2

Redefining Leadership: A Feminist Analysis of Influence, Gendered Power Play, Ethics, and Organizational Culture

Dr. Anjila Singh Mehla*

S.S. Jain Subodh PG College (Autonomous), University of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

*Corresponding Author: anjilasingh21@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper examines leadership as a relational process of influence rather than a mere extension of managerial authority. While management involves planning, coordination, and the exercise of formal control, leadership operates through vision, motivation, and the capacity to mobilize people toward shared goals (Kotter 1990). Drawing upon theoretical perspectives from Harold Koontz, Heinz Weihrich, John Gabarro, and John Kotter, the study distinguishes leadership from administrative function, arguing that authority alone does not secure followership. Instead, effective leadership is grounded in responsibility, comprehension of human motivation, inspiration, and contextually appropriate action. In simple terms, leadership is defined as an influence. People generally follow those whom they see as providing a medium of attainment of their personal desires, wants and needs. To be precise, in an organisational structure, people tend to follow those who offer personal satisfaction with the attainment of goals. The paper further interrogates the gendered history of leadership, noting how dominant organizational cultures have long aligned authority with masculine norms of assertiveness, autonomy, and instrumental rationality (Eagly and Carli 2007). Contemporary shifts toward collaborative, participatory, and emotionally intelligent leadership styles complicate this binary, revealing how women leaders contribute alternative frameworks rooted in empathy, inclusivity, and collective vision (Bass and Riggio 2006). Using the Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO) and Indra Nooyi's tenure at PepsiCo as case illustrations, it further shows how leadership norms and institutional success emerges when competence is integrated with ethical responsibility and shared purpose. Anchored in feminist organizational theory and intersectional critique, it further shows how leadership norms are structurally gendered within institutions and how ethical, relational leadership practices disrupt these exclusions without reproducing essentialist assumptions. Ultimately, the study argues that leadership transcends gendered assumptions: it is most powerful when it aligns organizational objectives with individual aspiration, cultivates followership through trust and inspiration, and functions as a catalyst for equity, innovation, and enduring growth.

Keywords: Leadership Studies, Gender and Leadership, Women in Management, Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Culture, Indra Nooyi.

Introduction

Feminist–Historical Context of Leadership

Nearly half of the global population consists of women, yet their economic, political, and organizational participation has remained historically constrained by patriarchal social structures. Across cultures, women have historically been relegated to subordinate roles, valued primarily for domestic labour and emotional support rather than institutional authority or public leadership. Although pre-industrial labour patterns offered comparatively fluid gender participation in communal economies, the onset of industrial capitalism intensified gender segmentation by privileging waged male labour and confining women to private domestic roles (Anderson and Zinsser 1999). The resulting gendered division of labour not only diminished women's visibility in public decision-making but also institutionalized masculine norms as synonymous with authority and leadership.

Feminism emerges within this history as a counter-structure. As a political, intellectual, and social movement, feminism seeks to dismantle systemic subordination by insisting upon equal rights, opportunities, and autonomy for women in every domain of public and private life (Delaney 2004; Ferree 2006). Its frameworks, liberal, radical, socialist, postmodern, interrogate power, identity, representation, and labour differently, yet remain united by the pursuit of gender equity and justice (Agger 1998; Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002). Importantly, feminist thought is not merely descriptive but transformative: it challenges the cultural conditions that naturalize male authority in leadership and opens space for alternative modes of power.

Virginia Woolf's metaphor of women as "looking-glasses reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size" (Woolf 1929, 35) offers more than a literary observation; it functions as a structural theory of authority. The metaphor reveals how women's social and professional roles have historically been organized to stabilize male confidence and institutional legitimacy. Within leadership contexts, this reflective function translates into organizational cultures that valorize male authority while positioning women as facilitators, supporters, or symbolic affirmations of existing power rather than as autonomous agents of vision. Leadership, therefore, cannot be understood apart from this legacy of institutional mirroring, in which authority is reproduced through gendered validation rather than distributed competence.

This historical–theoretical foundation reframes the central inquiry of the paper: How do women lead when institutions have been structured to mirror and magnify male power? By situating leadership within feminist critique, this study moves beyond descriptive celebration of women leaders to interrogate the gendered architecture of authority itself.

Understanding Leadership and Managership: Conceptual Distinctions

Are leadership and management synonymous? The two terms are often used interchangeably, yet scholarship consistently marks a structural and philosophical distinction between them. Management refers to the deployment of formal authority to plan, coordinate, and control organizational resources. Leadership, by contrast, emerges from the capacity to influence behaviour, inspire commitment, and mobilize people toward shared goals (Kotter 1990). A manager may secure compliance; a leader cultivates followership.

Classical theorists such as Koontz and Weihrich (2013) define leadership as an interpersonal process through which individuals willingly work toward group objectives.

Authority permits instruction, but leadership requires trust, respect, and emotional investment. Drawing on Gabarro and Kotter's association-based model (1980), effective leadership depends less on positional rank and more on relational capacity, the ability to read people, engage motivation, and align personal aspirations with institutional purpose.

Followership therefore becomes a crucial indicator of leadership. People follow when they believe that a leader enables the attainment of their own goals, values, or sense of meaning within the organization. Formal authority may ensure task completion, but meaningful leadership transforms obligation into willingness. It persuades rather than compels. Managers coordinate tasks; leaders awaken purpose by aligning individual aspirations with collective goals, transforming obligation into willingness rather than compliance.

Reconfiguring a Gendered Paradigm

Leadership under women represents not merely a demographic shift in organizational representation, but a conceptual reorientation of what power can mean. Historically, leadership has been coded masculine, associated with autonomy, decisiveness, hierarchical control, and rational action, traits valorized under patriarchal professional cultures (Eagly and Carli 2007). As women enter leadership spaces previously defined by male norms, they expose the gendered assumptions embedded in institutional authority.

Contemporary research demonstrates that many women leaders adopt collaborative and transformational styles, emphasizing emotional intelligence, shared responsibility, and open communication (Bass and Riggio 2006). These practices foster team cohesion and expand leadership beyond command-driven models toward cultures of mutual trust and participation. Yet it is crucial to approach this shift critically: women are not inherently more collaborative or empathetic. Rather, they bring leadership strategies shaped by negotiation with gendered expectations, workplace constraints, and sociocultural histories. These leadership orientations should be understood not as inherent gender traits but as contextually cultivated strategies developed within institutional environments that have historically restricted women's access to formal authority.

Thus, the significance of women's leadership lies not in "feminizing" leadership traits, but in deconstructing the belief that authority must operate through dominance. Women's leadership interrogates long-standing binaries, rational/emotional, assertive/nurturing, directive/participatory, suggesting that effective authority may emerge through integration rather than opposition (Diehl and Dzubinski 2016). The resulting model frames power not as control over others but as influence with others.

Despite such progress, challenges remain. Women leaders frequently navigate the "double bind," wherein assertiveness earns competence but threatens likability, while warmth enhances likability but risks diminished authority (Catalyst 2007). To lead successfully, women must often calibrate confidence and empathy with strategic precision, performing credibility in ways not equally required of men. Their leadership, therefore, reveals more than stylistic variation, it illuminates the structural pressures embedded in organizational cultures.

Women's leadership transforms leadership practice by replacing hierarchy with reciprocity, coercion with motivation, and authority with vision grounded in shared purpose.

Women do not simply take positions in existing systems; they redraw the terms through which leadership itself is imagined.

Leadership, understood as influence rather than authority, rests on a constellation of interrelated capacities. While formal position may grant decision-making rights, effective leadership depends on the ability to mobilize human motivation, build trust, and cultivate shared purpose. Koontz and Weihrich (2013) identify four foundational elements through which leaders convert potential into performance: power, comprehension, inspiration, and appropriate action. These components describe not only what leaders do, but *how* they shape collective energy into organizational achievement. Read through a feminist leadership lens, these elements acquire particular significance, as women leaders have often been required to mobilize influence relationally rather than rely on positional authority.

- **Power**

Power is broader than authority. Authority derives from positional rank; power emerges from the ability to influence beliefs, behaviour, and collective direction (Koontz and Weihrich 2013). In organizational life, power used ethically and transparently generates legitimacy, while power used coercively evokes resistance. Women leaders often demonstrate relational forms of power, grounded in trust, credibility, and participatory decision-making, that challenge traditional command-and-control models without diminishing effectiveness (Diehl and Dzubinski 2016). Here, power becomes not dominance over others, but *capacity with* others.

- **Comprehension**

Leadership requires the ability to understand how and why people act. Motivation is rarely uniform; individuals carry different needs, values, and aspirations. Comprehension therefore involves perceptiveness, an attunement to context, emotion, and human variability. Research suggests that many women leaders excel in this domain, employing emotional intelligence to read interpersonal dynamics and foster collaborative environments (Eagly and Carli 2007). Comprehension is thus not merely empathy, but the strategic use of insight to align personal meaning with institutional goals.

- **Inspiration**

Where authority instructs, inspiration energises. Inspired employees contribute with commitment rather than obligation. Inspiration arises from authenticity, shared vision, and the sense that work has purpose beyond task completion. Transformational leadership literature highlights this capacity as a distinguishing feature of effective influence: leaders motivate followers to exceed their own expectations by linking individual growth to collective achievement (Bass and Riggio 2006). Women leaders frequently inspire by articulating vision collaboratively, enabling ownership rather than passive compliance.

- **Appropriate Action**

Influence becomes leadership only when translated into practice. Appropriate action entails situational judgement, the ability to intervene wisely, communicate clearly, and cultivate conditions in which motivation thrives. This involves balancing expectations with support, designing systems that reward effort fairly, and maintaining ethical climate. Through such action, leaders convert vision into structure, energy into direction, and intention into outcome.

Structural Barriers, Organizational Cultures, and the Persistence of Gendered Leadership Norms

While contemporary discourse increasingly celebrates women's leadership achievements, structural barriers embedded within organizational cultures continue to regulate who is perceived as a "legitimate" leader. These barriers are not merely attitudinal but institutional, encoded in recruitment practices, promotion criteria, informal networks, and evaluative metrics that privilege traditionally masculine leadership behaviours (Acker 1990; Ely and Meyerson 2000). Leadership, despite its conceptual redefinition as relational and transformational, often remains assessed through standards historically aligned with male career trajectories, uninterrupted employment, competitive individualism, and hierarchical command.

Joan Acker's theory of "gendered organizations" is instructive here. Acker (1990) argues that organizational structures are not neutral arenas but are actively constituted through gendered assumptions about work, authority, and competence. Job descriptions, performance evaluations, and leadership pipelines implicitly assume an abstract worker unencumbered by caregiving responsibilities, an assumption that disproportionately disadvantages women. As a result, even when women demonstrate leadership capacities aligned with collaboration, ethical stewardship, and emotional intelligence, these attributes may be undervalued or reframed as supplementary rather than central to leadership effectiveness.

Organizational culture further amplifies these inequities. Informal networks, mentorship opportunities, and decision-making circles often remain male-dominated, producing what Ibarra, Carter, and Silva (2010) describe as the "leadership gap" rather than a confidence gap. Women are frequently over-mentored yet under-sponsored, receiving guidance without access to high-visibility assignments that translate influence into advancement. Leadership, therefore, is not simply a matter of individual competence but of structural access to power-enhancing opportunities.

Women leaders must navigate institutional cultures that simultaneously demand conformity to masculine norms and penalize deviations from gendered expectations. Leadership effectiveness, in such contexts, becomes an exercise in strategic negotiation rather than pure expression of authority. These structural dynamics form the context within which leadership capacities such as emotional intelligence, ethical judgement, and relational influence acquire both necessity and transformative potential.

Emotional Intelligence, Care Ethics, and the Revaluation of Leadership Capacities

One of the most significant contributions of women's leadership to contemporary theory lies in the revaluation of emotional intelligence and care ethics as central, rather than peripheral, leadership capacities. Daniel Goleman's influential work on emotional intelligence identifies self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill as critical determinants of leadership success (Goleman 1998). Subsequent research demonstrates that these competencies are strongly correlated with organizational performance, employee satisfaction, and adaptability during periods of crisis (Boyatzis and McKee 2005).

Feminist ethics of care, articulated by scholars such as Carol Gilligan (1982) and Nel Noddings (2003), further deepen this perspective by challenging the moral hierarchy that

privileges abstract rationality over relational responsibility. Care ethics emphasizes responsiveness, interdependence, and attentiveness to vulnerability, qualities often marginalized in leadership discourse yet essential for sustaining organizational communities. When women leaders integrate care ethics into leadership practice, they do not weaken authority; rather, they expand its moral and relational scope.

This reorientation is particularly relevant in contemporary organizational contexts characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA). In such environments, rigid command structures often fail, while adaptive, emotionally attuned leadership proves more resilient. Research conducted during organizational crises, including economic downturns and public health emergencies, suggests that leaders who prioritize transparent communication, empathy, and collective well-being foster greater trust and long-term stability (Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky 2009).

Women leaders' association with emotional intelligence should not be essentialized as innate disposition. Instead, it reflects historically gendered socialization patterns that have required women to develop relational competencies in environments where formal authority was denied. These competencies now emerge as indispensable leadership resources.

The Principle of Leadership: Motivation, Purpose, and Collective Achievement

At its core, leadership is sustained by motivation. People follow not simply because they are instructed to, but because they find satisfaction, meaning, or personal advancement in the goals they pursue. A leader succeeds when individual aspiration aligns with organizational purpose. In this sense, authority alone cannot generate loyalty; influence must be earned through understanding, credibility, and the capacity to create environments in which people believe their contributions matter.

The principle of leadership therefore rests on knowing what motivates individuals and how motivation translates into action. When employees perceive value in their work, whether through recognition, autonomy, collaborative purpose, or ethical alignment, they follow with willingness rather than compliance. Leadership succeeds when it transforms obligation into investment, and labour into shared accomplishment.

The following examples illustrate how leadership principles operate within distinct institutional cultures. This dynamic is visible in the success of the Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO). Its achievements have depended not only on technological capacity but on a workforce motivated by collective purpose, scientific curiosity, and national vision. As Aswathappa (2017) observes, ISRO's organisational culture cultivates intrinsic motivation, enabling scientists and engineers to "use and willingly utilise advanced technology to achieve organisational goals." Leadership, in this context, is exercised not through coercion but through shared aspiration, a model where purpose becomes propulsion.

A parallel can be seen in the leadership of Indra Nooyi at PepsiCo. Her philosophy of "Performance with Purpose" redefined corporate success by integrating profitability with sustainability, employee well-being, and long-term social responsibility (Nooyi 2021). Nooyi's approach exemplifies how emotional intelligence, ethical clarity, and visionary strategy can generate commitment rather than mere efficiency. Under her leadership, productivity became

inseparable from purpose; employees did not simply work toward goals, but understood themselves as stakeholders in their realisation.

These cases underscore the central argument of this study: leadership flourishes when power, comprehension, inspiration, and appropriate action converge around meaningful purpose. Women leaders frequently demonstrate this synthesis with particular acuity, not because leadership is inherently feminine, but because their professional trajectories have required them to build influence relationally, ethically, and collaboratively within historically exclusionary structures. When leadership mobilises people through vision rather than hierarchy, it produces not only results, but culture. Leadership, then, is most powerful when it becomes shared.

Intersectionality and the Limits of Universal Leadership Narratives

Any comprehensive account of women's leadership must also confront the limits of universalizing narratives. Intersectional feminist theory, advanced by scholars such as Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) and Patricia Hill Collins (2000), demonstrates that gender does not operate in isolation but intersects with class, caste, race, ethnicity, and nationality to shape leadership access and experience. Women leaders in the Global South, for instance, encounter distinct challenges rooted in postcolonial histories, socio-economic inequalities, and cultural expectations that differ significantly from Western corporate contexts.

In the Indian context, leadership trajectories are shaped not only by gender but by caste location, linguistic capital, and regional mobility. Women leaders from marginalized communities often face compounded exclusion, navigating both patriarchal norms and entrenched social hierarchies. As such, celebratory accounts of women's leadership must be tempered by attention to whose leadership is recognized, institutionalized, and remembered.

Intersectionality also complicates the assumption that women leaders uniformly adopt collaborative or transformational styles. Leadership practices are mediated by institutional constraints, sectoral norms, and survival strategies within unequal systems. A feminist leadership framework, therefore, must remain analytically attentive to difference, refusing to substitute one normative model for another.

Leadership as Ethical and Cultural Work

Leadership, as this study argues, is ultimately a form of ethical and cultural work. It shapes not only outcomes but organizational values, norms, and futures. Ethical leadership literature emphasizes integrity, accountability, and moral courage as foundational to sustainable success (Brown and Treviño 2006). Women leaders, often scrutinized more intensely than their male counterparts, frequently foreground ethical clarity as a means of legitimizing authority and building trust.

Indra Nooyi's leadership at PepsiCo exemplifies this ethical dimension. Her insistence on integrating sustainability, employee well-being, and long-term societal impact into corporate strategy challenged shareholder-centric models of success. Importantly, Nooyi's leadership was not oppositional to profitability but reframed it within a broader moral horizon. This capacity to align economic performance with ethical responsibility reflects a leadership paradigm increasingly necessary in an era of corporate accountability and social scrutiny.

Similarly, institutional cultures such as ISRO's demonstrate how leadership can cultivate collective ethos rather than individual dominance. The organization's emphasis on shared scientific mission, national service, and collaborative achievement underscores how leadership functions as cultural stewardship. Leaders in such contexts act less as commanders and more as custodians of purpose.

Toward an Integrated Model of Leadership Beyond Gender

The expanded analysis reinforces the paper's central claim: leadership is most effective when it transcends gendered assumptions and integrates power with responsibility, vision with empathy, and authority with relational influence. Women's leadership is significant not because it replaces masculine models with feminine ones, but because it exposes the contingency of leadership norms themselves.

An integrated leadership model recognizes that authority without trust breeds compliance, not commitment; that efficiency without ethics erodes legitimacy; and that vision without inclusivity limits sustainability. Leadership, understood as a dynamic process of influence, thrives when it mobilizes human potential through shared meaning and collective aspiration.

In this sense, feminist leadership scholarship contributes not merely to gender equity but to leadership theory as a whole. By interrogating who leads, how leadership is enacted, and whose values are institutionalized, it expands the conceptual terrain of leadership beyond managerial control toward ethical, relational, and transformative practice.

Conclusion: Leadership as Shared Power and Social Responsibility

This expanded inquiry affirms that leadership cannot be reduced to positional authority or individual charisma. It is a relational and culturally embedded practice shaped by historical structures and contemporary challenges. Women's leadership, situated within feminist critique, reveals how authority can operate through collaboration, care, and moral vision without sacrificing effectiveness.

As organizations confront global uncertainty, social inequality, and demands for accountability, leadership models grounded in domination and exclusion prove increasingly inadequate. The future of leadership lies not in gendered binaries but in integrative frameworks that value empathy alongside strategy, ethics alongside performance, and shared purpose alongside individual ambition.

Leadership, when understood as influence exercised with others rather than power wielded over them, becomes a catalyst for equity, innovation, and enduring institutional growth. In this transformation, women leaders are not exceptions to leadership norms; they are architects of its reimagining.

References

1.   Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." Gender & Society 4 (2): 139–158.

2.   Agger, Ben. 1998. *Critical Social Theories: An Introduction*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

3. Anderson, Bonnie S., and Judith P. Zinsser. 1999. *A History of Their Own: Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present*. Revised ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

4. Aswathappa, K. 2017. *Human Resource Management: Text and Cases*. 6th ed. New Delhi: McGraw-Hill Education.

5. Bass, Bernard M., and Ronald E. Riggio. 2006. *Transformational Leadership*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

6. Boyatzis, Richard, and Annie McKee. 2005. Resonant Leadership. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

7. Brown, Michael E., and Linda K. Treviño. 2006. "Ethical Leadership." The Leadership Quarterly 17 (6): 595–616.

8. Catalyst. 2007. *The Double-Bind Dilemma for Women in Leadership: Damned If You Do, Doomed If You Don't*. New York: Catalyst.

9. Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. Black Feminist Thought. New York: Routledge.

10. Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex." University of Chicago Legal Forum 1989 (1): 139–167.

11. Delaney, Carol. 2004. *Investigating Culture: An Experiential Introduction to Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

12. Diehl, Amy B., and Leanne M. Dzubinski. 2016. "Making the Invisible Visible: A Cross-Sector Analysis of Gender-Based Leadership Barriers." *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 27 (2): 181–206.

13. Eagly, Alice H., and Linda L. Carli. 2007. *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth About How Women Become Leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

14. Ely, Robin J., and Debra E. Meyerson. 2000. "Theories of Gender in Organizations." Research in Organizational Behavior 22: 103–151.

15. Ferree, Myra Marx. 2006. "Globalization and Feminism: Opportunities and Obstacles for Activism and Research." In *The Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, edited by Janet Saltzman Chafetz, 575–597. Boston: Springer.

16. Gabarro, John J., and John P. Kotter. 1980. "Managing Your Boss." *Harvard Business Review* 58 (1): 92–100.

17. Gilligan, Carol. 1982. In a Different Voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

18. Goleman, Daniel. 1998. Working with Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

19. Heifetz, Ronald, Alexander Grashow, and Marty Linsky. 2009. The Practice of Adaptive Leadership. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

20. Ibarra, Herminia, Nancy M. Carter, and Christine Silva. 2010. "Why Men Still Get More Promotions than Women." Harvard Business Review 88 (9): 80–85.

21. Koontz, Harold, and Heinz Weihrich. 2013. *Management: A Global, Innovative, and Entrepreneurial Perspective*. 14th ed. New Delhi: McGraw-Hill Education.

22.   Kotter, John P. 1990. "What Leaders Really Do." *Harvard Business Review* 68 (3): 103–111.

23.   Noddings, Nel. 2003. Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education. Berkeley: University of California Press.

24.   Nooyi, Indra. 2021. *My Life in Full: Work, Family, and Our Future*. New York: Portfolio (Penguin Random House).

25.   Ramazanoglu, Caroline, and Janet Holland. 2002. *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices*. London: Sage.

26.   Woolf, Virginia. 1929. *A Room of One's Own*. London: The Hogarth Press.

❧❧❧