proactive workplaces, relative to their compliant counterparts, focus on the development of human resources, see individual differences as assets, perceive differences as sources of competitive advantage, and value diversity in the workplace (Fink & Pastore, 1999). Employees who work in proactive workplaces have been found to possess higher job satisfaction and they are allowed to express their creativity at work (Fink et al., 2001, 2003). Further, when coupled with employee diversity, proactive cultures are associated with objective measures of organizational effectiveness (Cunningham, 2009). Thus, the benefits of a proactive department are clear, and the participants in this
study may have shared those positive attributions of that culture. These positive sentiments expressed toward the workplace culture were feasibly transferred to the leader, thereby resulting in high effectiveness ratings. Future researchers should explicitly test these relationships.

Consistent with our third hypothesis, prototypicality was positively related to leadership effectiveness. Although these results are consistent with previous literature (e.g., De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2002; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005), this study demonstrated a direct correlation between prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. Leaders in this study were rated as more effective if they were both higher in prototypicality and the organizational culture was proactive. Although culture partially-mediated the relationship between leadership effectiveness and prototypicality, it is important to look at the relationship between the two on their own.

Practical Implications

This research study demonstrated leaders in a proactive culture, regardless of sex, were considered to be more effective than leaders in a compliant culture. Given the changing demographics and other pressures (i.e., legal, social), understanding how to manage diversity is becoming more and more important to sport organizations (Cunningham, 2009). To be considered more effective, organizational leaders need to demonstrate a greater sense of cultural understanding, put into place mechanisms for others to begin to appreciate the value diversity creates, and institutionalize such strategies so that it defines the organizational culture in a manner consistent with a proactive diversity culture. Doing so may engender greater perceptions of leadership effectives that may have other potential outcomes as well (e.g., perceived fairness, increased motivation).

Limitations

As with any other research study, this study was not without limitations. First, some might view the use of a student sample and experimental design as a limitation; however, there are several counter-points to these claims are worth considering. First, although this was not measured with the current sample, research suggests that a strong majority of college students work while pursuing their degree (Orszag, Orszag, & Whitmore, 2001); thus, while the situation was hypothetical in nature, the participants were likely able to draw from their work experiences to respond to the questions. Second, as Till and Busler (2000) note, while ecological validity might have suffered, we "gained construct validity by minimizing spurious confounds and statistical conclusion validity by minimizing within-group variation with our manipulation" (p. 5). Finally, the approach adopted here (i.e., manipulating the organizational culture and diversity-related situations among student samples in an experiment) is consistent with that taken by other di-
versity researchers (Maass, Caudin, Guarneri, & Grasselli, 2003; Pierce, Broberg, McClure, & Aguinis, 2004). Thus, concerns over the experimental nature of the study might be unfounded.

Another potential limitation in this study was the use of prototypicality rather than leadership stereotypes as a predictor of effectiveness. Fielding and Hogg (1997) found effectiveness was a product of leadership stereotypes in the early development stages of a group. Given the sample in this study was not an actual member of the group presented in the scenarios, it could be argued individuals may use their leadership stereotypes to determine effectiveness. In addition, stereotypes may engender the sex differences expected in this study. However, prototypicality was related to effectiveness, and thus, this limitation may have been thwarted in terms of effectiveness, but may have prevented the sex effect from manifesting.

**Future Research**

In addition, there are several avenues for future research. For instance, a field study should be conducted to determine if prototypicality is consistent with masculinity in sport organization, and if this prototypicality affects leadership effectiveness ratings. Moreover, leadership categorization theory may provide a stronger framework for determining the effect of gender stereotypes on leadership positions. Gender stereotypes may be more consistent with leadership schemas as opposed to prototypicality because they are established expectations of how a leader should behave and what traits a leader is expected to possess. The preconceived schemas may change within different organizational cultures, and thus, may be a better construct in the study. To correct for these changes, a similar methodology to this study may be completed; however, leadership stereotypes should be collected in addition to prototypicality and effectiveness. In addition, to control for traditional values, future research should employ similar methodology to Hogg and his colleagues (2006) to determine if traditional values impact gendered leadership stereotypes.
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