AUTHORITATIVE PARENTING AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP:
AN EXAMPLE OF FAMILY-TO-WORK ENRICHMENT

By
Katherine Kearns

Christopher J. L. Cunningham
UC Foundation Associate Professor of Psychology
(Committee Chair)

Brian J. O’Leary
Department Head and Associate Professor of Psychology
(Committee Member)

Amye Warren
UC Foundation Professor
(Committee Member)
AUTHORITATIVE PARENTING AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP:
AN EXAMPLE OF FAMILY-TO-WORK ENRICHMENT

By
Katherine Kearns

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of Master of Science: Psychology

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee
May 2016
ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to examine the relationship between authoritative parenting and transformational leadership as an example of family-work enrichment. Participants were working managers who are parents ($N = 150$), recruited from MBA programs, manufacturing companies, and social media. Participants responded to an internet-based survey composed of measures of parenting style, work-family enrichment, and transformational leadership. Participants also provided responses regarding the overall impact of having children on their personal leadership development. Analyses of self-reported data consisted of correlation and regression-based methods for identifying relationships and predictor variables. Qualitative data were also gathered and content analyzed, helping to illustrate patterns observed in the quantitative survey data. Results identified a positive relationship between authoritative parenting and transformational leadership as a tangible and meaningful example of family-to-work enrichment. More generally, the results of the present study demonstrate that effective parenting influences optimal workplace leadership.
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CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTION

Do certain parenting skills, styles, or techniques enhance a manager’s ability to be more efficient and effective at work? An affirmative response to this question suggests that involvement in a family role may have positive effects on functioning in a non-family, work role. This phenomenon is known as positive interrole spillover or interrole facilitation (Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006). Hanson et al. (2006) define positive interrole spillover as a process involving the transfer of positive affect, skills, values, and/or behaviors from the originating domain to the receiving domain. This definition leads to the core research question at the center for the present study: Do behaviors, values, and interpersonal interaction styles from a person’s role as parent (originating domain) transfer to that person’s role as a leader in a work environment (receiving domain) to a positive effect?

Authoritative parents demonstrate a balance between demandingness and responsiveness by being assertive and demanding, while also being loving and responsive (Baumrind, 2013). This type of parenting style includes exercising warmth, affection, and adequate control toward one’s children. It has been positively associated with healthy child development and generally positive adolescent life outcomes (Smith, 2011). In a similar fashion, but within the work domain, transformational leadership is a model of leadership that research has identified as a positive and, in many cases, an optimal form of managerial leadership. Such research indicates a significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational functioning.
(Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996). Bass’ (1985) model of transformational leadership describes a selfless style of workplace management that enhances employee performance, as well as overall employee well being. Jex and Britt (2008) further describe transformational leadership as a leader’s ability to influence subordinates in a positive way and inspire them to perform beyond their abilities. As noted by Effelsberg, Solga, and Gurt (2013), this orientation indicates that transformational leadership is generally seen as beneficial for organization and employees.

According to Furr and Funder (2004), behaviors exhibited in family/parenting roles may transfer to other roles that an individual perceives as being similar. This concept, known as interrole behavioral congruence (Diener & Larsen, 1984), serves as the driving mechanism used in this study to demonstrate the influence parenting roles can have on leadership roles at work. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) claim that family-to-work enrichment occurs when familial behavior transference occurs in a positive manner and leads to a direct enhancement of the quality of life within a work role.

Family-work enrichment, is a component of positive interrole spillover or facilitation that involves a process whereby the resources (e.g., skills, knowledge, and abilities) a person obtains or develops in one role are applied to another role, enhancing that person’s performance or affective state in the other role (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). The present study was designed to examine what is, arguably, the most important potential path for interrole facilitation: the link between parenting and leadership.

To illustrate why this is so, consider the summary of similarities between good (i.e., transformational) leadership and good (i.e., authoritative) parenting in Table 1. When one considers the behavioral tendencies and values generally ascribed to authoritative parents and
transformational leaders, the similarities are striking. Interestingly, only a few studies have examined the possible link between these two forms of “managerial” style that span two different role domains. Within this limited research base is also an important question regarding how parenting and leadership may influence each other, perhaps as a form of family-to-work role enrichment. Among the only examples of research along these lines is Graves, Ohlott, and Ruderman (2007), who found that managers with a strong commitment to family roles claimed that it strengthened their leadership skills at work and their overall well-being. A limitation of this previous study, though, was that it focused on family role commitment as an antecedent of work role leadership skills. A more important question is whether actual leadership behaviors and skills (critical elements of leadership style) developed as a parent transfer to a person’s leadership style at work. With this context in mind, the present study was designed to determine whether and how authoritative parenting at home is associated with a manager’s transformational leadership at work. In the remainder of this introduction, relevant background theory and research evidence is summarized regarding the core elements for this study.

**Positive Interrole Spillover and Family-to-Work Enrichment**

The literature examining the work-family interface has focused predominantly on negative spillover of conflict and strain between work roles and family roles. There is also a limited amount of research examining the work-family interface with specific leadership roles (Michel, Pichler, & Newness, 2014). Michel et al. (2014) describe the influence of family on leadership roles using the conservation of resources (COR) theory, which is commonly used in organizational research to explain stress-related processes associated with an individual’s psychological and social resources. COR theory identifies these resources as the necessary
elements that support personal resilience to stressful life events (Hobfoll, 2001). Michel et al. (2014) contend that the resources gained through engaging in family or other activities outside of work “spillover” into work-related leadership roles, which in turn, can enhance leadership effectiveness.

Digging a bit deeper into the concept of positive interrole facilitation, Ruderman, Ohlott, Panzer, and King (2002) explain the benefits of multiple roles using the role accumulation perspective. In contrast to the more dominant scarcity perspective, which focuses on the negative consequences associated with multiple role involvements (namely, that something has to give when an individual is involved in many different roles), the role accumulation approach highlights the possibility that there are positive and beneficial outcomes associated with a commitment to multiple roles (Ruderman et al., 2002). A primary element to this argument is that multiple roles provide more opportunities to accumulate resources. There are, according to this approach and of relevance to the present study, three workplace opportunities that enhance managerial resources including: psychological, social support, and learning opportunities (Ruderman et al., 2002).

For the purpose of this study, it was important to consider all three of these manager-specific resource needs. From the family domain, raising children and building and maintaining a strong family support system are likely to have a significant, positive effect on a person’s perception of psychological and social support resources. Anecdotally, it is often noted in conversations with parents that raising a child has given them unshakable confidence and a belief they can do anything; in other words, compared to raising kids, everything else seems manageable. Using COR theory, this feeling of confidence can be explained by the accumulation of resources gained from raising children that apply to many other facets of life (McNall,
Nicklin, & Masuda, 2009). In a similar way, a strong family dynamic can provide positive social support when it is needed.

With respect to learning-related resources, it is also easy to understand how becoming a parent, and then developing and practicing one’s parenting style constitutes a tremendously important learning opportunity. This is also one of the few learning situations in which the learner is typically highly motivated to succeed and actually put into practice what is being learned (a stark contrast with the general response to training within work settings). For example, Morrison, White, and Van Velsor (1992) interviewed female managers with children and found that the managers attributed their managerial effectiveness to the self-awareness they gained from being a mother. McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) conducted a similar study using interviews with male executives and found that executives who coached their child’s sports team claimed that the experience taught them leadership lessons that they continued to use on the job. These types of findings illustrate how family-life experiences can influence one’s work-life in a positive way.

Building on the role accumulation literature, Greenhaus and Powell (2006) developed a concept they labeled work-family enrichment, defined as the degree to which the experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other main life role. The difference between accumulation and enrichment is that enrichment involves a process whereby one role provides resources that improve the quality of one’s experiences in another role. Accumulation involves a process dealing with multiple roles that provide an individual with resources that increase their overall well-being in general. Specifically, role accumulation focuses on gaining resources from multiple sources that can be used at any time in any other role. Role enrichment is more specific in that it involves the accumulation of resources directly attributable to one specific role context.
that enhance another similarly specific role context. Similar to work-family conflict, work-family enrichment is bidirectional. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) state that work-to-family enrichment occurs when work experiences improve the quality of one’s family life, and family-to-work enrichment (the focus of the present study) occurs when family experiences improve the quality of one’s work life.

These types of quality life improvements via interrole enrichment are theorized to occur through one of two mechanisms or pathways: instrumental and affective (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Enrichment through the instrumental pathway occurs when the resources obtained in one role directly improve performance in another role. An example of this would be a manager learning reinforcement skills from being a parent and because of these experiences with his/her children, having an overall better level of reinforcement skills at work when dealing with subordinates because of the skills that have been developed at home. Enrichment through the affective pathway occurs when the resources gained in one role indirectly impact an individual’s positive affect in another role (Carlson et al., 2006). For example, enrichment through the affective pathway occurs when an employee receives a promotion and therefore is extremely nice to his/her family later that evening because his/her overall mood (affect) was enhanced at work.

Research focusing on both directions of work-family enrichment has shown that enrichment from family to work is notably stronger than work-to-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Also, as stated previously, a large amount of research on constructs related to interrole enrichment found that familial roles lead to gains in resources that improve work-related roles (McCall et al., 1988; Morrison et al., 1992).
Authoritative Parenting

Moving beyond the boundaries of the work setting, it is important to acknowledge that leadership and management are also practiced in nonwork situations. In particular, parents are essentially leaders and managers all at once within their family “organizations.” Authoritative parenting is a parenting style widely considered within the developmental psychology arena as the most effective for children and important life outcomes (Baumrind, 2013; Smith, 2011). Research has highlighted a positive association between authoritative parenting and several positive child-level outcomes, including self-esteem, self-control, moral behavior, and academic achievement (Gecas & Seff, 1991; Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Takeuchi & Takeuchi, 2008).

An authoritative parenting style is characterized by high demandingness and high responsiveness, meaning that authoritative parents balance and express high levels of control and strictness, with high levels of warmth and involvement (Piko & Balázs, 2012). On the opposite end of the responsiveness scale is an authoritarian parenting style characterized by high demandingness and low responsiveness (Piko & Balázs, 2012). An authoritarian parent would then demonstrate high levels of control and strictness accompanied by low levels of involvement and warmth toward their children. Similarly, on the opposite end of the demandingness scale is a permissive parenting style, which is characterized by high levels of responsiveness and warmth accompanied by low levels of strictness and control. Recently, Alegre (2011) introduced a fourth parenting style, neglectful parenting, to the developmental psychological literature. This style is characterized by low levels of both demandingness and responsiveness, meaning that parents with this style fail to show their children control, strictness, warmth, and compassion (Alegre, 2011; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).
Transformational Leadership

A dominant theme in the leadership literature is that one of the most effective leadership styles for both an organization and its employees is transformational leadership. This form of leadership is effective because it has motivational potential that has been linked to employee performance beyond expectations and organization-wide performance and financial achievements (Hater & Bass, 1988). Transformational leadership was developed by Bass (1985), and involves four primary components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Since the development of Bass’ (1985) original model, researchers have identified critical issues that required changes to be made to the original model. The most critical problems with the original model were associated with researchers’ failures to replicate the original factor structure of the measure used to quantify Bass’ (1985) four subdimensions, as well as the lack of discriminant validity between these subdimensions when they were tested in various research situations.

Rafferty and Griffin (2004) developed a transformational leadership model with more refined subdimensions to confront these issues. All of the subdimensions used in Bass’ (1985) model were taken into consideration, and one of the original subdimensions was kept. Rafferty and Griffin (2004) defined intellectual stimulation as leadership behaviors that enhance follower awareness and encourage new ways of thinking. Rafferty and Griffin (2004) also combined Bass’ (1985) dimensions of idealized influence and charisma into a construct they termed “vision”. This new combined dimension represented the vision that transformational leaders create for their followers to strive to accomplish.

In Bass’ (1985) original definition of inspirational motivation, he states that transformational leaders use motivational talks and energizing techniques to facilitate follower
transcendence. Bass (1999) later proposed that transformational leaders use inspirational motivation and charisma to enhance follower motivation toward achieving shared goals. Due to multiple conflicting definitions of inspirational motivation, Rafferty and Griffin (2004) created a replacement dimension they called inspirational communication using similarities found in existing definitions of Bass’ (1985) original dimension. They defined inspirational communication as the positive language that transformational leaders use when interacting with subordinates in order to facilitate motivation and creativity.

Finally, Rafferty and Griffin (2004) replaced individualized consideration with supportive leadership, which was thought to better encompass the meaning behind this dimension derived from path-goal theory (House, 1971). Path-goal theory posits that a leader’s role in an organization is to help their subordinates be successful (Jex & Britt, 2008). Rafferty and Griffin (2004) added a fifth dimension, personal recognition, which describes a leader’s use of praise and acknowledgement for their subordinates’ efforts in achieving their goals. The present study utilizes this revised framework for transformational leadership.

**Transformational leadership development.** Underlying dimensionality aside, an ongoing debate in applied psychological and business research involves whether leadership abilities of any form are innate or situation specific. Zaccaro (2007) asserted that leadership ability is genetically or biologically determined, and that certain traits associated with transformational leadership, such as charisma and interpersonal skills are somehow intrinsic to the person from birth. From this perspective, leaders are born rather than made, and leadership is not likely to change over time through learning or development.

In contrast to this born-leader perspective, others such as Vroom and Jago (2007) argue that leadership ability is primarily determined by situational factors. From this perspective,
effective leadership involves using different skills in different situations, and thus requires effective adaptation skills within different environmental contexts. Transformational leadership can thus be seen as a style that emerges as a person effectively reads a given situation and responds with the most appropriate behaviors that inspire and motivate their followers. Through this approach, transformational leadership develops when leaders adopt different decision-making styles based on different situations.

In the present study, a blended perspective on leadership was considered. Some researchers refer to this as a contingency approach to leadership that combines biological and situational determinants of leadership effectiveness (e.g., Eberly, Johnson, Hernandez, & Avolio, 2013). Specifically, this view suggests that: (a) people may be predisposed to display leadership qualities, and (b) the degree to which these qualities manifest themselves is dictated, in part, by one’s opportunities to lead as well as other factors within the environment that might help or hinder one’s leadership efforts. This perspective also suggests that leadership can be learned, and the learning process is much more effective for those individuals who possess the traits that are related to effective leadership. This perspective also suggests that a person may not develop or display leadership capabilities until certain situational opportunities arise (e.g., promotion to manager status, becoming a parent).

A growing body of research suggests that transformational leadership can be learned. Fitzgerald and Schutte (2010), for example, explored the idea of increasing transformational leadership through efforts to increase managerial self-efficacy. Their study took a cognitive approach to developing transformational leadership using the expressive writing paradigm task. The purpose of the expressive writing paradigm task is to increase self-efficacy by having learners write about their feelings, thoughts, experiences, and accomplishments. This expressive
writing task was meant to serve as a reminder to participants of their unique skills, assets, and successes that make them a successful leader. Fitzgerald and Schutte (2010) found that, when managers were required to write about their leader-related accomplishments, encouragement, and abilities for 20 minutes a day for three days, their transformational leadership self-efficacy increased significantly from pre-intervention to post-intervention assessments.

Brown and May (2012) examined the effectiveness of a transformational leadership training program using managers at a manufacturing company. After the manufacturing company had experienced a decline in their subordinate productivity levels, Brown and May (2012) implemented an intervention using a training program designed to increase transformational leadership behaviors. This program involved assisting managers in creating transformational leadership behavioral action plans, setting goals, and providing consistent feedback for a year. Using a survey, they measured transformational leadership behaviors immediately before their intervention and three months after the intervention. Their intervention led to a significant increase in transformational leadership behaviors, subordinate satisfaction, and employee productivity.

**Authoritative Parenting and Transformational Leadership**

The similarities between effective parenting skills and transformational leadership skills are at the heart of the present research effort. The association between authoritative parenting and positive child life outcomes are very similar to the associations that have been identified between transformational leadership and positive employee outcomes (Popper & Mayseless, 2003). Table 1 presents a list of similarities between an authoritative parent and transformational leadership (Baumrind, 1991; Morton et al., 2010, 2011; Popper & Mayseless, 2003) using the
definition and facets proposed by Rafferty and Griffin (2004). The material in this table is adapted from Popper and Mayseless (2003), which compares Bass’ (1985) original transformational leadership facets with an authoritative parenting style.

Table 1 demonstrates many points of connection and similarity between authoritative parenting and transformational leadership. For example, transformational leadership and its effects on follower outcomes are primarily based on a leader’s concern for follower development (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). This is similar to the idea that authoritative parents are mainly concerned with the development of their child. These developmental outcomes that are achieved through transformational leadership are also reflective of those achieved through effective parenting. In a work context, these outcomes are reflected in follower motivation, morality, and empowerment (Popper & Mayseless, 2003). In a family context, motivation is reflective of academic achievement, morality is reflective of moral behavior, and empowerment is related to self-esteem and self-control of children (Baumrind, 1991).

A limited number of studies have explored the link between leadership and parenting, typically extending from the workplace to the family. For example, Morton et al. (2011) used transformational leadership theory to develop a “transformational parenting” questionnaire that adolescents used to rate their parents. Morton et al. (2011) found that parents’ engagement in transformational leadership behaviors was associated with heightened self-regulation, self-efficacy, and life satisfaction among their adolescents. These outcomes are similar to the organizational outcomes of transformational leadership behaviors exhibited by managers. For example, research on managers classified as being transformational leaders has demonstrated positive employee outcomes such as increased job performance, job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and motivation (Jex & Britt, 2008).
Table 1  Table of Similarities Between Transformational Leaders and Authoritative Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rafferty and Griffin’s (2004) Transformational Leader</th>
<th>Authoritative Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong> Transformational leaders create an organization-wide vision by expressing an idealized picture of the future based on the organization’s values and beliefs (Rafferty &amp; Griffin, 2004)</td>
<td>An authoritative parent has the ability to create a family-related vision in which their children admire them and wish to mimic their actions by adopting the same values and beliefs as the parent (Morton et al., 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Communication</strong> Transformational leaders use positive and encouraging messages about the organization in order to build follower motivation and confidence (Rafferty &amp; Griffin, 2004)</td>
<td>An Authoritative Parent develops and monitors clear expectations of their children’s behavior so that they are assertive, autonomous, cooperative, and socially responsible (Baumrind, 1991). These parents have the ability to increase their children’s self-efficacy by setting high but attainable expectations so that children become empowered and autonomous in their actions (Morton et al., 2010, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Leadership</strong> Transformational leaders express concern for their followers and take into considerations their individual needs (Rafferty &amp; Griffin, 2004).</td>
<td>Authoritative Parents are both responsive and demanding (Baumrind, 1991). They adopt individualized responses to their children’s needs and expectations by demonstrating availability, sensitivity, and understanding (Popper &amp; Mayseless, 2003). Research demonstrates that an authoritative parenting style leads to optimal developmental life-outcomes for children (Morton et al., 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation</strong> Transformational leaders increase their followers’ interests and awareness of relevant organizationally related issues while enhancing their follower’s ability to think about these issues in new ways (Rafferty &amp; Griffin, 2004).</td>
<td>Authoritative parents provide their children with opportunities to engage in unfamiliar and challenging experiences in order to stimulate their interests and develop creativity (Popper &amp; Mayseless, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Recognition</strong> Transformational leaders reward their followers for achieving organizational goals using praise and acknowledgement for their efforts (Rafferty &amp; Griffin, 2004).</td>
<td>An Authoritative Parent reinforces their child’s self worth and competence using praise for achieving goals, and by using emotionally warm and expressive language (Popper &amp; Mayseless, 2003).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interrole Behavioral Congruence

Another important element in the present study is the level of interrole behavioral congruence among workplace leaders who have children. This concept of interrole behavioral congruence is similar to cross-situational consistency in personality trait expression. Research by Diener and Larsen (1984) on behavioral consistency across situations suggests that individual behaviors, affect, and cognition tend to be similar across situations that are similar. Using the implications from research on cross-situational consistency, Furr and Funder (2004) made a distinction between objectively similar situations and subjectively similar situations. They noted that situations that are objectively similar are identical and can be experimentally manipulated or defined. Conversely, situations that are subjectively similar are based on perceptions or experiences that lead an individual to believe that the two situations are similar. In the context of the present study, the two situations of interest (work roles and parenting roles) can be seen as subjectively similar and, therefore, likely to foster transference of transformational leadership qualities from authoritative parenting experiences.

The Present Study

Research on constructs related to family-to-work enrichment has found that familial roles lead to gains in resources that improve work-related roles (McCall et al., 1988; Morrison et al., 1992). Using the positive end of the work-family balance spectrum, the present study proposes that an effective parenting style may lead to an effective leadership style at work through family-to-work enrichment.

An authoritative parenting style is widely considered to be the most effective parenting style for children and important life outcomes (Gecas & Seff, 1991; Rollins & Thomas, 1979;
Takeuchi & Takeuchi, 2008). Because the focus of the present study is on the positive (enrichment) components of work-family balance, an authoritative parenting style was chosen because existing research supports its beneficial outcomes for children (Gecas & Seff, 1991; Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Takeuchi & Takeuchi, 2008).

The second domain of interest in the present study involves the workplace. Specifically, managers who have children were examined because they are able to gain resources at home that are applicable to their managerial duties. Transformational leadership was used because research demonstrates that it is one of the most effective leadership styles for both the organization and its employees (Hater & Bass, 1988).

While the existing research on transformational leadership and authoritative parenting suggests many likely interconnections, direct within-person research on these related phenomena is lacking. The concept of behavioral congruence in this context is another critical component to examine because it can serve as a way of explaining how enrichment occurs between family roles and work roles. The present study was designed to address this research gap in part, by exploring one possible form of family-to-work enrichment, linking authoritative parenting in the family to transformational leadership at work.

Extending from the preceding discussion and considering the preceding background, it was expected that:

**Hypothesis 1.** Leaders who demonstrate an authoritative parenting style at home are more likely to demonstrate a transformational leadership style at work.
The concept of behavioral congruence in this context is another critical component to examine behaviors transferring from one similar role to another. According to Furr and Funder (2004), if individuals in the present study perceive their parenting roles as being subjectively similar (i.e., requiring similar skills, behaviors, and emotions) to their leadership roles, enrichment may have a higher likelihood of occurring. Congruence can then be referred to as the mechanism in which enrichment occurs between family roles and work roles. From these assumptions, it was expected that:

**Hypothesis 2.** Perceived family-to-work enrichment is highest for those who perceive a higher degree of transformational leader/transformational parenting behavioral congruence between work and family domains.

One of the main assumptions in the present study concerns the idea that transformational leadership behaviors increase after a leader becomes a parent. This increase in transformational leadership behaviors is explained using family-work enrichment theory, which states that skills learned in one’s family domain can enhance the quality of work-life in their receiving domain (Carlson et al., 2006). To develop transformational leadership behaviors, however, it is important to remember that the skills developed in the originating domain (parenting domain) will mirror the behaviors developed in the receiving domain (parenting domain). Reflecting on the similarities between authoritative parenting and transformational leadership, one could infer that authoritative parenting behaviors from the originating domain will transfer into transformational leadership behaviors in the receiving domain. This assumption leads to the final hypothesis.
Hypothesis 3. (a) There is a positive relationship between perceived strengthening of transformational leadership after becoming a parent and perceived family-to-work enrichment, and (b) this relationship is moderated by a person’s level of authoritative parenting. Specifically, this relationship will be strongest for those who are more authoritative than for those who are less authoritative.
CHAPTER II.
METHODOLOGY

Participants

A total of 480 surveys were distributed for the purpose of this study, and 150 responses were collected (response rate 31.25%). Most participants \( n = 75 \) were recruited through a variety of MBA programs within universities in the southeast and mid-western United States of America. Additional participants \( n = 44 \) were recruited directly from manufacturing firms in the southeast and upper mid-western areas of the country. A final group of participants \( n = 31 \) was also reached via social media recruitment (i.e., through posts on LinkedIn and Facebook).

All participants met the following inclusion criteria for this study: parent of at least one child, with more than 24 months of parenting experience, and current or recent past supervisory experience at the manager level or above. These criteria were necessary to ensure accurate assessment of one’s leadership and parenting style using the measures detailed in the next section. Age was not an explicitly stated inclusion criterion, given that students in an MBA program with children were over the age of 18. Age was included in the analyses as a covariate, however, to test for the influence of age and experience on changes in behavior after having children.

Table 2 presents all of the descriptive information provided by participants. Fifty-three percent of respondents were male, and 47% were female. The average age of all participants was 46, and 83% indicated their marital status as currently married or living as married. Overall, 95%
of participants indicated their race as Non-Hispanic, and 93% White, 3% Hispanic, and 2% Asian for ethnicity. The average number of children per participant was two, and the average number of dependents was two. The average age of all respondents’ children was 14.5. Fifty percent of participants indicated their parenting status as “both parents working full time”. The second highest parenting status reported (19%) one parent currently working full time, one parent currently not working. Respondents indicated the average number of children currently living at home is one.

Respondents indicated an average of 8.6 years in their current leader-oriented role, and 15.6 years overall in various leader-oriented positions. The mean number of direct reports per participant was six.

**Procedure**

Participants were asked to respond anonymously to an internet-based survey administered through the Qualtrics survey system. The survey began with a consent form and directions for participating in the study. Before the survey began, respondents were asked to check two boxes indicating that they met all of the inclusion criteria to participate, specifically that they were the parent of at least one child, with at least 24 months of parenting experience, and currently or in the recent past, holding a job at the manager-level or above. The survey contained 98 questions, and was designed to take less than 20 minutes for a participant to complete. No incentives were offered to participants.
Measures

The online survey was composed of measures of the following core study variables. Where appropriate, all observed reliabilities for the multi-item measures in this study are summarized along the diagonal of Table 3. All items for the following measures are included in the Appendix. These measures were presented to participants in the order that they are listed below to minimize the risk of contaminating participant responses to questions through social desirability. Presenting questions in this order also minimized the risk of contaminating responses to family-to-work enrichment and leadership impact questions by placing them subsequently after parenting and family-related questions.

Authoritative parenting style. Parenting style was assessed (see Appendix) using the Parenting Authority Questionnaire-Revised (Reitman, Rhode, Hupp, & Altobello, 2002). This 30-item measure captures parents’ perceptions of their approach to parenting their child(ren). The questions on the PAQ pertain to three types of parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and passive. Although the focus of the present study is on an authoritative parenting style, information pertaining to all parenting styles included in the scale were gathered for future analysis. Responses were made on a seven-point Likert scale of agreement, with higher overall scores on the authoritative facet indicating a more authoritative parenting style. In previous studies, the PAQ-R has demonstrated adequate internal consistency (α = .77), test-retest reliability, and convergent validity (Reitman et al., 2002).

Transformational leadership/transformational parenting. Transformational leadership was assessed using 30 items adapted from Rafferty and Griffin (2004). In the original scale created by Rafferty and Griffin (2004), each subdimension of transformational leadership contains three questions pertaining to that given dimension. For the purpose of the present study,
these questions were adapted to represent self-ratings for the work domain and the parenting domain. Therefore, to evaluate each subdimension of transformational leadership in the present study, six items were presented to participants, three pertaining to the work domain and three pertaining to the parenting domain. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a seven-point Likert scale, with one representing disagree strongly and seven representing agree strongly. A higher overall score indicates a higher level of transformational leadership type behaviors in both the present work domain and parenting domain. To enable comparisons of leadership style before and after becoming a parent, participants also responded to these items with a retrospective orientation, indicating their level of transformational leadership type behaviors prior to becoming a parent. The transformational leadership scale utilized and adapted for the present study has demonstrated sufficient internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .89$) and discriminant validity in previous research (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).

**Demographic information.** For the purpose of sample description and statistical control in the statistical tests of the hypotheses, participants were asked to provide information regarding their age, sex, marital status, household parenting status, number of dependents, overall number of children, number of children currently living in the home (as dependents), children’s ages, span of supervisory responsibility, time spent in current/most recent leader position, overall time spent in managerial/leadership positions, and the industry in which the participant performed managerial/leadership duties. These demographic variables were included to maintain consistency with other research on work-family issues and leadership (Hanson et al., 2006; Kacmar, Crawford, Carlson, Ferguson, & Whitten, 2014; Michel et al., 2014) and also to control for possible influences of experience on changeability of transformational leadership.
The duration of the participants’ current or most recent leader-oriented job was included due to research by Arvey, Zhang, Avolio, and Krueger (2007) stating that work-related training and development experiences and/or opportunities is a strong predictor of transformational leadership tendencies. Therefore, the time spent in a given managerial occupation may capture the amount of training and development each person has received. Finally, to determine whether or not family-to-work enrichment changes across different organizations, participants were asked to specify the industry they currently work in or most recently worked in.

**Family-to-work enrichment.** Family-to-work enrichment was measured using six questions developed by Carlson et al. (2006). The present study used the shortened version of this scale derived from Kacmar et al. (2014). These six items represent both the family-to-work direction and work-to-family direction of enrichment, and were taken from the original eighteen-item scale. This scale measures six subdimensions of family-to-work and work-to-family enrichment, each with one question pertaining to that subdimension. These subdimensions are family-to-work development, family-to-work affect, family-to-work efficiency, work-to-family development, work-to-family affect, and work-to-family capital. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a seven-point Likert scale with 1 representing disagree strongly and seven representing agree strongly. A higher overall score indicates a higher level of family-to-work enrichment. The revised items have demonstrated adequate internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .82$), as well as discriminant, convergent, and predictive validity (Kacmar et al., 2014).

**Trait personality.** Five-factor model traits were assessed using Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann (2003) 10-item personality inventory (TIPI). For the purpose of the present study, each item was included twice to assess FFM traits at home and at work. Participants were asked to rate their extent of agreement with the statements on a seven-point Likert scale, with one
representing disagree strongly and seven representing agree strongly as they relate to their personality experienced at home and at work. A higher score on each personality factor indicates a higher level of that trait experienced in either the work domain or the parenting domain. Using this scale for both work and home domains allowed for assessing behavioral congruency between roles. The ten-item personality inventory (TIPI) has demonstrated adequate levels of test-retest reliability ($\alpha = .72$), and convergent and discriminant validity in previous research (Gosling et al., 2003).

**Impact of parenting on leadership questions.** A series of 10 questions (see Appendix) were designed to gather qualitative data from participants regarding their managerial style and abilities prior to and after becoming a parent. These questions made it possible to gather insight into major influences on participants’ leadership and managerial style development.
CHAPTER III.
RESULTS

Before testing the hypotheses, data were prepared for the analyses in the following manner. Participants missing more than 50% of their survey responses were excluded from the dataset. For any remaining participants with data missing at random, mean scale within-person imputation was used to ensure the most complete data set possible for the analyses (Cunningham, LeMay, Sarnosky, & Anderson, 2014).

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for all study variables are summarized in Tables 2 and 3. In these tables, it is evident that participants reported a higher level of family-to-work enrichment \( (M = 6.04, SD = .87) \) than work-to-family enrichment \( (M = 5.58, SD = 1.10) \). Family-to-work enrichment was found to be correlated with emotional stability at home \( (r = .40, p < .05) \).

Respondents also reported higher levels of authoritative parenting \( (M = 6.03, SD = .57) \) compared with authoritarian \( (M = 4.52, SD = .87) \) and permissive parenting styles \( (M = 2.70, SD = .78) \). Authoritative parenting was found to be significantly correlated with transformational leadership \( (r = .54, p < .05) \) and transformational parenting \( (r = .48, p < .05) \). Authoritative parenting was found to be significantly correlated with agreeableness at home \( (r = .38, p < .05) \), as well as emotional stability at home, \( (r = .42, p < .05) \) and openness to experience at home \( (r = .41, p < .05) \). Authoritarian parenting style was also significantly correlated with number of children \( (r = .23, p < .05) \).
Transformational leadership was found to be significantly correlated with extraversion at work \( (r = .26, p < .05) \), as well as conscientiousness at work \( (r = .37, p < .05) \) and openness to experience at work \( (r = .48, p < .05) \). Transformational leadership was also found to be significantly correlated with years as leader overall \( (r = .23, p < .05) \).

Table 2  Descriptive Statistics for all Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience at Home</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability at Home</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness at Home</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness at Home</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion at Home</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personality at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience at Work</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability at Work</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness at Work</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness at Work</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion at Work</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transformational Parenting | 96 | 6.24| 6.33   | 0.53| 4.13    | 7       |
Transformational Leadership Before Children | 96 | 5.65| 5.90   | 1.00| 2.60    | 7       |
Transformational Leadership | 97 | 6.22| 6.27   | 0.49| 4.60    | 7       |
Impact of Parenting on Leadership | 92 | 5.88| 6.00   | 0.84| 4.00    | 7       |

Family-to-Work Enrichment | 93 | 6.04| 6.33   | 0.87| 3.67    | 7       |
Work-to-Family Enrichment | 93 | 5.58| 5.67   | 1.10| 2.67    | 7       |

Permissive Parenting Style | 97 | 2.70| 2.60   | 0.78| 1.20    | 5.1     |
Authoritarian Parenting Style | 97 | 4.52| 4.60   | 0.87| 3.00    | 6.3     |
Authoritative Parenting Style | 97 | 6.03| 6.10   | 0.57| 3.70    | 7       |

Age | 95 | 45.47| 46.00| 11.25| 24.00| 66       |
Sex | 95 | 1.48 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 2        |
Number of Dependents | 95 | 1.77| 2.00 | 1.24 | 0.00 | 6        |
Number of Children | 95 | 2.55| 2.00 | 1.50 | 1.00 | 12       |
Number of Children at Home | 95 | 1.43| 1.00 | 1.15 | 0.00 | 5        |
Number of Direct Reports | 94 | 59.53| 6.00 | 358.14| 0.00 | 3400     |
Average Age of Children | 94 | 14.29| 9.75 | 10.60| 1.00 | 45       |
Years as Leader (current role) | 91 | 8.45| 6.00 | 8.44 | 0.00 | 33       |
Years as Leader (overall) | 94 | 15.43| 12.00| 9.75 | 1.00 | 42       |
| Variables | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. | 13. | 14. | 15. | 16. | 17. | 18. | 19. | 20. | 21. | 22. | 23. | 24. | 25. | 26. | 27. |
|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. Openness to Experience at Home | .50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Emotional Stability at Home | .45 | .68 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Conscientiousness at Home | .19 | .43 | .14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Agreeableness at Home | .39 | .65 | .31 | .50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Extraversion at Home | .33 | .56 | .17 | .50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Openness to Experience at Work | .55 | .37 | .43 | .18 | .23 | .35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Emotional Stability at Work | .37 | .72 | .31 | .61 | .00 | .39 | .69 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Conscientiousness at Work | .17 | .37 | .59 | .30 | .19 | .34 | .12 | .36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Agreeableness at Work | .22 | .48 | .22 | .66 | .07 | .23 | .62 | .23 | .43 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Extraversion at Work | .22 | .06 | .04 | .06 | .52 | .27 | .01 | .00 | .03 | .64 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Transformational Parenting | .39 | .59 | .50 | .49 | .37 | .41 | .42 | .44 | .35 | .20 | .81 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Transformational Leadership Before Children | .30 | .21 | .11 | .07 | .00 | .29 | .26 | .11 | .19 | .09 | .36 | .94 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Transformational Leadership | .48 | .45 | .31 | .32 | .25 | .47 | .24 | .37 | .27 | .26 | .67 | .50 | .81 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Impact of Parenting on Leadership | .06 | .24 | .04 | .21 | .05 | .11 | .11 | .00 | .03 | .16 | .27 | .08 | .88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. Family-to-Work Enrichment | .28 | .40 | .27 | .27 | .27 | .19 | .09 | .22 | .04 | .14 | .43 | .05 | .35 | .79 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16. Work-to-Family Enrichment | .32 | .29 | .21 | .16 | .28 | .36 | .16 | .29 | .08 | .23 | .44 | .21 | .39 | .20 | .42 | .80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17. Permissive Parenting Style | .02 | .09 | .12 | .03 | .14 | .15 | .16 | .19 | .10 | .15 | .17 | .17 | .02 | .07 | .07 | .70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. Authoritarian Parenting Style | .03 | .03 | .14 | .10 | .05 | .06 | .02 | .10 | .13 | .14 | .12 | .13 | .19 | .04 | .11 | .05 | .22 | .74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. Authoritative Parenting Style | .41 | .42 | .24 | .38 | .19 | .32 | .28 | .28 | .19 | .03 | .48 | .21 | .54 | .10 | .27 | .27 | .02 | .11 | .73 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. Age | .15 | .21 | .03 | .14 | .20 | .07 | .17 | .03 | .07 | .12 | .11 | .31 | .16 | .05 | .15 | .10 | .21 | .01 | .03 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21. Sex | -.03 | .20 | .02 | .36 | .08 | -.11 | 16 | .30 | .38 | -.04 | .13 | .13 | .04 | .10 | .07 | .08 | -.03 | -.05 | .14 | .07 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22. Number of Dependents | .09 | .10 | .07 | .11 | -.15 | .21 | .08 | .02 | .06 | -.03 | .05 | -.12 | .03 | .20 | .06 | .08 | .05 | .08 | -.17 | -.04 | -.18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23. Number of Children | .19 | .15 | .01 | .06 | -.14 | .04 | .01 | -.15 | .14 | .01 | .09 | .33 | .19 | .04 | .08 | .07 | .09 | .23 | .09 | .24 | .17 | .09 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24. Number of Children at Home | -.06 | -.03 | .09 | -.03 | -.06 | .02 | -.09 | -.08 | -.09 | .01 | -.05 | -.13 | -.04 | .09 | .04 | .03 | .03 | .20 | -.03 | -.42 | -.07 | .54 | .30 | .04 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25. Number of Direct Reports | .12 | .04 | .01 | .00 | -.07 | .11 | .04 | -.05 | .05 | .01 | -.02 | .08 | -.03 | .23 | -.02 | .08 | .17 | .07 | .00 | .05 | .06 | .02 | .36 | .04 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26. Average Age of Children | .05 | .02 | -.14 | .07 | -.13 | .04 | .08 | -.09 | .11 | .03 | -.03 | .04 | -.08 | -.17 | -.31 | -.11 | -.08 | -.12 | .53 | .06 | -.01 | .26 | .23 | .24 | .24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27. Years as Leader (current role) | .09 | .11 | -.02 | .02 | -.09 | .02 | .06 | .04 | -.03 | .08 | .12 | .34 | .20 | -.11 | .02 | .17 | -.24 | .07 | .05 | .44 | -.10 | -.12 | .30 | -.25 | -.05 | .33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28. Years as Leader (overall) | .08 | .07 | -.07 | -.03 | -.10 | .08 | .05 | -.08 | -.07 | -.05 | .16 | .39 | .23 | -.15 | -.07 | .12 | -.13 | -.02 | .02 | .64 | -.29 | -.18 | .32 | -.32 | .15 | .17 | .28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

*Note. p < .05; alpha reliabilities along the diagonal*
Hypothesis-Related Analyses

To test Hypothesis 1, that parents who demonstrate an authoritative parenting style at home are more likely to demonstrate a transformational leadership style at work, the online cocor correlational comparison tool was used (Diedenhofen & Musch, 2015). The cocor tool leverages the R statistical analysis software program to generate several tests of the hypothesized differences between overlapping correlations based on dependent groups. In Table 4, the results from the most commonly known test for this type of analysis are summarized, the Pearson-Filon z test (however, the results across all of the various tests performed via the cocor tool were significant). From these results and as illustrated in Table 4, demonstrating an authoritative parenting style at home was significantly related to demonstrating a transformational leadership style at work. In other words, the relationship between transformational leadership and authoritative parenting is significantly more positive than the relationship between transformational leadership and any of the other parenting styles measured by the PAQ-R.

Table 4  Pearson r and Pearson-Filon z-Test Results Comparing Correlations Between Transformational Leadership and Authoritative Parenting vs. Other Parenting Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson's r</th>
<th>Pearson-Filon z-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership with Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>$r = .53^*$</td>
<td>$z = 5.69^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership with Authoritarian Parenting</td>
<td>$r = .20^*$</td>
<td>$z = 2.78^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership with Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>$r = .53^*$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership with Permissive Parenting</td>
<td>$r = -.16$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05; N = 97$. The Pearson-Filon z test results were generated using the COCOR tool (Diedenhofen & Musch, 2015).
The second hypothesis stated that perceived family-to-work enrichment is highest for those who perceive a higher degree of transformational leader/transformational parenting behavioral congruence between work and family domains. For H2, polynomial regression and response surface modeling (RSM) techniques were used as an alternative to difference score techniques, which may not tell the whole story when working with research questions pertaining to behavioral congruence (Cunningham, 2011; Edwards, 2002). Polynomial regression with response surface modeling is a powerful technique that allows one to measure the degree to which a set of predictor variables (TL and TP) relate to an outcome variable (FWE) in situations where predictor variable discrepancy is of major interest (Shanock, Baran, Gentry, Pattison, & Heggestad, 2010). For the present analyses, the steps outlined by Shanock et al. (2010) were followed. First, this involved analyzing the amount of participants showing adequate evidence of discrepancy low and high between transformational leadership and transformational parenting. This gave us the necessary base rate of discrepancy within the obtained sample, and provided the evidence necessary to proceed with conducting the polynomial regression (Fleenor, Smither, Atwater, Braddy, & Sturm, 2010; Shanock et al., 2010). The results of this preliminary step are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5  Frequencies of Transformational Leadership (TL) Levels Over, Under, and In-Agreement with Transformational Parenting (TP) Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Groups</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean TP</th>
<th>Mean TL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL less than TP</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-agreement</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL more than TP</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 97. Table shows adequate evidence of discrepancy low and high needed to move forward with polynomial regression.
Second, polynomial regression with family-to-work enrichment as the outcome variable was run to determine how congruence of each leader-oriented role (i.e., transformational parenting and leadership) related to family-to-work enrichment. To reduce the likelihood of multicollinearity (Aiken, West, & Reno, 1991) we centered each predictor around the mean of their particular scale, and subtracted 4 from each score since 7-point Likert scales were used on each measure. Using these centered predictor scores, we created three new variables that would be included in the polynomial regression analysis. Given the significant variance explained by the predictors (see Adj. $R^2$ in Table 6), the equations were plotted and the polynomial regression results were evaluated with regard to four surface test values: $a_1$, $a_2$, $a_3$, and $a_4$ (Shanock et al., 2010). The unstandardized beta coefficients from the polynomial regression analysis for this hypothesized model were used to generate three-dimensional graphs for interpretation. The surfaces of these graphs allowed us to gain a better understanding of the nature of the transformational parenting-leadership congruence relationship (Shanock et al., 2010).

The surface test values in Table 6 provide estimates of the slopes and curvatures of the surface along two lines: $X = Y$ and $X = -Y$. The $X = Y$ line runs from the back corner to the front corner of the graph and represents the line of perfect agreement. The slope of this line represents how the degree of agreement between transformational leadership and transformational parenting relate to family-to-work enrichment. The $X = -Y$ line runs perpendicular to the $X = Y$ line and represents the line of incongruence. The curvature along this line demonstrates how the level of discrepancy between TL and TP influence family-to-work enrichment. This will allow us to determine whether perceived family-to-work enrichment is highest for those who perceive a higher degree of transformational leader/transformational parenting behavioral congruence between work and family domains.
Table 6  Transformational Parenting-Leadership Discrepancy as a Predictor of Family-to-Work Enrichment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership at work (X)</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational parenting (Y)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership squared</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership x Transformational parenting</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational parenting squared</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adj. $R^2$ .14 *  
$F$ 1.95 *

Surface tests

$a1$: Slope along $x = y$ (as related to $Z$) .30 1.20
$a2$: Curvature on $x = y$ (as related to $Z$) .07 .28
$a3$: Slope along $x = -y$ (as related to $Z$) -1.25 3.71
$a4$: Curvature on $x = -y$ (as related to $Z$) -1.03 1.60

Note: * $p < .05$; $N = 91$; the surface test coefficients ($a$) are as defined by Shanock et al. (2010; 2014).

Figure 1 displays the surface plot for the predictors as they relate to family-to-work enrichment, where $X$ is transformational leadership, $Y$ is transformational parenting, and $Z$ is perceived family-to-work enrichment. The curvature along the $X = Y$ line was positive, but nonsignificant (curvature = 0.07, $p = .81$), weakly indicating a possible non-linear, U-shape relationship between TL/TP and family-work enrichment. As is evident in Figure 1, individuals with high levels of both TL and TP or low levels of both (i.e., high level of congruence between roles) experience family-work enrichment the most. In other words, family-to-work enrichment was highest for those who experience a high degree of congruence between parenting and leadership roles. This was also true for individuals scoring low in both transformational leadership and transformational parenting. In examining the figure, the levels of family-to-work
enrichment are at its highest when both levels of TL/TP are either high or low. In other words, when levels of TL and TP are similar (or congruent), family-to-work enrichment is present.

The curvature along the $X = -Y$ line was negative (curvature = -1.03, $p = 0.552$), indicating that as the degree of discrepancy between TL and TP increased, family-to-work enrichment decreased. This provides support for the notion stating individuals with varying levels of TL and TP (lack of congruence between roles) experience less family-work enrichment. Ultimately, these findings failed to support H2. The surface tests revealed a negative slope along the $X = -Y$ line (slope = -1.25, $p = .737$). This finding suggests that the direction of the discrepancy matters. The negative term indicates that the levels of family-to-work enrichment are greater when the discrepancy is such that transformational parenting is higher than transformational leadership than when a discrepancy opposite in nature is present.
Note: Variables X (transformational leadership) and Y (transformational parenting) were centered around the scale midpoint (4 on a 7-point scale). -4 represents the lowest possible rating and 4 represents the highest possible rating. Family-to-work enrichment scores were provided on a 7-point scale of agreement. Corresponding to these scores on the Z-axis, the colors show different levels of family-to-work enrichment. The X = Y line (the line of perfect agreement) runs from the front corner to the back corner. The X = -Y line (the line of incongruence) runs from left to right across the base of the figure.

Figure 1  Family-to-work Enrichment Explained by Congruence/Discrepancy Between Transformational Leadership at Work and “Transformational” Parenting at Home
Hypothesis 3 was that (a) there is a positive relationship between perceived strengthening of transformational leadership after becoming a parent and perceived family-to-work enrichment, and (b) this relationship is moderated by a person’s level of authoritative parenting. Prior to testing, a difference score was created to reflect change in transformational leadership change from before to after children. Scores on this indicator of change were scaled such that higher scores equaled higher transformational leadership after children than before children. To make more complete use of available information, participants’ FFM scores for home and work were averaged into a single set of composite FFM traits. These composite traits were then included as covariates in the analysis testing H3 as more robust indications of participants’ underlying basic personality.

A three-stage hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to test H3. On step one, composite FFM trait scores, age, sex, number of direct reports, number of dependents, and overall number of years in leadership roles were added as covariates given previously observed relationships between these variables and other study variables of interest. On step two, the transformational leadership change score and all parenting style subscale scores were entered. On step three, the product of transformational leadership change and authoritative parenting was entered to test the interaction of these two variables. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 7.

To test the first part of the third hypothesis, transformational leadership change score and all parenting subscale scores were added to stage two. Results indicated that introducing the transformational leadership change score accounted for 32% of the variation in family-to-work enrichment scores, and this change in $R^2$ was significant $F (4,75) = 2.53, p < .05$, providing support for the first part (a) of H3. Interestingly, Emotional Stability also contributed
significantly to the regression model ($\beta = .37, p < .05$), indicating that participants’ degree of emotional stability also predicted perceived family-to-work enrichment.

In stage three, a product variable was added in order to identify a possible interaction between transformational leadership and authoritative parenting to support the second part of the third hypothesis. Results indicated that the product variable did not significantly contribute to the regression model and therefore failed to support H3B.

Table 7  Family-to-Work Enrichment Explained by Core Transformational Leadership and Authoritative Parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$\beta$ Predictors</th>
<th>$\beta$ Step 1</th>
<th>$\beta$ Step 2</th>
<th>$\beta$ Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.33 *</td>
<td>.37 *</td>
<td>.37 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dependents</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Direct Reports</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as Leader (overall)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL$<em>{now}$-TL$</em>{bc}$ Change Score (TL Change)</td>
<td>.29 *</td>
<td>.30 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting Style</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Parenting Style</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive Parenting Style</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL Change * Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Delta R^2$ | .21 | .11 | .02
$\Delta F$  | 2.15 * | 2.96 * | 1.90
Adjusted $R^2$ | .11 | .19 | .20
$F$          | 2.15 * | 2.53 * | 2.52 *

Note. $N = 97; * p < .05$
CHAPTER IV.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to identify an example of family-to-work enrichment using parenting and leadership roles. The outcomes of this study have demonstrated that parenting and leadership roles can be an example of family-to-work enrichment in individuals with high behavioral congruency. It has also shown that critical life events outside of work, such as becoming a parent can develop skills that are applicable to the workplace.

Results of the present study found support for the contention that leaders who are authoritative parents at home are more likely to be transformational leaders at work. This finding falls in line with past research arguing that parenting roles and managerial roles require similar behaviors, which can lead individuals to behave similarly within those roles (Morton et al., 2010, 2011; Popper & Mayseless, 2003). The present study also supports Popper and Mayseless (2003) argument that authoritative parenting and transformational leadership are indeed, similar concepts.

Results did not support the hypothesis stating that perceived family-to-work enrichment is highest for individuals who perceive a high degree of transformational leader/transformational parenting behavioral congruence between work and family domains. Results did indicate a pattern in which participants that experience a high degree of congruence between their roles as a parent and a leader were more likely to experience family-to-work enrichment. Congruence, in this context, occurred when an individual’s perceptions related to their degree of transformational leadership and transformational parenting was relatively equal. In other words,
when an individual’s levels of TL and TP were both high (or both low), they experienced behavioral congruence between their parenting and leadership roles (Diener & Larsen, 1984). In this instance, participants who did not experience congruence between roles did not experience family-to-work enrichment. Only when levels of transformational leadership and transformational parenting were similar, were family-to-work enrichment scores high. The patterns identified here support past research that indicates in subjectively similar situations, behaviors and cognition are also typically similar (Diener & Larsen, 1984), but only to the extent that individuals perceive the situations as being subjectively similar (Furr & Funder, 2004). In other words, when individuals perceive their parenting roles and leadership roles as being similar and requiring similar behaviors, they will typically experience family-to-work enrichment more than individuals who do not find the situations to be similar.

The results of the third test provided support for the first part of the hypothesis stating that there is a positive relationship between perceived strengthening of transformational leadership after becoming a parent and perceived family-to-work enrichment. Analyses did not support the second part of this hypothesis stating that the relationship is moderated by a person’s level of authoritative parenting. A positive relationship between the strengthening of TL after becoming a parent and family-to-work enrichment was identified, which supports the notion that the resources accumulated while raising children are applicable to many other facets of life, including the workplace (McNall et al., 2009). This also helps to explain past research indicating that many managers who are parents attribute their leadership effectiveness or success to the skills that they developed through being a parent (McCall et al., 1988; Morrison et al., 1992).

The qualitative questions asking participants to reflect on the impact of parenting on their leadership provided support for Greenhaus and Powell (2006) theory of family-to-work
enrichment through the instrumental pathway. The responses to these questions support the idea that enrichment between roles occurs when skills gained from parenting roles are directly applicable to, and enhance the quality of life within work-related roles.

The impacts of parenting on leadership questions were included as a way for us to gather qualitative data on participants’ leadership development after having children (for all questions, refer to the survey provided in the Appendix). When asked to rate the extent to which becoming a parent has impacted your leadership abilities on a 7-point scale (1 = much weaker, 7 = much stronger), 45% indicated they are “stronger” leaders at work, and 91% of respondents rated 5 or above ($M = 5.76, SD = .88$). 70% of participants also indicated a moderate level of agreement on a 7-point scale (1 = disagree strongly, 7 = agree strongly) with the statement that becoming a parent has made them a better leader ($M = 5.96, SD = .90$). For this question, 94% of respondents rated a 5 or above, suggesting that they are at least a “somewhat” better leader after having children. It is also important to point out that zero participants provided negative ratings (below 4 or neutral) on either of these scales. From this, it can be concluded that the majority of leaders in this sample believe that becoming a parent has made them a stronger and better leader (93%), while a small percentage (7%) believe they are unchanged.

Participants were asked to list three leadership skills that they have learned or developed through parenting, and rate the extent to which they use their listed skills on the job in their leadership roles. Table 8 summarizes the leadership skills that participants identified, after thematic coding was used to categorize the skills. Ratings for the usage of these skills were provided on a 5-point scale, 1 representing not at all used and 5 representing all of the time. The usage ratings of all three skills were averaged ($M = 4.49, SD = .69$) and results indicated that 42% of respondents indicated they use these skills all of the time. Related to this qualitative
information and also for exploratory purposes, participants were asked if becoming a parent had negatively affected their ability to lead others, and 100% of participants answered “No”. This finding suggests that leaders not only developed these skills after having children, but that they need these skills to function as a leader in their everyday work-life.

Table 8  Summary of Leadership Skills Developed as a Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% (relative to total # of skills)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching/Mentoring</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise &amp; Negotiation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination &amp; Problem Solving</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication &amp; Perseverance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability &amp; Trustworthiness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy &amp; Understanding</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty &amp; Fairness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration &amp; Influence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition &amp; reward</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision &amp; Progression</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations and Future Research

One internal validity limitation in this study concerns its relational/correlational nature, and cross-sectional design. Although some of the findings from this study were significant, parenting causing family-work enrichment cannot be inferred. Future research on this topic should consider using a longitudinal design where data collection begins prior to participants having children, and continuing data collection for a longer period of time. Another consideration for future research would be to include a comparison group of workplace leaders who do not have children. Using retrospective scales were another limitation due to the cross-sectional design of this study. Specifically, individuals whose children were older probably had a more difficult time answering these questions, making them less valid.

A measurement limitation includes the reliance on self-reports. Although attempts were made to decrease the likelihood of response shift bias using retrospective-baseline questions, this does not mean the concern should be entirely discounted. Future research in this area should examine the influence of parenting skills by using multiple sources of information including subordinates, coworkers, children, spouses, and even financial performance of the organization.

A final limitation to this study deals with the nature and size of the sample used. The nature of the sample used in this study was fairly homogeneous in terms of race and ethnicity. Perhaps future research on this topic should broaden the sampling strategy by sampling directly in minority groups. This would allow for more sufficient generalizability of the results. In terms of sample size, since only 150 participants were used, more participants would increase power, and possibly increase the significance of the results overall.
Practical Implications

In terms of the relevant literature, the findings from this study fall in line with the theory of family-to-work enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006); defined as the degree to which family experiences increase the quality of work life. Support was found for Greenhaus and Powell (2006) theory of family-to-work enrichment occurring through the instrumental pathway, meaning that parenting experiences develop skills that are useful for leadership roles at work. Theory related to behavior congruence (Diener & Larsen, 1984; Furr & Funder, 2004) can also be attributed through the subjectively similar perceptions that were faced by the participants included in the present study. The majority of research on work-family relations is on the conflict side, whereas this study is on the positive end of this spectrum, making it unique.

The results are useful for applied purposes because they are extremely relatable. With more women entering the workforce, and more companies offering work-family balance options for working parents, the findings obtained in the present study are both insightful and encouraging. Companies need to hear more about the benefits of hiring parents as leaders, because (as this study demonstrates) they have been exposed to leadership development opportunities that many organizations pay large sums of money to impose in their employees.

These findings are also potentially useful for application and/or consulting purposes. Although transformational leadership behaviors can be learned (Kelloway & Barling, 2000) and current programs for developing these behaviors exist, a better approach may be even more successful than those available today. Although more research may be necessary before implementing such a leadership development program, using authoritative parenting skill development as the foundation for transformational leadership development may prove to be a successful method. The present findings also suggest that organizations may not want to shy
away from employees with children as somehow less-than-ideal candidates for management or leadership roles. Instead, the present findings suggest that there is a positive transference of transformational leadership qualities between home and work domains. Overall, the findings of this study are useful for theoretical advancement and practical purposes. This research indicates that many individuals attribute their leadership success at work to the experiences involved in becoming a parent.
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Informed Consent Form

Purpose of the study
This study is being conducted by Katherine Kearns, a graduate student in the Industrial and
Organizational Psychology program at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. This research is
being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Chris Cunningham. The purpose is to examine whether
parenting style and leadership styles are related. Please note that participants in this study must be at
least 18 years of age, parents of at least one child, with more than 24 months of parenting
experience, and current or recent past supervisory experience at the manager level or above. If you
do not meet these criteria, you may not participate in this research.

What will I experience?
If you agree to participate, you will be asked to respond to a brief internet-based survey (requiring
approximately 20 minutes of your time). The survey includes questions about your parenting style,
leadership style, personality characteristics, and overall leadership development. Some demographic
questions are also included so that we can accurately describe the characteristics of the final group of
participants.

Benefits of this study
You will be contributing to a growing base of knowledge regarding how leaders’ work and family
roles affect leadership development and effectiveness.

What are the risks to me?
The risks of this study are anticipated to be limited to the inconvenience of taking the survey. If you
feel uncomfortable with a question, you can skip that question or withdraw from the study altogether.
If you decide to quit at any time before you have finished the questionnaire, your answers will NOT
be recorded. Please note, however, that we can only make use of fully complete surveys, so we
greatly appreciate your full cooperation.

What about my privacy?
You are able to participate in this study anonymously; no names or personal contact information will
be requested from you. In addition to this protection, all data will be securely gathered and stored in
password protected files accessible only by the researchers.

Voluntary participation
It is your choice to participate in this research and you may withdraw from this study at any time. As
noted above, however, we need complete information from all participants, so if you are willing to participate, we hope you will respond to all questions included in the survey.

How will the data be used?
Data gathered in this study will be analyzed and presented educational settings and at professional
conferences. Results of this work may also be published in a professional journal in the field of
psychology.

Contact information:
If you have concerns or questions about this study, please contact the chair of UTC’s Institutional
Review Board, Dr. Bart Wathington at bart-wathington@utc.edu or 423-425-4269, or the
supervisor of this study, Dr. Chris Cunningham at Chris-Cunningham@utc.edu or 423-425-4264. By
completing and returning this survey, you acknowledge that you have read this information and
agree to participate in this research, with the knowledge that you are free to withdraw your
participation at any time without penalty.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and participation.

Sincerely,

Katherine Kearns
Chris Cunningham, Ph.D.
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (FWA00064145)
has approved this research project #13-008.
APPENDIX D

REITMAN, RHODE, HUPP AND ALTOBELLO 2002 PARENTAL AUTHORITY QUESTIONNAIRE - REVISED
Reitman, Rhode, Hupp and Altobello 2002 Parenting Authority Questionnaire – Revised

Respond to the following items thinking about your current beliefs about parenting your child. There are no right or wrong answers. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. As a well-run home children should learn their way as often as their parents do. | o | o | o | o | o |
2. It is for my children's own good to assert their view that it is right even if they don't agree. | o | o | o | o | o |
3. When I ask my children to do something, I expect to see them work on it. | o | o | o | o | o |
4. Once family rules have been made, I discuss the reasons for the rules with my children. | o | o | o | o | o |
5. I always encourage discussion among my children when they have different likes and dislikes. | o | o | o | o | o |
6. Children need to be free to make their own decisions about activities, even if the decisions are what a parent might want to do. | o | o | o | o | o |
7. I do not allow my children to question the decisions I make. | o | o | o | o | o |
8. I direct my children's activities and decisions of my children by talking with them and using reminders and punishments. | o | o | o | o | o |
9. Other parents should use more books to get their children to behave. | o | o | o | o | o |
10. My children do not need to stay home alone because people in the community have told them to. | o | o | o | o | o |
11. My children know when to listen and when to talk. | o | o | o | o | o |
12. School students should teach their children exactly who is the boss of the family. | o | o | o | o | o |
13. I usually don't give justification for my children's behavior. | o | o | o | o | o |
14. Most of the time I do what my children want when making family decisions. | o | o | o | o | o |
15. I tell my children what they should do, but I explain the reasons why I want them to do it | o | o | o | o | o |
16. I get very upset if my children try to disagree with me. | o | o | o | o | o |
17. Most problems in society would be solved if parents would let their children choose their activities, their own clothes, and follow their own desires while growing up. | o | o | o | o | o |
18. Not my children know what behavior is expected and if they don't follow the rules they get punished. | o | o | o | o | o |
19. I allow my children to decide for themselves without a lot of help from me. | o | o | o | o | o |
20. I do not allow my children to make decisions in anything without a lot of help from me. | o | o | o | o | o |
21. I do not think of myself as responsible for setting my children's goals. | o | o | o | o | o |
22. I do not discuss the goals of behavior for my children, but I am going to listen to their complaints and discuss it with them. | o | o | o | o | o |
23. I expect my children to follow my rules, but I always explain why I have the rules and discuss the rules with them. | o | o | o | o | o |
24. I allow my children to form their own opinions about family matters and let them make their own decisions about those matters. | o | o | o | o | o |
25. Most problems in society would be solved if parents were to let their children decide how they want to do it. | o | o | o | o | o |
26. I often tell my children exactly what I want them to do and how I expect them to do it. | o | o | o | o | o |
27. I am fair in my punishments for my children but am understanding when they disagree with me. | o | o | o | o | o |
28. I do not allow for the behavior, reactions, or desires of my children. | o | o | o | o | o |
29. My children know what I expect of them and do what I expect them to do out of respect for my authority. | o | o | o | o | o |
30. If I make a decision that hurts my children, I am willing to admit that I made a mistake. | o | o | o | o | o |
APPENDIX E

ADAPTED RAFERTY AND GRIFFIN 2004 TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE
Adapted Rafferty and Griffin Transformational Leadership Questionnaire

Using the scale provided, respond to the following items thinking about your current personal leadership style. Rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

_in my job as a leader at work, I......_
APPENDIX F

ADAPTED RAFFERTY AND GRIFFIN 2004 TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP - BEFORE CHILDREN QUESTIONNAIRE
Adapted Rafferty and Griffin 2004 Transformational Leadership Questionnaire – Before Children

Using the scale provided, respond to the following items thinking about your personal leadership style before you became a parent. Rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

**In my job as a leader at work, I...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. had a clear understanding of where we were going.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. had a clear sense of where I wanted our unit to be in 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. had no idea where the organization was going.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. said things that made employees proud to be part of our organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. said positive things about our work unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. encouraged employees to see opportunities and challenges as situations full of opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. challenged employees to think about old problems in new ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. shared ideas that forced employees to question why they had never questioned before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. challenged employees to rethink their tacit assumptions about their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. communicated employees' feelings before acting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. behaved in a manner that was insightful to the employees' needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ensured that the employees' interests were given consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. commended my employees when they did a better than average job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. acknowledged employees' improvements in their quality of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. personally complimented employees when they did outstanding work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

ADAPTED RAFFERTY AND GRIFFIN 2004 TRANSFORMATIONAL PARENTING QUESTIONNAIRE
Adapted Rafferty and Griffin Transformational Parenting Questionnaire

Using the scale provided, please respond to the following items as you feel now (today).

_In my role as a parent at home, I....._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have a clear understanding of how my family is developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have a clear idea of what I want my family to be like in 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have no idea what my family will look like in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Say things that make my children feel like a part of our family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Say positive things about my children and our family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Encourage my family members to view change as being a positive opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encourage my children to think about their future in new ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Share ideas that foster my children in new and different ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Challenge my children to rethink their basic assumptions regarding various aspects of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consider my children’s feelings before acting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Behave in a manner that is thought to my children’s needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ensure that my children’s interests are given consideration prior to making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Comment on my children when they do something better than average job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Acknowledge my children’s achievements in their quality of work and/or skill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Personally compensate my children when they demonstrate outstanding performance in their extracurricular activities, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Demographic Questions

What is your age? (please round to nearest year)

What is your sex?
- Male
- Female

Indicate your marital status using the scale provided.

NOTE: If you are engaged or soon to be married, please indicate "Married/Living as married" on this scale.

- Married/Living as married
- Single
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Other

I am...
- Hispanic/Latino
- Non-Hispanic, Asian
- American Indian / Alaskan Native
- Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander
- Middle Eastern / Arab

I identify most strongly as...
- White
- Black/African American
- Asian
- American Indian / Alaskan Native
- Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander
- Middle Eastern / Arab

Indicate the parent working arrangements for your family by choosing the most appropriate option below:

- Both parents work full time.
- One parent working full time, one parent working part time.
- One parent working full time, one parent not working.
- Both parents working part time.
- Other

Report the number of dependents you support (children or other adults):

To how many children are you considered a parent?

Indicate the number of children that are currently living in your home.

How many employees work directly under your management or leadership in your current position?

Indicate the age(s) of each of your children using the spaces provided (round to nearest year for each child):

- Child’s Ages
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10

How would you describe the industry in which you work?

How many years and months have you been working in your current position? Please round to the nearest year.

How many years of experience do you have overall in managerial or leadership positions? Please round to the nearest year.
APPENDIX I

KACMAR, CRAWFORD, CARLSON, FERGUSON AND WHITTEN 2014 SHORTENED WORK-FAMILY ENRICHMENT SCALE.
Kacmar, Crawford, Carlson, Ferguson, and Whitten 2014 Shortened Work-Family Enrichment Scale

To respond to the items that follow, mentally insert each item into the sentence where indicated. Then indicate your agreement with the entire statement using the scale provided.

**My involvement in my work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Makes me feel happy and this helps me be a better family member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Helps me feel personally fulfilled and this helps me be a better family member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To respond to the items that follow, mentally insert each item into the sentence where indicated. Then indicate your agreement with the entire statement using the scale provided.

**My involvement in my family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Helps me to apply skills and this helps me be a better worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Encourages me to use my work skills in a focused manner and this helps me be a better worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

ADAPTED GOSLING, RENTFROW AND SWANN 2003 TEN-ITEM PERSONALITY INVENTORY
Gosling, Rentfrow and Swann 2003 Adapted Ten-Item Personality Inventory

Listed below are a number of personality traits that may or may not describe you. Please insert each pair of descriptors into the following sentence and rate the extent to which you agree or disagree that each completed sentence accurately describes you.

**I see myself at work as ______.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Disagree Strongy</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Strongy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extroverted, enthusiastic.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical, quarrelsome.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disposable, self-disciplined.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anxious, easily upset.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Open to new experience, complex.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reserved, quiet.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sympathetic, warm.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Disorganized, careless.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed below are a number of personality traits that may or may not describe you. Please insert each pair of descriptors into the following sentence and rate the extent to which you agree or disagree that each completed sentence accurately describes you.

**I see myself in my parenting roles as ______.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Disagree Strongy</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Strongy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extroverted, enthusiastic.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical, quarrelsome.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disposable, self-disciplined.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anxious, easily upset.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Open to new experience, complex.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reserved, quiet.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sympathetic, warm.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Disorganized, careless.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

IMPACT OF PARENTING ON LEADERSHIP QUESTIONS
Impact of Parenting on Leadership Questions

Which of the following best describes how becoming a parent has impacted your leadership abilities at work?

As a leader I am
- Much weaker
- Weaker
- Somewhat weaker
- Unchanged
- Somewhat stronger
- Stronger
- Much stronger

To what extent would you agree that becoming a parent helped you become a better leader at work?

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neutral
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

List three leadership skills that you have learned or developed through parenting.

Leadership Skill 1
Leadership Skill 2
Leadership Skill 3

To what extent do you use each of these leadership skills in your work as a leader?

- Not at all
- Slightly (less than once per week)
- Occasionally (no more than twice per week)
- Frequently (more than once per week)
- All of the time

Leadership Skill 1
Leadership Skill 2
Leadership Skill 3

5. Has becoming a parent negatively affected your ability to lead others?

- Yes
- No
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