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Abstract:  
This study intends to add to the debate whether differences in risk behaviours exist between genders. These results are used to inform the conversation about the role of gender in management and leadership. The design is an investment game in which participants could gain or lose money from investing in a hypothetical risky asset. Participants were first paid $10 to complete a survey. They could then invest any or all of this $10 in a risky asset with a known probability of gaining and losing. After winnings from the first round of investments were dispersed, a second chance to invest in the same asset was offered. The findings suggest that there is no difference between genders in their willingness to invest into the risky asset. This held true for the pooled data and for the U.S. and Brazil data separately. It is often assumed that the inherent risk behaviours differs between genders and, often times, this information is used when making promotion or hiring decisions. The methodology offers a unique approach to measuring financial risk taking at an individual level. The investment game included salient rewards and subjects were in a setting where other factors could be controlled.
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1. Introduction

Across the world, women are significantly underrepresented in leadership and management in business and political governance, representing only 14.6% of Fortune 500 Executive Officer positions in 2013, 21% of senior management positions across seven major industrialized countries and 22% of parliamentary positions worldwide (Catalyst, 2014; Grant Thorton, 2014; United Nations, 2015).

Eagly and Carli (2007) explain that the demands of family life, leading to underinvestment in social capital at the higher tiers of the office, acts as a barrier to
entry for women to leadership and management. They also add that stereotypical perceptions of male and female leadership hinder them. For instance, more people consider men to be better than women at negotiating profitable deals and taking risks (PewResearchCenter, 2015).

Within the context of effective management, Gandz and Seijts (2013) explain that being able to handle risk well is one of the qualities of a good leader. Executives are increasingly considering risk management to be significant in today’s dynamic world (KPMG, 2013). In addition, several studies have found a positive and significant relationship between effective risk management and firm performance (Damodaran, 2007; McShane et al., 2014; Walls, 2005). This leads to the following types of questions: Are men better suited for these roles, given their propensity to take on more risk than women? Are women too risk averse to effectively work with the uncertainties that come with such positions? Essentially, is there a gender difference in risk perception, thus affecting subsequent risk behavior, which could impact the persons’ proficiency in leadership and management?

Men and women have been found to assess risk differently, with women being, on average, more risk-averse than men due to factors like discrepancies in confidence levels and emotional responses (Byrnes et al., 1999). Nevertheless, studies show that such gender differences in risk perception and behavior is small or non-existent between men and women in management and other professional roles (Atkinson et al., 2003; Johnson and Powell, 1994). This suggests that these observed differences within the general population might have been due to discrepancies in the mediums of economic opportunity like education, experience, wealth, etc. rather than inherent gender traits.

The following study attempts to add to the gender differences in risk literature by analyzing data from a survey and investment game that a sample of students from the U.S. and Brazil participated in. The findings suggest that difference in gender does not have an impact on risk perception.

The paper begins with a review of the literature, which is followed by an explanation of the experimental design and procedure and a discussion of the results. It ends with a conclusion that summarizes the findings, discusses its implications and limitations, and suggests future directions for research.

2. Literature Review

Women in Leadership and Management

Much fewer women than men are in leadership and management positions in both business and political governance. For instance, worldwide, only 24% of senior management positions are held by women, while only 10 serve as heads of state and 14 as heads of government (United Nations, 2015).

Many factors are cited to explain the lack of women in leadership positions. One line of thought is that, due to societal norms, women are expected to be in charge of most of the household production activities like child rearing and managing of the
These activities not only keep them away from participation in the labor market but also from attaining management positions due to the loss of human capital and lack of experience. (Anderson et al., 2002; Gough and Noonan, 2013).

In addition, according to Eagly and Carli (2007) men are usually linked with traits that connote leadership like assertion and control, while women are linked with communal qualities that are more related to compassion, thus skewing the evaluation of female leadership. Eagly et al. (1992) reviews research on the evaluation of women and men in leadership roles, to find that women were devalued relative to their male counterparts when they carried out their duties in stereotypically masculine styles. Also, analysis of survey data showed that 18% of the public perceive men to be more capable at negotiating profitable deals and 34% perceive men to be better at risk-taking than women. On the other hand, only 7% consider women to be better at negotiating profitable deals and 5% think that women are better risk-takers (PewResearchCenter, 2015). This demonstrates the persistence of negative perceptions with respect to females in leadership and management.

**Gender Differences in Risk Perception**

Several studies do show that men and women perceive risk differently (Croson and Gneezy, 2009; Harris et al, 2006). For instance, Charness and Gneezy (2012) examine data from 15 sets of experiments with one underlying investment game across different countries. They found that women were more financially risk averse than men because they invested less. Byrnes et al. (1999) conducted a meta-analysis of 150 studies and found greater risk taking in men. However, they also found this gender gap to be growing smaller over time.

Many explanations are offered to account for this disparity. Lundeberg et al. (1994) studied responses from male and female students with respect to their confidence levels about their answers on their tests. She found both men and women to be overconfident. However, men were found to be more overconfident than women. Such kinds of highly overconfident individuals perceive risk to be more controllable, thus making them less risk-averse. Additionally, it is argued that men and women have different emotional responses. Upon reviewing the literature on gender differences in fear, Mclean and Anderson (2009), find that women report greater fear than men. Men and women experience and deal with stress in different ways as well, as indicated by Matud (2004) who found higher scores of chronic and minor daily stress in women when compared to men. Finally, Arch (1993) concludes that men tend to perceive risky situations as challenging thereby encouraging participation, while women tend to perceive risky situations as threats thereby encouraging avoidance.

**Gender, Risk and Management**

However, upon studying people in management and other professional roles, such gender differences in the perception of risk was found to be small or non-existent.
(Atkinson et al., 2003). For instance, Johnson and Powell (1994) study respondents from a “non-managerial” population and a “managerial” population to find both sexes displaying similar risk propensity in “managerial” populations and dissimilar risk propensity (women being more risk-averse than men) in “non-managerial” population. This suggests the evolution of risk evaluation as women gather more education, experience, wealth, etc.

Non-Gender Risk Factors

Several other factors may affect one’s perception of risk apart from gender. For instance, studies have found entrepreneurs to have a higher risk propensity than non-entrepreneurs (Begley and Boyd, 1988; Carland et al., 1995; McGrath et al., 1992). Stewart and Roth (2001 and 2004) conducted a meta-analytic review of the literature to find that managers were more risk averse than entrepreneurs. However, in light of opposing results by Brockhaus (1980) and Miner and Raju (2004), Low and MacMillan (2007) suggested that it might be more insightful to say that entrepreneurs have more ability to manage risk where they view some situations to be less risky which would be viewed by others to be very risky.

Certain demographic characteristics have also been found to be related to a person’s attitude towards risk. For instance, age has been found to be inversely related to risk-taking behavior (Nicholson et al., 2005; Pålsson, 2006). Also, many have found that those who are married tend to be less risk tolerant or engage in less risky behavior than the unmarried (Halek, 2001; Hallahan, 2004). Finally, whites have been found to be less risk averse than other non-white groups (Brown, 2007; Fang et al., 2013). Others have found a “white male effect” where white men were found to be more risk tolerant than white women and other ethnic categories of both sexes (Flynn et al., 1994; Kahan et al., 2007).

3. Methodology

Seventy eight students were recruited from economics courses at the University of New Mexico (UNM) and 54 students were recruited from a variety of courses at Universidade Católica de Brasília (UCB) in Brasília, DF Brazil. Four sessions were conducted in a one-week span at UNM and three sessions were held at UCB over a two week span. Students received very limited information regarding the nature of the study during recruitment. They were made aware that they had an opportunity to receive as much as US$40 or R$40 (R$ will denote Brazilian Reais) for participating. Thanks to the Latin American and Iberian Institute at the University of New Mexico for the financial support of this study.

Once participants entered the experimental area and were seated, they were given the initial instructions. Each participant was told they were being paid US$10 (in US$/R$1 denominations) for completing a survey, hence, giving them the impression that they were going to “earn” the money. All monies in the experiment sessions were conducted using actual monetary notes, not experiment or game
money. This tactic of paying the respondent to complete the task, which was also used by Eckel and Grossman (2008), was implemented to account for the house money effect. As described by Thaler and Johnson (1990), the presence of the house money effect implies that participants may make riskier choices if they have experienced a recent financial gain.

The survey consisted of a subset of questions from the Entrepreneurial Attitudes Orientation (Robinson et al., 1991). Upon completing the survey, participants were then informed that they would have the opportunity to invest in a risky asset. Participants could invest any portion of their earnings into this asset, of which they had a 60% chance of gaining and a 40% chance of losing from their investment. For example, if a participant chose to invest US$/R$7 and lost, he/she would be left with US$/R$3. However, if he/she gained from the investment he/she would receive the US$/R$7 plus an additional amount equal to the investment amount. Therefore, he/she would receive US$/R$14. The expected payout from round 1, \( E(P_1) \), can be seen in equation (1), where \( 0 < x_1 < 10 \) is the chosen round 1 investment. The expected payout for round 1 is always greater than the US$/R$10 survey payment because the probability of gaining from the investment is larger than the probability of losing and the gain/loss amount is equal to the investment amount. The expected payout for round 2, \( E(P_2) \), is shown in equation (2), where \( Y \) is the starting value after the gain and/or loss from round 1 has been realized. \( 0 < x_2 < 20 \) is the chosen round 2 investment amount. The final expected payout is equal to the expected payout from round 2 because the participants did not know of the second round of play when making the round 1 decision.

\[
E(P_1) = .6(10 + x_1) + .4(10 - x_1) \tag{1}
\]

\[
E(P_2) = .6(Y + x_2) + .4(Y - x_2) \tag{2}
\]

The probability of gaining or losing from the investment was dictated by allowing the participants to choose a card from a stack of 10 playing cards. The stack was comprised of the ace through the 10 of spades. A draw of an ace through six represented a gain and a draw of seven through ten represented a loss.

Once the gains and losses had been accounted for and dispersed to all participants, they were given the opportunity to invest in the same risky asset again with identical probabilities of gaining or losing. Theoretically, some participants could have zero money to invest if they invested all of their money in the first round and lost. On the other hand, if someone invested all of his/her money in the first round and gained, then he/she would begin the second round with a total of US$/R$20 to invest. The stack of playing cards was used again to determine if a participant gained or lost from the investment. Once this round was over and the gains and losses were ascertained and disbursed, the participants received a receipt and were free to go. The sessions in Brazil were conducted in Portuguese.
4. Results

To measure willingness to take on risk, participants were categorized as risky based on what percentage of their money was invested in the risky asset. Table (1) shows the investment percentage by gender and location. These results include the investment decisions from both rounds. The percentages reported in Table (1) is the percentage of total money which was invested in round 1 and 2 determined by \( \frac{(x_1 + x_2)}{10 + y} \times 100 \).

### Table 1: Investment Percentage by Gender and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.28%</td>
<td>23.871</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.41%</td>
<td>20.938</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.35%</td>
<td>11.111</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.95%</td>
<td>16.667</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.50%</td>
<td>23.387</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.12%</td>
<td>19.072</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, males invested 48.5% of their money and females invested 45.12%. In Brazil, females invested at a higher rate than males, where males invested 45.35% of their money and females 45.95%. Males in the U.S. invested 50.28% of their money and females invested 44.41%. However, none of these differences were statistically significant. Also, the differences in means were tested between U.S. vs Brazil males and U.S. vs Brazil females and there was no statistically significant difference between their respective investment choices.

As some of the previous literature suggests there are other variables which could cause a variation in an individual’s risk taking propensity. In an attempt to control for these other factors, an ordinary least squares regression was employed. Please see equation (3) for the model specification.

\[
\text{Investors} = \alpha + \beta \text{Investors} + \gamma \text{entrepreneurial} + \delta X + \theta \text{Brazil} + \mu \text{female}
\]
white variables into one category is due to the differences in the way ethnicity is reported in the U.S. and Brazil. Some categories, such as Moreno, is commonly used in Brazil but not in the U.S. Also, Hispanic is a category common in the U.S. but not in Brazil. Therefore, some of the ethnicity variables had a very small sample size. The control variable, *brazil*, is also a binary equal to 1 if the observation is from Brazil and 0 if from the U.S. Finally, the variable of most interest in the model is *female*. The value of this variable is 1 if the individual is female and 0 if male.

The summary statistics of the variables can be seen in Table 2. From this sample, the average EAO score was 6.324. Around 10% of the sample was married which is expected since all of the participants were college students. This is also why the average age is just over 23 years. 54.5% of the sample were male and 47% were white. About 41% of the data was generated from the experiment in Brazil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>investperc</td>
<td>46.966</td>
<td>21.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurial</td>
<td>6.324</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23.402</td>
<td>7.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the results from the regression. The results suggest that the more entrepreneurial an individual is the more likely they are to take financial risks. This finding is discussed in more detail in Barber III (2015). Also, white individuals invested at a significantly higher rate than non-whites. There was no strong difference between countries as seen in the previous descriptive statistics. The coefficient for the gender variable was not found to be statistically significant. Therefore, it reinforces the finding that, in this sample, there was no difference in the risk taking tendencies between males and females. The regression attempts to control for other factors that may influence risk taking and the earlier finding was still supported. It is important to note that the explanatory power of the regression model is low due to data limitations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>investperc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurial</td>
<td>5.959**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.374)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>-7.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.505)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2.281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusion

Upon examining students in Brazil and the U.S. this study found no support for differences in financial risk taking among genders. Males were more likely than females to invest at a higher rate in the risky asset; however, this difference is not statistically significant. This result held true for the pooled data as well as for the U.S. and Brazil data separately. Therefore, these findings, along with papers that have found similar results, might suggest that statistically discriminating against women in the workforce on the basis of their presupposed risk propensity (as in being more risk averse than men) is not efficacious. In fact, several studies have found a positive and significant relationship between gender diversity at the board level, and firm performance as measured by the Tobin’s Q, Return on Equity, Return on Assets, etc. (Campbell and Minguez-Vera, 2008; Erhardt et al., 2003; Lückerath-Rovers, 2013; Smith et al., 2006). Carter et al. (2003) extends the conceptual case for diversity in the workplace in general, summarized by Cox and Blake (1991) and Robinson and Dechant (1997), to board diversity. He explains that it increases creativity, innovation and effective problem solving due to the availability of a broader perspective and heterogeneity in opinion that can lead to better decisions.

However, due to a small sample of students as the basis for the data in this experiment, careful attention must be paid when attempting to generalize the results. Each group from the U.S. and Brazil was not nationally representative due to only being chosen from amongst university students. In addition, other control variables that could affect risk perception like knowledge/intelligence, personal facets, religious beliefs, etc. were not included in the analysis due to data limitations. It is also important to note that this study adds to the unsettled debate about gender differences in risk perception by studying individual behavior. A future research agenda could include a more representative sample which would lead to the ability of more robust hypothesis testing.
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