

1-1-2013

"who Taught Us How To Lead?" Parental Influence On Leadership Styles

Asiyat Magomaeva
Wayne State University,

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_theses



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Magomaeva, Asiyat, "'who Taught Us How To Lead?' Parental Influence On Leadership Styles" (2013). *Wayne State University Theses*. Paper 307.

**“WHO TAUGHT US HOW TO LEAD?” PARENTAL INFLUENCE ON LEADERSHIP
STYLES**

by

ASIYAT MAGOMAEVA

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

2013

MAJOR: PSYCHOLOGY
(Industrial/Organizational)

Approved by:

Advisor

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend special acknowledgment to my mother, Zuleta, who taught me the art of perseverance and made sure that I was put into an English as a second language group in high school. I would also like to acknowledge my father, Bagodii, for the wonderful person he is and for sponsoring my trip to the United States after I graduated from college.

I am thankful to my dear friends Anna and Kirill Filin for allowing me to stay with them during my first year in the US. They gave me shelter until I was able to get on my feet. I would like to acknowledge Dr. Janice Bajor, our Wayne State I/O program Alum, who recommended me to Dr. Marcus Dickson, my current advisor, and with his support and belief in my ability I was accepted into the program. Special thanks go to Dr. Boris Baltes and Dr. Alyssa McGonagle for their help and for serving on my committee.

I would also like to acknowledge wonderful people I have met while in graduate school who made me a better student, teacher and person – Becky, Ben, Keith, Ariel, Annie, Nathalie, Nate, Cort, Kevin, Amy, and Lucy.

Last year I became a citizen of the United States, and I am happy and proud of the opportunity to give back by working hard and advancing science.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
LIST OF TABLES	IV
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
<i>PARENTS AS LEADERS</i>	2
<i>PARENTING STYLES</i>	5
<i>LEADERS AS PARENTS</i>	6
<i>LEADERSHIP STYLE</i>	10
<i>GENDER RELATED ISSUES IN LEADERSHIP</i>	13
CHAPTER 2 - METHOD	19
<i>PARTICIPANTS</i>	19
<i>MEASURES</i>	20
<i>MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE (MLQ)</i>	20
<i>PARENTAL AUTHORITY QUESTIONNAIRE (PAQ)</i>	21
<i>PROCEDURE</i>	22
<i>ANALYSIS</i>	22
CHAPTER 3 - RESULTS	25
<i>HYPOTHESIS 1</i>	25
<i>HYPOTHESIS 2</i>	25
CHAPTER 4 - DISCUSSION.....	27
<i>LIMITATIONS</i>	30

<i>FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS</i>	32
Appendix A - Scales	34
Appendix B – Tables	37
References	41
Abstract	48
Autobiographical statement.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Participants' Age	37
Table 2: Race.....	37
Table 3: Perceptions of Effectiveness by Gender	37
Table 4: Perceptions of Better Parenting Style.....	38
Table 5: Correlations and Descriptive Statistics	38
Table 6: Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Overall Effective Parenting Style	39
Table 7: Overall Means for Each Leadership Style for Effective Parents	39
Table 8: Gender x Effective Parenting Factorial Analysis of Variance for Transformational leadership style	39
Table 9: Gender x Effective Parenting Factorial Analysis of Variance for Transactional leadership style	40
Table 10: Gender x Effective Parenting Factorial Analysis of Variance for Laissez-fair leadership style	40

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is evidence that parenting styles shape the development of competence and achievement strategies, and that the authoritative parenting style is the most successful style in developing appropriate achievement strategies (Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000; Glasgow, Dornbusch, Troyer, Steinberg & Ritter, 1997). The present study investigates the influence of recalled parental styles on the subsequent leadership style of individuals in leadership positions. Previous research suggests that bio-data can be a valid predictor of leadership success (Mumford, O'Connor, Clifton, Connelly & Zaccaro, 1993; Rothstein, Schmidt, Erwin, Owens & Sparks, 1990). Additionally, several studies have found support for the influence of parenting practices on a child's future leadership style (Avolio, Rotundo, & Walumbwa, 2009; Ferguson, Hagaman, Grice & Peng, 2006; Hartman & Harris, 1992). The present research explores the impact of different parental styles on the specific leadership styles adopted in adulthood.

The purposes of this study are: 1) investigate the link between parenting styles experienced during childhood and leadership styles adopted later in life, 2) establish whether the gender of the parent and the gender of the child matter in adopting an appropriate leadership style, and 3) determine which parent children perceive as most effective and whether that influences the leadership style they adopt later in life above and beyond the gender of the parent.

There are at least two opinions about the way leaders adopt leadership styles and the ability of leaders to change their existing leadership style. Fiedler (1967) suggests that leadership is formed in the early years as a facet of personality and

learned at a young age. He emphasizes that leadership styles are learned early in life and therefore individuals would have difficulties changing their leadership preference. Other theorists suggest that leadership styles are formed later in life and therefore can be trained and changed (e.g., House & Dessler, 1974). These two approaches have implications for selection and training strategies in organizations. If the first is true, it is important to identify leaders early in the selection process and gather information about individual's leadership style early in the employment. If the second is true, leaders can be developed into better leaders by identifying the roots of the current maladaptive style and adopting a more effective leadership style. In both cases, investigating parents as role models of future leadership style could prove beneficial for the leaders and organizations that wish to select better leaders and develop existing leadership team into better leaders. The present research concentrates on the applicability of identifying experienced parenting styles in training and selecting leaders with preferred leadership styles.

Parents as Leaders

Parents are the first leaders for their children and serve as prototypes for leadership models (Anderson, 1943). Family is the first place where a child gains experience with a leader, learns about obedience and forms impressions about authority (Keller, 1999). The attachment style between a parent and a child formed during childhood translates into adulthood and affects relationships individuals build with others (Keller, 1999, 2003; Popper & Mayseless, 2003). The idea that parents serve as leadership prototypes has been examined by several researchers (Avolio, Rotundo &

Walumbwa, 2009; Baumrind, 1991; Ferguson, Hagaman, Grice & Peng, 2006; Lewin, Lippitt & White, 1939; Popper & Maysseless, 2003).

The belief that children model their parents' behavior is based on social learning theory (Bandura, 1969), which states that we tend to mold our behavior, thoughts and feelings after a person we perceive to be a model. There is substantial evidence that early childhood socialization experiences with one's parents mold interpersonal relationships in adulthood (Parker, Barrett & Hickie, 1992). Parents are perceived as role models and leaders, and have tremendous influence over their children (Grunwald & McAbee, 1999). Children want to be like their parents and model their behavior after the thoughts and attitudes of their parents. For example, Hartman and Harris (1992) investigated whether children adopt the leadership style of an admired parent, but reject and adopt a contrary style when the parent is not admired. Their results suggest that regardless of whether children admire or reject their parents, they still model their parents' leadership styles. In other words children model their parents' leadership style even when they do not get along with that parent.

Lyon (2006), on the other hand, found somewhat opposite results. In her study she observed that individuals who reported their mothers to be authoritative also reported having a democratic leadership style, while individuals who reported their mothers to be authoritarian or permissive seemed to rebel against their mothers' style. Lyon suggests that this change in the leadership style may be due to managerial experience gained on the job, meaning that the desired democratic style that children adopted from their mothers was consistent with the organizational expectations of effective leaders, and individuals retained that leadership style. At the same time,

undesired by the organizations authoritarian and permissive styles that children observed in the childhood changed when individuals entered their leadership roles in organizations. As these two studies indicate, the findings about parental influences on adopted leadership styles are inconclusive and contradictory; they deserve further investigation.

Besides adopting their parents' attachment and interpersonal relationship styles, early childhood experiences may influence individuals' prototypes of successful leaders (Keller, 2003). In her insightful study, Keller (1999) investigated the extent to which people assign their own personality traits to idealized leaders, and whether parental traits they describe affect their image of an idealized leader. She found that most individuals described an idealized leader using personality traits they possess themselves. Keller argues that most people assign traits they possess to an idealized leader because they tend to hold positive illusions about themselves and would like to think that they have great leadership potential. In the same study Keller observed that participants' perceptions of their parents' traits were correlated with the image of the idealized leader. Parental dedication was significantly correlated with the idealized leaders' dedication, and parental charisma was significantly correlated with the charisma dimension of the idealized leader. Remarkably, people also attributed idealized leadership traits that are close to those of their parents even when they identified their parents as dictatorial and tyrannical as well as when they identified their parents as devoted and caring. Keller suggested that this phenomenon occurs because children observe their parents' behavior, and if they see that a parent gets his/her way

by being dictatorial, the children will associate that behavior with a positive outcome and with a leadership style that produces results.

Parenting Styles

In the present study, I will use Baumrind's (1966) frequently cited conceptualization of parenting styles based on the work of Lewin, Lippitt, and White's work (1939). Baumrind identified three distinct parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. The main difference between the three is the degree of control and support parents show to their children.

- Authoritative parents are demanding and responsive. They set high goals and challenge their children to reach them while still being supportive, considerate and caring. They control but do not restrict their children. Authoritative parents encourage communication and provide reasons that are behind their decisions. They use both reason and overt power to shape their children's behavior.
- Authoritarian parents are demanding but non-responsive. They show little support and lack warmth and consistency. Authoritarian parents control and restrict the autonomy of their children. They value obedience and educate their children on what they think is right and what they think is the standard for proper behavior.
- Permissive parents, on the other hand, are non-demanding but responsive. They show lack of control and consistency. Permissive parents allow their children to act on their impulses and desires. They attempt to manipulate their children with reason and not with overt power (Baumrind, 1966).

The majority of the research on the effects of parenting styles on future role occupancy accentuates the importance of authoritarian versus authoritative parenting styles (Baumrind, 1991; Ferguson et al., 2006). The superiority of the authoritative parenting style has been identified by many researchers. Adolescents who identify their parents as authoritative receive higher scores on psychological competence and lower scores on behavioral dysfunction than adolescents who identify their parents as authoritarian (Lamborn et al., 1991). There is also evidence that authoritative parenting leads to higher school achievement (Spera, 2005), better school integration and mental well-being (Shucksmith, Hendry & Glendinning, 1995), better adaptive achievement strategies in adulthood, along with lower levels of failure expectations and higher self-enhancing attributions (Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000). Families where both parents exhibit authoritative parenting styles were associated with the lowest rate of depression and highest school commitment (Simons & Conger, 2007). In the present research, I aimed to investigate authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles and what leadership styles they influence the most.

Leaders as Parents

The idea of leader as a parent figure is not novel. Several researchers have proposed that leaders can be seen as a father figure (Freud, 1939; Dreikurs, 1962; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008; Popper & Amit, 2009). Paternalistic leadership is used in many organizations and is a well-researched topic in business management literature. For example, Pellegrini and Scandura (2008), in their review of paternalistic leadership, found that paternalistic practices by leaders positively relate to subordinate job satisfaction, organization commitment, reduced turnover intentions and job performance

at an organizational level across cultures. Relationships between leaders and followers somewhat resemble parent and child relationships (Popper & Maysel, 2003). The person in the superior role in both types of relationships takes responsibility for somebody with lesser power, provides guidance and directs behavior, educates, and makes important decisions. In both scenarios there is somebody leading the other in the family and in the organization.

The present study examined whether the leadership styles proposed by Bass (1999), transformational, transactional and laissez-faire, echo the authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting leadership styles proposed by Baumrind (1966). The first research that was aimed at linking parenting styles with leadership styles was conducted by Hartman and Harris (1992). They investigated whether parents influence management styles adopted later in life. In their research they asked participants to identify their own leadership style and the style of the person they selected as the most influential during their childhood. Participants' responses were evaluated based on the consideration and initiating structure dimensions of leadership (Stodghill, 1965). The results of the study suggest that perceptions of the leadership style of the person who was most important during childhood influences how managers adopt leadership styles later in life.

Several years later Popper and Maysel (2003) proposed that parenting styles and leadership styles should be examined more thoroughly. Specifically, they draw parallels between transformational leadership and "good" parenting. They suggest that just as "good" parents help their children grow into successful, autonomous adults; transformational leaders help their followers grow and develop. Transformational

leadership, like good parenting, assumes sensitive caring leaders who are eager to help but allow room for growth, create learning environments and serve as an inspiration (Popper & Mayseless, 2003). After reviewing the literature on parenting styles and positive outcomes in children, one can notice that most studies find authoritative parenting style to be the most successful style, where children have better socialization skills, adjustment, higher school performance, self-esteem, and entrepreneurial competence than children who have experienced other parental styles (Baumrind, 1991; Lamborn et al., 1991; Dekovic & Janssens, 1992; Shucksmith, Hendry & Glendinning, 1995; Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000; Spera, 2005; Lee, Daniels, & Kissinger, 2006;). Popper and Mayseless (2003) suggest that there is an overlap between transformational leaders and good parents in that both foster self-esteem, self-confidence, trust in others, and achievement orientations. It is evident that authoritative parenting and transformational leadership have a strong resemblance. Therefore, I propose that authoritative parenting style translates into transformational leadership style; this research examined that relationship.

Ferguson and colleagues (2006) also suggested that early childhood experiences with a parent-leader can shape future leadership styles. They linked parental values to three leadership styles: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. In their research they empirically identified five values that represent each of the leadership styles: autocratic (obedience to authority, conformity to rules, aggression as a means of solving problems, competitive superiority and winning is everything), democratic (fair play, mutual respect, creativity, empathy and peaceful negotiation), and laissez-faire (pursuit of personal wishes, appearance and good impressions, freedom in action, being different, and

doing what is best) and linked it to the global ratings of the parental styles that reflected autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire styles. They found that participants who identified their parents as autocratic also rated autocratic values higher than democratic and laissez-faire values. At the same time, individuals who rated their parental value styles as democratic rated autocratic values lower. However, they found partial support for a connection between democratic and laissez-fair parental values and leadership styles, mainly because democratic and laissez-fair items merged into one concept while autocratic style was split into two: autocratic and individualism.

There are several explanations for these results. First, it is possible that the formulation of leadership styles proposed by Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) did not reflect parental values identified by Ferguson et al. (2006). Second, it is possible that both parents and participants confuse democratic and laissez-fair styles. I wished to extend on their research by investigating further the relationship between parental styles and leadership styles using well established measures of both parental and leadership styles.

In her dissertation, Lyon (2006) proposed that there is a relationship between leadership styles that adults exhibit later in life and perceived parental leadership styles reported. In her investigation she used the classification of parenting styles proposed by Baumrind (1966): authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. Similar to Hartman and Harris (1992), the leadership styles in her study were based on the consideration and initiating structure dimensions that translated into three leadership styles to reflect those dimensions: democratic/participative, autocratic/directive, and laissez-faire. She reasoned that authoritative parenting style reflects democratic leadership style,

authoritarian parental style reflects autocratic/directive leadership style, and permissive parental style reflects laissez-faire leadership style. She found partial support for her hypotheses. Specifically, she found that participants who reported having authoritative mothers exhibited democratic/participative leadership styles. Lyon (2006) did not find support for the other two propositions.

Leadership styles

Bass (1985) identified transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. Transformational leadership style is described as the ability of a leader to motivate followers to go above and beyond satisfying self-interests, put organizational goals first, and perform better than expected. Transformational leadership is more people-oriented, with a concentration on inspiring others to do better and achieve higher goals. Transformational leadership with four dimensions of the transformational leadership can be considered similar to Baumrind's (1966) definition of authoritative parenting style. This leadership style provides high support as well as time control and guidance to employees the same way authoritative parents provide understanding, encouragement and supervision to their children.

Bass (1999) distinguishes four components of transformational leadership: Idealized Influence (Charisma), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration.

- "Idealized influence", or what has been called the charisma component, refers to the extent to which a leader personally inspires others and affects followers on an emotional level. A charismatic leader is perceived as a role model and a

“natural born leader”, someone who is not afraid to take a stand and has a vision he/she is willing to share with his/her followers.

- “Inspirational motivation” refers to the ability of a transformational leader to introduce a vision, persuade people of its importance, and persuade them to follow the leader towards attaining that goal, regardless of the hardships they may encounter on the way. Inspirational motivation means providing encouragement and optimism for the tasks at hand.
- “Intellectual stimulation” refers to the ability of a leader to challenge followers to be creative and open to new ideas and concepts. Leaders challenge followers to “think outside the box”, discover new ways to solve old problems, and promote expression of new ideas.
- “Individualized consideration” refers to the ability of a leader to provide understanding and support. These leaders are good listeners and have a genuine concern for people around them. They are ready to advise, teach and develop their followers on an individualized level (Bass, 1999).

Transactional leadership is described by Bass (1999) in terms of the carrot and stick concept. Followers are rewarded for behaviors that are expected of them and punished or not rewarded when their performance is not up to the expected level. This leadership style is more task-oriented, and leaders maintain control by offering rewards, resources or punishment to their followers. I propose that this leadership style is related to authoritarian parental style. Like authoritarian parents transactional leaders offer high control, but not enough support. They cultivate obedient employees, restrict autonomy and rarely show encouragement. There are three different forms of the transactional

leadership style: contingent reward, active management-by-exception, and passive management-by-exception.

- The contingent reward form of transactional leadership refers to leaders conveying their expectations of followers and what actions they need to take to be rewarded for their performance.
- Leaders that supervise day-to-day activities of the followers and offer consistent feedback to increase performance are using the active management-by-exception style.
- Transactional leaders that use passive management-by-exception are those who get involved after the behavior that occurs becomes an issue instead of intervening the early staged of the problem. They tend to solve problems as they occur (Bass, 1999).

Laissez-Faire leadership is identified as a leadership style where leaders do not take responsibility for their actions, are often unavailable to their followers, and avoid making executive decisions (Bass, 1999). In this study I hypothesized that this leadership style is related to permissive parenting style and individuals who experience this style in their childhood will be more likely to adopt laissez-faire leadership style. As permissive parents, laissez-faire leaders are inconsistent and show low control over their employees. They are supportive, but have difficulties instilling discipline and provide actionable guidelines.

There has been a scarcity of research linking parenting styles experienced in childhood to leadership styles adopted later in life. The similarity that can be observed between models of parenting styles and models of leadership styles calls for further

investigation of the influence of parenting style on the leadership style in adulthood. In this research, I propose that the parenting leadership style children experience in their early years not only influences attachment style, achievement practices and self-esteem, but it also influences what leadership style they will use in adulthood.

Gender Related Issues in Leadership

Eagly and Johnson (1990) proposed two competing ideas about gender differences in leadership. First, they provided the reasoning as to why males and females are not that different in their behavior while in leadership positions. Most organizations have criteria for identifying and selecting leaders with certain characteristics. This perspective suggests that men and women in leadership positions both exhibit leader-like behaviors and the differences between men and women occupying the same position must be minimal. This theory assumes that a leader's goal to be an effective leader will override any gender differences existing between men and women.

Eagly and Johnson's (1990) second argument is built on the hypothesis that there are differences between male and female leaders in both behavior and expectations. They suggest that gender differences are ingrained in each individual and can be traced through traits, temperaments and behaviors. The difference between the sexes is so considerable that neither organizations' selection procedures nor socialization into leadership roles can reduce its effects. Some psychologists suggest that differences in males and females are due to our biological make-up (Wilson, 1975). More recent research also provides evidence for gender differences in brain functioning explaining differences between men and women in behavior and cognitive processing

(Lawton, 2010; Berenbaum, Blakemore & Beltz, 2011). Other researchers suggest that gender differences in leaders may be due to the fact that boys and girls have different expectations as children; they also play different games while growing up which require different sets of skills and methods of influence (Maccoby, 1988). These findings indicate that gender differences may be so strong that even when occupying a structured leadership role with specific competences, traits and skills, men and women still differ in their leadership styles.

Social psychologists' research on gender differences suggest that stereotypes about gender roles provide a powerful motive to act in congruence with one's role as determined by social expectations (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, 2002). The stereotype male is to be aggressive, independent, ambitious, and assertive, while females are expected to be kind, friendly, caring, and warm (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). In their research Cuadrado, Morales and Recio (2008) investigated differences in perceptions of the effectiveness of a leader with the male-stereotypical leadership style versus female-stereotypical leadership style. Interestingly, they identified the male-stereotypical leadership style as autocratic with an emphasis on task-orientation, while the female-stereotypical leadership style was described as democratic with an emphasis on personal relationships and consideration for others. They explain these findings by the fact that society today has certain expectations about the behavior of individuals in leadership roles.

These expectations may not be equal across all societies. Williams and Best (1982) hypothesized that the difference in the labor force is the reason why females are seen as less agentic than males and are perceived to have different leadership styles.

Gibson (1995) points out that in 1991 in the United State more that 80% of males were in the labor force while less than 60% of females were working. As reported by U.S. Labor Force Trends Bulletin (Lee & Mather, 2008) the picture did not change drastically in 2008 with females plateauing at 60% and males decreasing to 73% in the labor force, with the number of male workers going down due to “baby boomers” retiring. This inequality suggests that a large number of females prefer to stay home fulfilling their roles as mothers and care takers while the majority of males are away from the house fulfilling their roles as breadwinners.

The picture is not the same across cultures. The Swedish Unit for Equal Opportunity statistics in 1990 stated that 90% of males and 85% of females were employed in Sweden. This may lead to males and females being seen more equal in the workforce with similar leadership styles. However, Gibson’s (1995) work on gender differences in leadership styles across the United States, Australia, Sweden, and Norway did not support that hypothesis. Interestingly, females across all four countries emphasized the interaction facilitation dimension as a primary dimension of leadership, while males emphasized the goal setting dimension of leadership. This is congruent with Eagly’s (1987) idea of *communal* and *agentic* attributes that are different in males and females. Women are attributed with *communal* characteristics such as concern for others and being affectionate, helpful and nurturing. Men are attributed with *agentic* characteristics such as confidence, assertiveness, dominance, and independence. This suggests that even across cultures, males and females are perceived differently when in leadership positions. In the present research I sought to investigate whether mothers and fathers influence their children’s leadership style differently.

Research on the differential influence of mothers' and fathers' parenting styles on their daughters and sons is inconclusive. Some research indicates that there is a difference in the way children of different genders perceive their parents' parental style and the ways it affects them (Hartman & Harris, 1992). Research suggests that mothers and fathers affect the socio-emotional development of children in the early years of development differently (Van Ijzendoorn et al., 1991). Children who show high ego-resilience and low ego-under control are reported to have secure mothers. Dismissive fathers are reported to have children that are more aggressive, less social and less timid than children with secure fathers (Van Ijzendoorn et al., 1991).

A literature review of the influence of parents on the leadership style of their children is somewhat contradictory. Hartman and Harris (1992) hypothesized that perceptions of parenting style depends on the gender of the parent and on the gender of the child; therefore, the father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, and mother-daughter dyads would show different effects on children's' leadership styles. Their findings suggest that parents do influence their children differently depending on the gender of the child, but an insufficient sample size did not allow them to look into this issue in more depth. Zacharatos, Barling and Kelloway (2000) found that a mother's leadership style did not significantly influence the adopted leadership styles in adolescents, but they suggest that the main reason for their not being able to find significant results for a mother's leadership style is due to multicollinearity. They suggest that future research should separate perceived parental style by the gender of a parent. Towler (2005), in a study of the emergence of a charismatic leader, found that fathers affect future leadership style to a higher degree than mothers. Lyon's (2006)

results suggest that mothers mostly serve as role models in both relations and task aspects of leadership dimensions for authoritative parenting only. Conrade and Ho (2001) found that mothers and fathers use different parental styles with their daughters and sons. The investigation of father-daughter, mother-daughter, father-son, mother-son dyads revealed that daughters perceive their mothers to be more authoritative while sons reported their mothers to be more permissive. At the same time, sons reported their fathers to be more authoritarian.

It is important to note that sixty percent of individuals do not differentiate between their mothers' and fathers' leadership styles and perceive them to be the same (Smetana, 1995). Simons and Conger (2007) reported that parent dyads with the same parenting styles are more frequent than a combination of two different parenting styles for mothers and fathers, suggesting that parents often have the same parenting style. They found that authoritative, uninvolved and indulgent styles were shared by both parents more often than any other combination of parenting styles. The inconsistency of findings and lack of research on this topic calls for further investigation of the relationship between experienced parental style, adopted leadership style, gender of the parent, and gender of the child.

In the present study I addressed respondents' perceptions of their father's and mother's parenting styles during their childhood and whether they are related to the leadership style they select in adolescence. Hartman and Harris (1992) found that children's perceptions of their parents' parenting styles do not always match the parenting styles parents report about themselves. They also found that there is a higher correlation between individuals' perceived parental styles and their own styles than

parents' reported styles and individuals' reported styles. These findings suggest that perceptions of parenting style by children are more important than actual parenting styles reported by parents. Therefore, for the goals of the present research, asking participants about their parents' parenting style is a valid measure of parenting style experienced in childhood.

Consistent with Eagly and Johnson's (1990) argument about the importance of being an effective leader, the goal of the present study is to investigate the influence of the gender of parents and children on future leadership style when one parent is perceived as more effective. I also seek to investigate whether individuals are influenced more by the parenting style of the parent who they perceive to be most effective, especially when both participant and the parent are of the same gender. Participants were given an opportunity to fill out surveys about both parents, and identify the most effective parent as a part of demographics question.

Hypothesis 1a: Perceiving the effective parent as authoritative is related to adopting a transformational leadership style in adulthood.

Hypothesis 1b: Perceiving the effective parent as authoritarian is related to adopting a transactional leadership style in adulthood.

Hypothesis 1c: Perceiving the effective parent as permissive is related to adopting a laissez-faire leadership style in adulthood.

Hypothesis 2: The effect of Hypothesis 1 is magnified when the participant and parent identified as the most effective are the same gender.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

The sample consisted of Amazon Mechanical Turk workers (Mturk; n=317). Mturk is an online survey provider where individuals are paid to take online surveys. In order to participate in the study, participants had to have occupied a leadership position for at least 6 months and have lived in a two-parent household until the age of 18. Each participant was paid \$1 for participating in the survey. Original data collection utilized undergraduate students at a large Midwestern university and Mturk workers. The first wave of data collection had to be dismissed due to omission of one of the key questions in the survey, "Which parent do you believe to be the most effective leader". The second data collection included Mturk workers only. Data from 23 participants were deleted due to inadequate responses, which involved taking less than 9 minutes to complete the survey. The survey was estimated to take 18 minutes on average as projected by the survey host, Survey Gizmo. In addition, 22 participants were excluded from further analyses for not being raised by both parents (n = 19) and for answering one value for all the surveys (n = 3). Participants were 25 to 34 years old (40%), male (51.8%) 72.8% were Caucasian/White, 75% had participated in leadership training programs in their career, 87.5% were from the United States and 7.7% were from India (see Tables 1, 2, and 3). Supervisory positions included retail management, business owners, restaurant management, shift supervisors, and team leaders.

Measures

Two established questionnaires were used in this study: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ). The MLQ is a well-developed measurement tool with high validity and reliability in measuring leadership styles (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The PAQ instrument has been found to have a considerable level of reliability and validity in measuring parenting styles and has been recommended for use in assessing both mothers' and fathers' parenting styles for adults of various ages (Buri, 1989). The effectiveness of perceived parental leadership styles was included among the demographic questions.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

The MLQ-6 is an adapted version of the original MLQ, which was developed by Bass and Avolio (1992) and consists of 21 items and measures seven dimensions of leadership including: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, active management-by-exception, passive management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership. The MLQ-6 consists of items like "I enable others to think about old problems in new ways" and "Whatever others want to do is O.K. with me", using a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from "not at all" (0) to "always" (5). The reliability estimates for the MLQ were as follows: .89 for transformational leadership, .67 for transactional leadership, and .57 for laissez-faire leadership styles. Low alpha coefficients for transactional and laissez-faire dimensions are somewhat expected and are higher than estimated in previous research (Den Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997). Transformational and transactional leadership

styles were correlated at .73, which is consistent with prior research (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999)

Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ).

The PAQ consists of 30 items that measure authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles using a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). Sample items include “As I was growing up my father/mother would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him/her” and “As I was growing up my father/mother did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family” (Buri, 1989). Participants filled out the questionnaire twice: once describing their father’s parenting style and once describing their mother’s parenting style. In order to be classified as authoritative, authoritarian or permissive, responses were transformed into z scores and had to be above the mean and at least one-half standard deviation above other scores to be identified as exhibiting one of the parenting styles (Smetana, 1995). In the present sample 46 mothers and 37 fathers were not identified as having one dominant parenting style. In the demographics section of the survey each participant identified which parent they believed had the most effective parenting style. An “effective parent” category was created that included the parenting style of the parent identified as most effective, regardless of gender. In the present sample 234 participants identified their parents as effective with one dominant parenting style.

Another procedure for classifying participants’ parents into one dominant category was used: the highest score on the parenting dimension (authoritative, authoritarian, and laissez-fair) was identified, and a parent was placed in the category if

they had the highest score on that dimension (.3 higher than other scores.) This method did not produce significant results, so the classification procedure outlined by Smetana (1995) was followed for this study.

One issue with asking participants to fill out questionnaires about their parents is it requires them to recall information from their past. There is a sound concern that data collected based on recall might not represent actual information about actual behavior. Several researchers, however, argue that retrospective data is valid as long as the measures that are used to collect the retrospective data are valid and reliable (Miller, Cardinal & Glick, 1997). Adults have extensive knowledge of this construct due to years of experience with their parents. Unless the researchers are attempting to measure precise estimations, such as how often an event occurred and the exact date of the event, the information collected that requires recall is considered valid and reliable (Henry et al., 1994). In order to focus a participant's attention on a particular parent while completing the PAQ, participants were asked to write a paragraph about their father and mother separately before completing the scale for each. Participants were asked to describe in three to five sentences a typical morning routine for their father and mother prior to filling out a scale for each parent.

Procedure

Participants were asked to complete two online questionnaires including the MLQ and PAQ for both parents separately. Instructions for the PAQ asked participants to think about their mother and then about their father while filling out the questionnaire describing each parent's parenting style.

Analyses

Hypothesis 1: Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to investigate the relationship between parenting style perceived as effective and leadership style adopted in the adulthood. This analysis is especially appropriate when dependent variables are related. The independent variables “parenting styles” are categorical variables. The three dependent variables are continuous: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. The data were examined for the multivariate normality, outliers, linearity, homoscedasticity, and homogeneity of variance matrices using Box’s M procedure and were identified as normally distributed.

The analysis was set up as follows: authoritative, authoritarian or laissez-faire fathers and mothers of the participants that were identified as effective were placed into one of these three categories: effective authoritative, effective authoritarian and effective permissive. Categorical variables were entered in MANOVA to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and leadership styles: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. Post-hoc analysis was used to test for all possible comparisons using the Bonferoni adjustment to control for Type I error.

Hypothesis 2: The second step of the study investigated the influence of perception on the effectiveness of parenting style and the gender of the parent together. Three separate ANOVAs were conducted for each leadership style. The parenting styles of the parents identified as the most effective were entered as the independent variable, with a variable that represents a match or mismatch between the gender of the parent nominated as most effective and the participant, and also the interaction between effective parenting style and a match or no-match with the gender of the parent. Post-hoc analysis was used to test for all possible comparisons using the Bonferoni

adjustment to control for Type I errors.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1

Table 4 provides descriptive statistics and Table 5 provides correlations. A 3 x 3 between-subjects MANOVA was performed to compare the influence of three effective parenting styles (authoritarian, authoritative and permissive) on three leadership styles: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire (see Table 6). The analysis produced an overall significant result with Pillai's Trace = .08, $F(6,460) = 3.41$, $p < .01$. Subsequent tests of between subjects effects revealed that Hypothesis 1a was not supported. Perceiving effective parents as authoritative was not related to adopting a transformational leadership style in adulthood $F(2,234) = .28$, $p = .76$. Hypothesis 1b was also not supported as perceiving an effective parent as authoritarian was not related to adopting a transactional leadership style in adulthood $F(2, 234) = 2.46$, $p = .09$. In contrast, Hypothesis 1c was supported; perceiving effective parents as permissive was related to adopting a laissez-faire leadership style in adulthood but not to adopting a transformational or transactional leadership style in adulthood $F(2, 234) = 5.55$, $p < .01$. The post-hoc analysis indicated participants who described their parents as permissive were more likely to report a laissez-faire leadership style than participants that indicated their parents had an authoritarian parenting style $F(2,234) = 2.56$, $p = .006$ or authoritative parenting style $F(2,234) = 2.195$, $p = .021$. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 7.

Hypothesis 2

Three separate two-way ANOVAs were performed to investigate the relationship between the gender of the participants and that of the parent each perceived as more effective. Match or no match between the gender of the participant and that the parent identified as most effective, effective parenting style, and the interaction of the two were entered in the analysis. Out of 272 participants, only 129 were identified as a match between gender of the participant and gender of the parent perceived as effective. Hypothesis 2 was not supported for transformational leadership as there was no relationship found between the gender of the participant and gender of the parent perceived as effective on reported transformational style $F(2, 228) = .09, p = .95$ (see Table 8). Hypothesis 2 was also not supported for transactional leadership as there was no relationship found between the gender of the participant and gender of the parent perceived as effective on reported transactional style $F(2, 228) = .07, p = .96$ (see Table 8). Hypothesis 2 was again not supported for laissez-faire leadership style as there was no relationship found between the gender of the participant and gender of the parent perceived as effective on reported transactional style $F(2, 228) = .21, p = .82$ (see Table 10). However, the main effect of permissive parenting style was significant $F(2,228) = 5.35, p = .005$, indicating that participants who nominate permissive parents to be effective are likely to adopt a laissez-faire leadership style, which is consistent with results from testing Hypothesis 1.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The main goal of the proposed study was to examine the relationship between parenting styles experienced during childhood and leadership styles adopted in adulthood. Extant research has examined the influence of parents on leadership behavior (Avolio, Rotundo & Walumbwa, 2009; Zacharatos, Barling & Kelloway, 2000; Hartman & Harris, 1992). The present study builds upon previous research by establishing a direct link between parenting style and leadership style.

Organizations can benefit from this knowledge in at least two ways. Bio-data information about one's most influential parent during upbringing could be useful in predicting a prospective employee's leadership style, and understanding who influences the leadership style people select and adopt as their own will benefit employment selection procedures (Avolio, Rotundo, & Walumbwa, 2009). It was proposed that participants who recall parents demonstrating an authoritarian style of parenting and perceive that style as most effective are more likely to report having a transactional leadership style themselves. Participants who recall parents having an authoritative style of parenting and perceive it as most effective are more likely to report themselves as having a transformational leadership style, and participants who recall their parents to have a permissive parenting style and perceive it as most effective are more likely to report having a laissez-faire leadership style themselves.

The hypothesis I was partially supported, such that participants who reported their permissive parents to be most effective also identified themselves as having laissez-faire leadership style. This suggests that individuals who have been raised with a

permissive parenting style and perceive that to be most effective are likely adopt a laissez-faire leadership style in adulthood. These findings provide partial support for social learning theory which suggests that we tend to mold our behavior after a person we perceive to be a model (Bandura, 1969).

The present study finding that authoritative parenting does not lead to transformational leadership was somewhat unexpected since previous research suggests that there is a link between authoritative parenting and transformational leadership styles (Ferguson et al., 2006; Zacharatos et al., 2000). One potential explanation is the high correlation between transformational and transactional leadership styles (.73). Transformational and transactional leadership styles are not mutually exclusive and individuals who are transformational are also transactional (Bass, 1999). It is possible that results were not significant due to the multicollinearity problem.

Another possible explanation can be found in Popper and Mayseless's (2003) vast review of the parenting literature as it relates to future leadership styles. They propose that transformational leaders are like "good parents" because they motivate, direct, and support their follower. A closer evaluation of their description of the "good parent" and transformational leaders reveals great emphasis on freedom and autonomy, which is a key component of laissez-faire leadership style and permissive parenting style. It is understandable that an individual who grew up with parents who allowed him/her freedom to explore, provided opportunity to learn, and trusted them with their autonomy would perceive this style to be the most effective and apply the same style with his/her followers. It is conceivable that they believe in their followers, give them an opportunity

to learn from challenging experiences, and provide them with what they believe their parents provided for them growing up: trust and autonomy at work. The other emphasis in Popper and Mayseless's conceptualization of "good parenting" is made on setting limitations and discipline, which is a major part of both authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles and did not produce significant results in the present study. Providing direction, setting goals, and keeping people accountable can be seen as dictatorial with the current trend towards democracy, and an unequal partnership in a family or prescribed work structure are often seen as negative and undesirable (Ferguson et al., 2006).

Second, the present study proposed that the influence of the parent identified as most effective would be magnified when the participant and the parent are of the same gender. No relationship was found between the gender of the participant and that of the parent perceived as effective regarding reported leadership style. Interestingly, the majority of male participants identified their mothers to be a better parent but their fathers to have better leadership skills. Female participants also nominated their mothers as having a better parenting style but nominated an equivalent number of fathers and mothers to have the more effective leadership styles. This may be due to the fact that male participants had a clear distinction of what parenting and leadership styles are like and that one does not influence the other. Another explanation may be that male participants endorse a societal view of men as leaders and their bias toward female leaders is responsible for nominating their fathers to be more effective although they have adapted their mother's parenting style (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

The findings of this research suggest that individuals who grew up with high autonomy and freedom will provide the same climate for their followers. Although such a leadership style may not be beneficial in all organizations, some work groups require a highly trust and empowering environment (Bennis, 2012). It can also help to develop more effective leaders by identifying the roots of their current leadership styles and addressing their existing leadership hindrances in situations where the laissez-faire leadership style is not desirable. Another interesting implication is possible; although Bass (1999) identifies laissez-faire leaders as those who do not take responsibility for their actions, are often unavailable to their followers and avoid making decisions, leaders themselves may perceive this as a positive style of leadership because they have full trust in the capabilities of their followers.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First, although participation in the study was restricted only to participants who had occupied a leadership position for at least six months, no actual information about the nature of the leadership positions of the participants, such as number of employees and levels of responsibility, was collected. There was also no information collected about the quality of the leadership styles amongst participants. Including these data in future investigations will allow for a more enhanced and nuanced understanding of leadership experience.

Second, the study is limited in that all measurements occurred at a single point of time. Future endeavors should be made to obtain longitudinal data about participants' leadership styles before and after spending several years in the work force to clarify

the strength of the influence of parenting style on leadership style versus actual work experience.

Third, the study data used self-report measures about one's own leadership style and perceptions of parenting styles experienced during childhood. Although the validity of such retrospective data has been supported as long as measures used in the study are valid and reliable (Miller et.al., 1997), some researchers have found discrepancies between how parents and children recall parenting styles. Specifically, individuals may view their parents as more permissive and more authoritarian, whereas parents view themselves as more authoritative (Smetana, 1995). It would be beneficial to investigate if parenting styles as described by parents have more influence on future leadership styles of the children or if the perception of the child matters the most.

Another limitation of the study is the issue with identifying parenting styles. The present research followed procedures to identify a predominant parenting style outlined in the Smetana (1995) article. Using the suggested procedure, 10% of participants were not placed in either parenting category or were placed into two categories. When investigating the relationship between gender and effective parenting, only 55.5% of participants had a gender match with the parent they perceived to be the most effective.

Additionally, the present research only included participants from two-parent households, which excludes individuals that were brought up by single parents. A follow-up study should look at the difference in leadership styles between individuals raised in dual versus single parent homes.

Finally, treating parenting scales as categorical may have posed some problems as some participants may recall their parents exhibiting a mixture of parenting styles and not one particular style. A more detailed examination of mother and father parenting styles and the influence on their children's leadership styles can be examined using different statistical measures without creating categories for parenting variables, such as correlation and regression.

Future Research Directions

The study uses perceptions of participants of their parents' parenting styles and how they influence their leadership styles. It has been suggested that the way parents and children view parenting styles has some discrepancies, such as daughters perceive their mothers to be more authoritative while sons report their mothers to be more permissive (Conrade & Ho, 2001). Differences in parents' perceptions of their own parenting style and their children's perceptions of their parents' parenting styles have also been found (Hartman & Harris, 1992). Information from followers on individual's leadership style may also reveal differences in the way individuals describe their leadership style with the perceptions of their followers of their leadership style. Future research should utilize followers' ratings of leaders to identify if there is a link between parenting and leadership style that participants themselves may be unaware of.

The present research utilized participants mostly from United States where culture is very individualistic (Hofstede, 1980). A cross-cultural study including a more collectivist culture where paternalistic leadership is expected may reveal a more powerful relationship between parenting and leadership styles. Operationalization of authoritative parenting as "good parenting" may be US specific, and other parenting

styles may be preferred. It would be beneficial to investigate what type of parenting style is believed to be more effective and if that influences the leadership style adapted in adulthood.

Additionally, future research should employ a larger sample and possibly use a forced choice rating to help identify the most detailed description of parenting style. Some participants were not sure which parenting style their parents preferred and often had their parent distinctly represent two or no dominant parenting style at all.

This study extended the knowledge we have so far on development of leadership in adults. Findings suggest that permissive parenting leads to the laissez-faire leadership style while authoritarian does not lead to the transactional leadership style, and authoritative parenting does not lead to the transformational leadership style. Future research should take into consideration leadership position, length in the leadership position and quality of the leadership style of participants to identify differences in influences of parenting styles on leadership styles exhibited in adulthood.

Appendix A

Parental Authority Questionnaire (fathers)

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

1. While I was growing up, my father felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.
2. Even if his children didn't agree with him, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right.
3. Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.
4. As I was growing up, once family policy was established, my father discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.
5. My father has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.
6. My father has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and do what they want to do even if this does not agree with what their parent might want.
7. As I was growing up, my father did not allow me to question any decision that he made.
8. As I was growing up, my father directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.
9. My father has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.
10. As I was growing up, my father did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.
11. As I was growing up, I knew what my father expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my father when I felt that they were unreasonable.
12. My father felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who the boss is in the family.
13. As I was growing up, my father seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.
14. Most of the time as I was growing up my father did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.
15. As the children in my family were growing up, my father consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.
16. As I was growing up, my father would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him.
17. My father feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents did not restrict their children's activities, decision, and desires as they are growing up.
18. As I was growing up, my father let me know what behaviors he expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, he punished me.
19. As I was growing up, my father allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from him.

20. As I was growing up, my father took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.
21. My father did not view himself as responsible for direction and guiding my behavior as I was growing up
22. My father had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but he was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of the individual children in the family.
23. My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up, and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.
24. As I was growing up, my father allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters, and he generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.
25. My father has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcefully deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.
26. As I was growing up, my father often told me exactly what he wanted me to do and how he expected me to do it.
27. As I was growing up my father gave me clear direction for my behavior and activities, but he was also understanding when I disagreed with him.
28. As I was growing up, my father did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.
29. As I was growing up, I knew what my father expected of me in the family and he insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his authority.
30. As I was growing up, if my father made a decision in the family that hurt me, he was willing to discuss that decision with me and admit if he had made a mistake.

Where are the same questions about the mother?

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 6Sⁱⁱⁱ

0 = Not at all
always
1 = Once in a while

2 = Sometimes
3 = Fairly often

4 = Frequently, if not
5 = Always

1. I make others feel good to be around me.
2. I express with a few simple words what we could and should do.
3. I enable others to think about old problems in new ways.
4. I help others develop themselves.
5. I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work.
6. I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards.
7. I am content to let others continue working in the same way as always.
8. Others have complete faith in me.
9. I provide appealing images about what we can do.
10. I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things.
11. I let others know how I think they are doing.
12. I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals.
13. As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything.
14. Whatever others want to do is OK with me.
15. Others are proud to be associated with me.
16. I help others find meaning in their work.
17. I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before.
18. I give personal attention to others who seem rejected.
19. I call attention to what others can get for what they accomplish.
20. I tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work.
21. I ask no more of others than what is absolutely essential.

Idealized influence (items 1, 8, and 15)	_____	Factor 1
Inspirational motivation (items 2, 9, and 16)	_____	Factor 2
Intellectual stimulation (items 3, 10, and 17)	_____	Factor 3
Individualized consideration (items 4, 11, and 18)	_____	Factor 4
Contingent reward (items 5, 12, and 19)	_____	Factor 5
Management-by-exception (items 6, 13, and 20)	_____	Factor 6
Laissez-faire Leadership (items 7, 14, and 21)	_____	Factor 7

Appendix B

Table 1

Participant's Age

Age	Frequency	Percent
18-24	55	20.2
25-34	109	40.1
35-54	78	28.7
55+	30	11.0

Table 2

Race

Race	Frequency	Percent
Asian/Pacific Islander	35	12.9
Black/African-American	13	4.8
Caucasian/White	198	72.8
Hispanic	14	5.1
Native American/Alaska Native	3	1.1
Other/Multi-Racial	7	2.6

Table 3

Perceptions of effectiveness by gender

	Effective Father	Effective Mother	Total
Male	83	58	141
Female	63	68	131
Total	146	126	272

Table 4

Perceptions of better parenting style by gender

	Effective Father	Effective Mother	Total
Male	41	100	141
Female	39	92	131
Total	80	192	272

Table 5

Correlations and descriptive statistics

Variables	Mean (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender	1.48 (.50)	-						
2. Categorized Age	3.30 (.92)	.06	-					
3. Race	2.82 (.96)	.00	.06	-				
4. Parent Effective as a Leader	1.46 (.50)	.11	.03	-	-			
5. Transformational Leadership Style	3.56 (.67)	.03	-.12	-	-.11	(.89)		
6. Transactional Leadership Style	3.55 (.63)	.06	-.08	-	-.12	.73*	(.67)	
7. Laissez-faire Leadership Style	2.70 (.80)	-.05	-.12*	.11	.11	.13*	.24*	(.57)

Note. Scale alphas are listed on the diagonal.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 6

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Overall Effective Parenting Style

	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Transformational Leadership style	.275	2	.760
Transactional Leadership Style	2.457	2	.088
Laissez-fair Leadership style	5.545	2	.004

Note. $p = .05$

Table 7

Overall Means for Each Leadership Style for Effective Parents

	Effective Authoritarian			Effective Authoritative			Effective Permissive		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Transformational Leadership style	3.53	.70	78	3.60	.66	90	3.60	.66	90
Transactional Leadership Style	3.52	.66	78	3.68	.58	90	3.47	.68	66
Laissez-fair Leadership style	2.11	.81	78	2.19	.81	90	2.56	.94	66

Table 8

Gender Match x Effective Parenting Factorial Analysis of Variance for Transformational Leadership style

	<i>Df</i>	<i>F</i>	η^2	<i>p</i>
Gender Match	1	.278	.002	.911
Effective Parent	2	.013	.000	.758
Gender Match*Effective Parent	2	.068	.001	.935
Error (within groups)	228			

Table 9

Gender Match x Effective Parenting Factorial Analysis of Variance for Transactional Leadership style

	<i>Df</i>	<i>F</i>	η^2	<i>p</i>
Gender Match	1	.008	.000	.927
Effective Parent	2	2.402	.021	.093
Gender Match*Effective Parent	2	.036	.000	.964
Error (within groups)	228			

Table 10

Gender Match x Effective Parenting Factorial Analysis of Variance for Laissez-fair Leadership style

	<i>Df</i>	<i>F</i>	η^2	<i>p</i>
Gender Match	1	.703	.003	.403
Effective Parent	2	5.354	.045	.005
Gender Match*Effective Parent	2	.205	.002	.815
Error (within groups)	228			

REFERENCES

- Anderson, W. A. (1943). The family and individual social participation. *American Sociological Review*, 8, 420–424.
- Aunola, K., Stattin, H., & Nurmi, J. (2000). Parenting styles and adolescents' achievement Strategies. *Journal of Adolescents*, 23, 205-222.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M. & Jung, D. I. (1999) Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441–462.
- Avolio, B. J., Rotundo, M., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Early life experiences as determinants of leadership role occupancy: the importance of parental influence and rule breaking behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 329-342.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social-learning theory of identification processes. *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, Rand McNally & Company.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press. Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(20), 130-139.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907.

- Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during early adolescent transition. *Family Transitions*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bennis, W. (2012). The crucibles of authentic leadership. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis, (Eds.), *The Nature of Authentic Leadership* (pp. 543- 556). Los Angeles, California: Thousand Oaks.
- Berenbaum, S. A., Blakemore, J.E, & Beltz, A A. M. (2011) A role for biology in gender related behavior. *Sex Roles*, 64, 804-825
- Buri, J. R. (1989). An Instrument for the measurement of parental authority prototypes, Paper presented at the 61st *Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association*, Chicago, IL.
- Conrade, G., & Ho, R. (2001). Differential parenting styles for fathers and mothers. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 53(1), 29-35.
- Cuadrado, I., Morales, F. J., & Recio, P. (2008) Women's Access to Managerial Positions: An Experimental Study of Leadership Styles and Gender. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11 (1), 55-65
- Dekovic, M., & Janssens, J. (1992). Parents' child-rearing style and child's sociometric status. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 925-932.
- Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70 (1), 19–34.
- Dreikurs, R. (1962). Living together in a family. *Family Life*, 22, 5.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233–256.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. T. (2002) Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological review*, 109 (3), 573–598.
- Ferguson, E. D., Hagaman, J., Grice, J. W., & Peng, K. (2006). From leadership to parenthood: applicability of leadership styles to parenting styles. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 10(1), 43-56.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Freud, S.(1939). Moses and monotheism. Oxford, England: Knopf, 218
- Gibson, C. B. (1995). An investigation of gender differences in leadership in four countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26 (2), 255-279.
- Glasgow, K. L., Dornbusch, S. M., Troyer, L., Steinberg, L., & Ritter, P. L. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescents' attributions, and educational outcomes in nine heterogeneous high schools. *Child Development*, 68(3), 507-529.
- Grunwald, B. B., & McAbee, H., (1999). *Guiding the family: Practical Counseling technique* (2nd ed.) Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Hartman, S.J., & Harris, O.J., (1992). The role of parental influence in leadership. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 132(2), 153-167.
- Henry, B., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Langley, J., & Silva, P. A. (1994). On the “remembrance of things past”: a longitudinal evaluation of the retrospective method. *Psychological Assessment*, 6(2), 92-101.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B., (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), 169-180.

- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., & Dessler, G. (1974). The path-goal theory of leadership: Some post-hoc and a priori tests. In J. Hunt & L. Larson (Eds.), *Contingency approaches to leadership* (pp. 29–55). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004) Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755–768.
- Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: individual differences and implicit leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(4), 589–607.
- Keller, T. (2003). Parental images as a guide to leadership sensemaking: an attachment perspective on implicit leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 141-160.
- Kishton, J. M., & Widaman, K. F. (1994). Unidimensional verses domain representative parceling of questionnaire items: An empirical example. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*(3), 757–765.
- Lawton, C. A. (2010). Gender, spatial abilities, and wayfinding. In J. C. Chrisler & D. R. McCreary (Eds.), *Handbook of gender research in psychology, 1*, 317–341. New York: Springer.
- Lee, S. M., Daniels, M. H., & Kissinger, D. B. (2006). Parental influences on adolescent adjustment: Parenting styles versus parenting practices. *Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 14*, 253-259.

- Lee, M. A., & Mather, M. (2008) U.S. Labor Force Trend: Population Bulletin. *Population Reference Bureau*, 63 (2).
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created 'social climates.' *Journal of Social Psychology* 10, 271–299.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1988). Gender as a social category. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 755-765
- Miller, C. C., Cardinal, L. B., & Glick, W. H. (1997). Retrospective reports in organizational research: a reexamination of recent evidence, *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 189-204.
- Mumford, M. D., O'Connor, J., Clifton, T. C., Connelly, M. S., & Zaccaro, S. J. (1993). Background Data Constructs as Predictors of leadership. *Human Performance*, 6(2), 151- 195.
- Parker, G. B., Barrett, E. A., & Hickie, I. B. (1992). From nurture to network: examining links between perceptions of parenting received in childhood and social bonds in adulthood. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 149(7), 877-885.
- Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 34, 566-593.
- Popper, M., & Amit, K. (2009). Attachment and leaders' development via experiences. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), 749–763.
- Popper, M., & Maysless, O. (2003). Back to basics: Applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 41–65.

- Shucksmith, J., Hendry, L. B., & Glendinning, A. (1995). Models of parenting: implications for adolescent well-being within different types of family contexts. *Journal of Adolescence*, 18, 253–270.
- Simon, L. G., & Conger R. D. (2007) Linking Mother–Father Differences in Parenting to a Typology of Family Parenting Styles and Adolescent Outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(2), 212-241.
- Smetana, J. G. (1995). Parenting styles and conceptions of parental authority during adolescence. *Child Development*, 66(2), 299-316.
- Spera, C. (2005) A Review of the Relationship Among Parenting Practices, Parenting Styles, and Adolescent School Achievement. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17, (2), 125-146.
- Stodghill, R. M. (1965) *Managers, employees, organizations*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Rothstein, H. R., Schmidt, E L., Erwin, E W., Owens, W. A., & Sparks, C. P. (1990). Biographical data in employment selection: Can validities be made generalizable? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 175-184.
- Towler, A. (2005). Charismatic leadership development: role of parental attachment style and parental psychological control. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 11(4), 16-25.
- Unit for Equal Opportunity Statistics. 1990. Women and men in Sweden: Equality of the sexes. Stockholm, Sweden: Statistics Sweden.
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Kranburg, M. J., Zwart-Woudstra, H. A., Van Busschcach, A. M., & Lambermon, W. E. (1991). Parental attachment and children's socio-emotional

development: some findings on the validity of the adult attachment interview in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 14(4), 375-394.

Williams, J. E. & Best, D. L. (1982) *Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty-nation study*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Wilson, E. O. (1975). *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Zacharatos, A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(2), 211-226.

ABSTRACT**“WHO TAUGHT US HOW TO LEAD?” PARENTAL INFLUENCE ON LEADERSHIP
STYLES**

by

ASIYAT MAGOMAEVA**December 2013****Advisor:** Dr. Marcus Dickson**Major:** Psychology (Industrial/Organizational)**Degree:** Master of Arts

There is evidence that parenting styles shape the development of competence and achievement strategies, and that the authoritative parenting style is the most successful style in developing appropriate achievement strategies (Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000; Glasgow, Dornbusch, Troyer, Steinberg & Ritter, 1997) The present study investigated the link between parenting styles experienced during childhood and leadership styles adopted later in life, as well as which parent children perceive as most effective and whether that influences the leadership style they adopt later in life. Findings suggest that knowing the parenting style one experienced in childhood can help identify an individual's future leadership style, such that individuals who have been raised with a permissive parenting style and perceive that to be most effective tend to adopt a laissez-faire leadership style in adulthood. No relationship was found between the gender of the participant and the gender of the parent perceived as effective on reported leadership style. Limitations and future research are discussed.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Asiyat Magomaeva grew up in Pyatigorsk, Russia. After high school, she attended Pyatigorsk Linguistic University. After receiving her M.A. in English with a double major in Psychology from Pyatigorsk Linguistic University, she moved to the United States of America in the summer of 2002. In 2008 she was accepted into Madonna University in Livonia, MI. After completing her second B.A. in Business Psychology, she entered the Industrial/Organizational Psychology Ph.D. program at Wayne State University in Detroit, MI.

During her time at Wayne State, Asiyat has taught a number of different classes. She co-authored two book chapters under the guidance of her advisor, Dr. Marcus Dickson. In addition, she has completed several internships with General Motors, Detroit; with Infosys Ltd, Mysore, India; currently, with Kellogg, Battle Creek, MI. During her internships she has gained valuable applied and research experience including statistical data analysis and development of leadership training programs.