

St. Cloud State University

The Repository at St. Cloud State

Culminating Projects in Psychology

Department of Psychology

5-2022

Leadership Styles and Satisfaction: An Application of Adlerian Theory to the Workplace

Kirsten Hiltner

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/psyc_etds

Recommended Citation

Hiltner, Kirsten, "Leadership Styles and Satisfaction: An Application of Adlerian Theory to the Workplace" (2022). *Culminating Projects in Psychology*. 17.
https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/psyc_etds/17

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Psychology at The Repository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Culminating Projects in Psychology by an authorized administrator of The Repository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact tdsteman@stcloudstate.edu.

Leadership Styles and Satisfaction: An Application of Adlerian Theory to the Workplace

by

Kirsten N. Hiltner

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Science

in Industrial/Organizational Psychology

June, 2022

Thesis Committee:

Jody Illies, Chairperson

John Kulas

Edward Ward

Abstract

While Adlerian theory has been applied to both the workplace and parenting, the linkage between the two has not been investigated. Therefore, the first goal of this study was to find if the way someone was raised has an influence on the values they have as an adult. Then, the second goal was to determine whether the individuals' values influence the style they prefer in a leader. The last goal was to see if congruence between individuals' preferred leadership style and the perceived leadership style of their current supervisor results in higher job satisfaction. This study found that the participants' personal values were predicted by their parents' values while they were growing up. Their preferred leadership style was predicted by their personal values, but not their parents' values. Lastly, the participants indicated having higher supervisor and overall satisfaction the more similar their current supervisor's leadership style was to their preferred leadership style.

Keywords: Adlerian Theory, parenting values, personal values, leadership styles, satisfaction

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my three committee members: Dr. Jody Illies, Dr. John Kulas, and Dr. Edward Ward. I appreciate all the time that was spent helping me make this thesis the best thesis I possibly could complete. The energy put into this thesis not only allowed me to complete this thesis, but also gave me knowledge that I will be able to apply for the rest of my life. I would also like to thank my classmates, Adelaide and Cat for their input on my thesis. Your input made my proposal stronger and I'm forever grateful for your friendship. I would also like to thank my friends (Alex, Tyler, and Kaylan) who read through my thesis and gave me feedback (even though some of you are not psychologists at all). I am forever grateful for the time you spent reading this. I would also like to thank my family for supporting me throughout this process, without you I would not be as stubborn and determined to complete this. I would also like to thank my husband for all the nights that you brewed me tea and popped in with a joke while I was working on this. You may have annoyed me at the time, but I am forever grateful for your dad jokes. Lastly, I would like to thank my mom and my grandmothers for pushing me to never settle for anything but my best. I am so proud to be the first female in my family to not only receive a degree, but also complete a master's thesis. Without you ladies constantly being there for me, I would probably not have challenged myself nearly as much.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	6
Chapter	
I. Introduction and Review of Literature.....	7
Adlerian Theory	8
Personal Values.....	11
Leadership Styles	14
Connection between Leaders and Employees.....	19
Connection between Personal Values, Leadership Style, and Satisfaction	22
This Study	24
II. Method	26
Participants.....	26
Procedure	27
Measures	27
Analysis.....	29
III. Results.....	31
Data Cleaning.....	31
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Statistics	31
Analysis of Parental Styles Influence on Personal Values	34
Analysis of Personal Values Influence on Preferred Leadership Style	37
Analysis of Parenting Styles Influence on Preferred Leadership Style	38
Analysis of Leadership Style Congruency Influence on Satisfaction.....	39

Chapter	Page
IV. Discussion.....	41
Findings.....	41
Limitations	45
Future Research	46
Conclusion	47
References.....	48
Appendices.....	54
A. Ferguson Inventory PVi – Parent.....	54
B. Ferguson Inventory PVa – Self.....	55
C. Vannsimpco Leadership Survey Key.....	56
D. Job Diagnostic Survey	59

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Correlation Table	33
2. Results of Multiple Regression Analyses by Parenting Value	35
3. Results of Multiple Regression Analyses by Parenting Value	36
4. Results of Multiple Regression Analyses by Leadership Style and Personal Value	37
5. Results of Multiple Regression Analyses by Leadership Style and Parenting Value ..	39
6. The Profile Similarity Coefficient's Relationship with Satisfaction	40

Chapter I: Introduction and Review of Literature

Adlerian theory is most often associated with its application in the parenting and scholastic world. However, the span of Adlerian theory's influence and prevalence in subsequent theoretical development and practical application may not be adequately recognized in the field of industrial-organizational psychology. Adlerian theory is applicable to a wide array of issues in the workplace, making it beneficial for both academics and practitioners seeking to examine and improve working environments. For example, the idea that cooperation in the workplace requires individuals to exercise mutual respect and encouragement leads to higher job-related satisfaction and performance is an Adlerian Theory (Ferguson, 2003). This is shown by theory being applied to not only cooperation, but also to conflict resolution within the workplace (Ferguson, 1996). Adlerian theory can also be applied in workplace conflict resolution contexts, as it emphasizes the role of understanding others' goals and cognitions in preventing and resolving conflicts (Ferguson, 1996).

Yet another area Adlerian theory may prove beneficial is the understanding of leadership. Many companies have started to shift their focus towards leadership within the past decade (Bass, 2008). This shift could have potentially been driven by an increase in our understanding of the complexity of organizational leadership and its vital role in impacting followership (Illies & Reiter-Palmon, 2008). Leadership style refers to a leader's preference for certain behaviors when in leadership situations (Bass, 2008). Gandolfi and Stone (2017) found that a leader's perception of their leadership may not always align with the perception of their subordinate. Furthermore, there is also potential for incongruity between a leader and a follower's perceptions of employee behavior (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017). The perceptions an individual has are based off of their identification and interpretation of the information around them (Schacter,

2011). This interpretation then impacts their memories and their expectation for future events. This can be caused by leadership thinking they are better leaders than their subordinates do or feeling that their employees are better employees than they truly are or vice versa (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017). Oftentimes, employees can become dissatisfied with their leaders in the event of any disconnect in the perceptions between the leader and the employees.

Perceptions of the relationship between the leader and the employees in the workplace can cause conflict to occur, but also the quality of the relationship can have an effect on the organization. Leaders who strive to understand their followers and interact with them frequently lead their organizations to higher overall morale and motivation levels than leaders of companies who fail to do so (Crouter & Bumpus, 2004). When leaders cannot communicate the task in a way that demonstrates credibility in an understandable way, the employees will either be confused or lose respect for their leader (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Leaders guide their employees toward the pillars of success; it is imperative that they know the way.

Adlerian Theory

Background. In 1902, Adler shifted his focus from psychiatry towards psychology (Manaster, 1987). This led him to join a team of individuals working underneath Freud and become increasingly concerned with the behavioral processes of individuals (Manaster, 1987). Eventually, he began generating ideas of his own regarding the drivers of human motivation and behavior and constructing his own approach to psychology, called Individual Psychology (Ferguson, 1999).

Adler went through three stages of refining his school of thought, the first being the concept of organ inferiority (Ferguson, 1999). This was the theory that weakness in the individual's organs had psychological implications (Ferguson, 1999). During the second stage of

refinement, Adler started to focus on an individual's feeling of inferiority, and he abandoned many of his previous ideas (Ferguson, 1999). This stage focused on an individual's outlook and attitude along with how they went about overcoming their feelings of inferiority (Ferguson, 1999). The last stage of refinement Adler went through was shifting from his focus on individual psychology to a focus on equality and cooperation among individuals (Ferguson, 1999). This led to the conclusion that there was importance to an individual striving to contribute to the community and feel that their contributions were appreciated (Ferguson, 1999). Oftentimes, Adler's theories are mistaken for only focusing on one person. However, his theories stress that individuals and society are interdependent (Manaster, 1987). According to Adler, an individual's personality is not made up of separate parts but comprised of how the individual orients themselves in accordance with the community and what they perceived the outside world to be (Ferguson, 1999).

Adler also stressed the importance of a concept he called Life Style (Ferguson, 1999). He defined this as the way an individual envisioned themselves, others, and their basic life goals (Ferguson, 1999). He posited this conceptualization of lifestyle to be independent of personality and to be a dynamic characteristic that changes through time (Ferguson, 1999). An individual's lifestyle was found to be one of the primary guiding factors of behavior they exhibited (Ferguson, 1999). Therefore, Adler felt it necessary for an individual's behaviors to be understood by understanding their ultimate goals (Ferguson, 1999). Through its emphasis on societal contexts and lifestyle, Adlerian theory can be attributed for early academic conceptualizations of the intertwined nature of the individual and society as well as the impact of goal setting on behavior.

Family influences. One of the factors Adler focused on when developing his theory is the influence of family. The environment in which a child grows up has not only an immediate impact on their early life development, but it also has a latent impact on their development as an adult (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). For example, one environmental factor that has been suggested to impact child and adult development is birth order (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). An older child has a different experience growing up compared to their younger siblings (Pepper, 1971). Therefore, this can shape how the child reacts to situations once they are in the world outside of their home (Pepper, 1971). This led to Adler emphasizing that how an individual perceives a situation is more important than what the situation actually is (Pepper, 1971). The way a child is raised or the way their family interacts can also affect the way that they think or perceive the world around them (Mosak, 1971). Adlerians believe that this can be interpreted based off of their verbal and nonverbal behavior once they become adults (Mosak, 1971). This theory was applied in a study that was trying to find ways to predict the rate of burnout in emergency medical technicians (Vettor & Kosinski, 2000). Based on the memories an individual has and the way they react to situations, such as being a controller versus being a pleaser, could have an impact on their burnout rate (Vettor & Kosinski, 2000).

Another influence on the personality and behaviors of adults is the type of traits that are seen as desirable in their family as they grow up (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). For example, if a child tries to voice their opinion and they are told that they are wrong continuously, they may develop behaviors of avoidance (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). As an adult, this may lead to them contributing less and voicing their ideas less that could result in the adult lacking leadership skills, thwarting hopes of promotional opportunities (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). A study by Ferguson, et al., (2006) demonstrated the impact of parenting behaviors on the behavioral

tendencies of children as adults. Results of this study revealed that people who indicated that their parents were primarily autocratic (preferred order over all else) rated themselves lower on items that were considered democratic (order, but with freedom) or laissez-faire (no order and only freedom). Similarly, when people rated their parents as primarily democratic, they rated themselves as primarily democratic (Ferguson et al., 2006). Overall, the way they raise their children can have a more lasting effect than parents may be initially anticipating.

Adlerian theories stress that individuals should help others and not give up when they encounter obstacles (Ferguson, 1999). Parents can emphasize this by exhibiting helping characteristics while focusing less on being the best of the best (Ferguson, 1999). Furthermore, parents can also emphasize this by helping their children overcome challenges and brainstorming ways to conquer challenges (Ferguson, 1999). This will allow children to grow up with the mindset that challenges in life are growth opportunities and not just simply inconveniences (Ferguson, 1999). Children who are raised with these mindsets are also more likely to help others overcome the challenges they are encountering (Ferguson, 1999).

Personal Values

Values of a family are what they perceive as important to being a person (Dewey, 1971). Values of the members of a family reflect how important the family views aspects of life, such as religion and education (Dewey, 1971). Even if parents do not agree on the same values, the child bases their values off of the values the family as a whole formed while they were growing up (Dewey, 1971; Parke et al., 1979).

The quality of the parents' relationship can also have an influence on the way children perceive interactions outside of the family along with the relationship between the child and their parents (Parke et al., 1979). In recent years, researchers have been shifting their focus more

towards looking at individuals with their family dynamics as a whole and how this shapes them once they get older (Cox & Paley, 2004). The way an individual perceives their family and the social interactions that occur within this dynamic has been found to have lasting behavioral and interpersonal effects (Cox & Paley, 2004). Furthermore, how the family adapts to obstacles along the way also influences the way the child will handle challenges in their adult life (Cox & Paley, 2004).

Similarly, Adler believed that an individual's behavior was based off of the social environment they were in and their interaction with it (Nikelly, 1971). An individual's overall lifestyle is based off of their perception of others and themselves and how these relate to their life goal (Ferguson, 1999). Their lifestyle influences the way they interact with others and the behaviors they exhibit in certain situations (Ferguson, 1999). Whether the individual was raised to cooperate with others and have others interest at heart can have a lasting impact on the lifestyle an individual forms (Ferguson, 1999). Each individual has strengths and weaknesses that come from the way they were raised and the way this affected them long term (Ferguson, 2003). The lifestyle an individual forms in their mind is leading them towards perfection, but perfection differs for each individual (Ferguson, 1999). Individuals who have the same lifestyle are more likely to cooperate well together than those who do not (Ferguson, 1999). However, if individuals can be understanding of their differences due to lifestyles, relationships can still be functional and beneficial to those involved (Berndt, 2004). Overall, it is beneficial when values are taken into consideration when groups are formed in order to achieve the highest levels of efficiency and satisfaction among group members (Anjum et al., 2014).

Connection between Adlerian Theory and values. Adlerians stress that the way parents raise their children is vital (Ferguson, 1999). The younger a child is the more impressionable

they tend to be (Ferguson, 1999; Ferguson, et al., 2013). This can influence not only the way they interact with others in social settings but also how they lead individuals when they are in leadership positions (Ferguson, 1999). Children who grow up with parents who have contrasting parenting styles can develop a style that reflects a blend of those two styles (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). Furthermore, children with similar styles may be drawn to each other since they value similar things (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). A family's values can vary depending on which parent is the head of the family, if there is one at all, along with what type of culture the family has (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). Families that value being individualistic can lead to a child being more competitive and not considering others quite as much when making decisions (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). However, when families are more collectivistic in nature, children are more likely to grow up to think of others and focus on the community (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971). This is not the only factor that comprises the environment of the family. The way parents interact with their children along with the way the children interact with each other can have an influence on the style of the children once they grow up (Dewey, 1971). The way the family makes decisions and also the leadership of the family can shape not only the way the child leads but also the way they go about making decisions (Ferguson et al., 2006). This has also been shown in schools where teachers are similar to leaders (Ferguson, 1996). They encourage their students while also keeping children motivated to achieve their goals (Ferguson, 1996).

A study conducted by Ferguson et al. (2006) focused on creating an inventory that could be utilized to measure the effect parents had on the values of their children. In an effort to formalize more clearly the Adlerian-based theory on family and personal values, Dreikurs (1995) utilized Kurt Lewin's leadership style framework working off the idea that a parent is similar to a leader when considering a child's development. Lewin et al., (1939) proposed that leadership

could be conceptualized along three style preferences, democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire (discussed in more detail later). According to Dreikurs (1995), parenting values could also be delineated along these three dimensions, with each dimension having a different effect on the development of a child's values and personality. A democratic parent stresses mutual respect and allows their child to have input in decisions the family makes (Ferguson, 2006). An autocratic parent enforces obedience and prefers order without giving their children freedom to voice their opinion when decisions are being made (Ferguson, 2006). Lastly, a laissez-faire parent allows their children to do as they wish and gives very little guidance (Ferguson, 2006). The type of parent a child has results in them valuing certain styles themselves as they reach adulthood. Ferguson et al. (2006), for example, found that adults who grew up with an autocratic parent had a more autocratic style themselves and those who grew up with a democratic parent had a more democratic style.

Leadership Styles

Leadership can be mistaken as just solely being a position that a person occupies, but leadership skills can be developed and are not aspects individuals are born with (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Leadership can also be defined as a process that can be understood by observing individuals' personal and social actions (Malik, 2012). This is the basis behind the democratic leadership style since individuals are having an influence on one another instead of one person simply telling the other what to do or giving no guidance at all (Ferguson et al., 2006). An effective leader is essential to an organization being successful in a constantly changing workforce (Simmons & Striley, 2014). The way an individual goes about influencing a group of people toward a common goal is a leadership style (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017).

Oftentimes, this consists of the behaviors they exhibit during the time they are trying to have the

group of people lead towards a common goal (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017). Therefore, the focus of this study would be on leadership behaviors without personality being a factor.

As noted, leadership can be developed, which is good news for those that are worried that they may be lacking in leadership skills (Bass, 2008). Interpersonal skills are important in regard to being able to adapt to changing situations, handle obstacles rationally, maintain relationships with followers, and keep followers motivated (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). A leader must also have business skills in order to be able to budget resources and coordinate with others while planning for the continuously changing workforce (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Naturally, leaders should have the ability to build teams and keep them motivated in working towards a common goal (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). The behaviors leaders exhibit and not just the skills they have also are a factor when it comes to how they are perceived by followers (Bass, 2008).

Lewin's framework. Overall, the leadership style theory that ties into the Adlerian theory the best is the theory by Lewin and his colleagues (Ferguson, et. al, 2006). In a study by Lewin et al. (1939), leaders were given specific leadership styles to exhibit in order to see how the individuals reacted along with how the group dynamics changed. This study showed that members adapted their behaviors to be more aggressive when the leader was being autocratic. However, when a democratic leader led the meetings, the individuals were more cooperative and focused on the task at hand. In the autocratic group, the leader and group members initially took more initiative with completing tasks. Unfortunately, as time went on, the children became more submissive to the leader and would only respond to the leader instead of interacting with one another. In contrast, the individuals in the democratic group experienced more freedom and also exhibited cohesiveness within their subgroups. Individuals who were in the laissez-faire group did have a better view of the leader compared to those in the democratic group. However, they

experienced a lower level of satisfaction and cohesiveness due to the lack of understanding about the task they should be completing. Similarly to Adlerians, Lewin felt that the democratic leadership style was the leadership style most likely to lead to individuals having a more positive outlook of the leader and the culture of the organization being one that encouraged collaboration and respect (Lewin et al., 1939). However, he felt it was necessary to note that each leadership style did have a time or place where it could work effectively (Lewin et al., 1939). Overall, Lewin et al., showed how leadership style could influence not only one individual, but also the group as a whole.

One of the aspects of Lewin et al.'s (1939) study that was revolutionary was the focus on the underlying factors (i.e., their inner thoughts) to the behaviors that were exhibited by the children throughout the course of the experiment (Billig, 2015). This theory can be applied outside of this study since oftentimes what an individual is showing in their outward behaviors has other aspects behind it (Billig, 2015). Therefore, Lewin believed that by identifying these factors, a better understanding of individuals would be achieved (Billig, 2015). It is also important to note that leaders do not always just display one leadership style; they can adapt their leadership style to handle the situation in which they find themselves (Bass, 2008). Leaders would be wise to remember this when trying to identify any issues that are occurring with employees or teams within the workplace.

Amiri, et al., (2010) expanded on Lewin et al.'s (1939) leadership style theory by conducting a study where five different leadership styles were found. The first was development-oriented leadership, which focuses on looking for new ideas for innovation. The second was achievement-oriented leadership, which focuses on setting goals that are challenging and exhibiting confidence in the followers. The third was supportive leadership, which focuses on

being understanding of followers' needs while providing structure. The fourth was directive leadership, which is a style that is less considerate of followers while providing strict rules. The last leadership style was participation leadership, which focuses on involving followers in the decision-making processes.

Similar to the democratic leadership style, develop-oriented leaders allow followers to propose ideas and contributed to the advancement of the company through development (Amiri et al., 2010; Lewin et al., 1939). Achievement-oriented leaders support the democratic leadership style by allowing followers freedom while also providing guidance. Supportive leaders focus on guiding individuals while also being considerate of their opinions, similar to that of the democratic leadership style. Directive leadership supports the autocratic leadership style in that it is focused on giving strict rules while being less considerate of followers' feelings (Amiri et al., 2010; Lewin, et al., 1939). Participation leadership supports the democratic leadership style since followers are involved in the process of completing projects and includes followers in decision-making processes. These leadership styles give a more in-depth view of how leadership can change based on the situation and is not a permanent state.

Future studies broadened the knowledge gained about leadership styles after the study conducted by Lewin et al. (1939). Dreikurs and other Adlerians stressed that a democratic style is often most effective, but oftentimes leaders have not been trained in the in this leadership style, which can lead to leaders using a more laissez-faire style than intended (Ferguson et al., 2006). Lewin also stressed that the way followers perceive their leader's style is more important than the style the leaders are actually using (Gandolfi & Stone, 2017). Autocratic leaders have also been found to contribute to the order of an organization along with being consistent in their message (Jago, 1982). Autocratic leaders have also been shown to provide more information to

their subordinates, but they tend to use their power to get their subordinates to do what they want. In the military field, the autocratic leadership style has been found to be beneficial since the situation supplements having extreme order and the subordinates doing as they are told (De Cremer, 2006). Autocratic leadership has also been found to help organizations that need to be turned around quickly after a crisis happens (Rast, et al., 2013). One main factor that determines if a leader who is being autocratic will go over well is if they are highly knowledgeable about what is occurring within the organization and what they are telling their subordinates to do.

The democratic leadership style is most commonly contrasted to the autocratic leadership style. This could be due to democratic leaders focusing more on involvement and satisfaction of their followers in order to establish a feeling of equality in the workplace (Bass, 2008). Where autocratic leadership is more task-oriented as only the leader is involved in the decision making process, democratic leadership is employee-centered and focused on everyone being involved in the decision making process (Bass, 2008). Instead of using their power to influence behaviors in a way that benefits their wants, democratic leaders set guidelines for decisions and encourage their followers to join in on creating ideas (Fiaz, et al., 2017). This leadership style provides subordinates with autonomy and allows them to feel their opinion is valued, which in turn establishes mutual respect within the workplace (Fiaz et al., 2017). A study by Comrey, et al. (1952) found that employees who had democratic leaders described them as being sympathetic and willing to share information. In turn, the departments with democratic leaders were found to be the most successful departments in the organization (Comrey et al., 1952). Similarly, a study by Argyle, et al. (1958) found that democratic leadership results in increased productivity, less turnover, and less absenteeism in employees. In situations that are highly structured, such as athletic teams, democratic leadership is not typically seen. However, a study by Tucker (2017)

discovered that athletes preferred having a democratic leader guiding them and those that were more successful actually perceived their coaches as being democratic. Research has also shown that workers felt they had more control and input over what was occurring in the organization after their leaders went through a training course emphasizing the benefits of democratic leadership (Baum, et al., 1970).

The laissez-faire leadership style has essentially been explained as being the lack of any sort of leadership (Bass, 2008). Oftentimes, laissez-faire leaders avoid any responsibilities and do not help the group make decisions due to their lack of confidence in their supervisory abilities (Bradford & Lippitt, 1945). Another issue is that the type of autonomy that laissez-faire leaders provide is not the type of autonomy that is beneficial (Fiaz et al., 2017). Laissez-faire leaders often tend to be neither proactive nor reactive to the changes that occur within the organization and this creates confusion among their followers (Fiaz et al., 2017). Overall, the effectiveness of various leadership styles tends to depend on the situation along with the leadership that the subordinates prefer.

Connection between Leaders and Employees

When individuals focus more on their own personal gains instead of the benefit of everyone, conflicts can arise between coworkers and within the organization as a whole (Ferguson, 2007). Studies have shown that when leaders set goals that are challenging, yet obtainable, their followers are more likely to succeed in completing the goals (Ferguson, 2007). When leaders and individuals mutually agree upon goals, conflict is less likely to arise (Ferguson, 1996). The democratic leadership style stresses that individuals should be allowed to be a part of the goal setting process in order to feel involved and have a better understanding of the organization (Bass, 2008). This will increase the likelihood of goals being completed and the

workplace flowing effectively (Ferguson, 1996). Setting goals for employees and allowing them to contribute can allow the organization to withstand changes and turmoil while maintaining a competitive edge (Buchanan et al., 2005).

Cooperation and being involved in decision making can also help establish better leader-follower relationships within the workplace (Ferguson, 1996). Effective leader-follower relationships increase the feeling of appreciation that individuals feel when in the workplace (Ferguson, 2003). Leaders can increase the functionality of the workplace just by allowing individuals to be involved in decisions or being able to voice their opinions so they feel that they matter, are appreciated, and belong (Ferguson, 2003). Cooperation and being involved in decision-making processes are also characteristics of the democratic leadership style (Lewin et al., 1939). This was found in Lewin et al.'s (1939) study to result in positive attitudes toward the leader by the followers.

Oftentimes, the ways that leaders think they are handling situations are not the ways that their employees perceive the situations as being handled. Malik (2012) found that employees altered their job expectations based off of the behavior of their boss. Malik also found that an individual's perception of their boss had an influence on the effort they put into their job. When the leaders were more participative, the individuals would put more effort into accomplishing their work to the best of their abilities compared to when their leaders were more directive, achievement-oriented, or supportive (Malik, 2012). Malik's study was an example of the literature shifting from a focus on the way leaders lead to the way leaders are being perceived after Lewin et al.'s (1939) study found that perceived leadership style did have an impact on the functionality of a group. Another study found that the actions of one individual had the ability to impact others, especially when it comes to leaders influencing those who work underneath them

(Gandolfi & Stone, 2017). Lewin et al. (1939) set up the framework that other researchers utilized to identify leadership strengths and faults within the workplace and within groups. For example, a study by Kassim and Ibrahim (2016) showed that how employees perceive the way their leaders are treating others and themselves can have an influence on their relationship with the leader and also other aspects of their job. This could include not only their behavior, but also their productivity and performance (Kassim & Ibrahim, 2016). When all employees are treated fairly within the workplace and the leaders are actually leading the way employees' desire, employees will perform better and the organization will be more likely to succeed (Kassim & Ibrahim, 2016). It is essential that leaders realize how vital their role is to their employees in order to achieve organizational success (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005).

One of the main focuses of employee conflict is that it can be avoided if leaders handle it in the correct manner (Qadir & Khan, 2016). When employees and leaders communicate properly about conflicts that arise, these conflicts are less likely to escalate beyond a manageable point (Qadir & Khan, 2016). The democratic leadership style is more effective in this regard in that leaders and employees are working together to find conflict solutions (Qadir & Khan, 2016). When employees feel that there is a compromising environment, they are less likely to leave and more likely to be committed to helping improve the workplace alongside their leaders (Kassim & Ibrahim, 2016). If conflict is not handled appropriately, then productivity can decrease and success at the organization can be at stake (Anjum et al., 2014). Furthermore, it has been found that when individuals have too many negative experiences with other individuals they are more likely to experience disagreements and have a higher chance of conflict during their day-to-day interactions (Berndt, 2004). Overall, when leaders and followers share the same values and

attitudes they have higher satisfaction with their work relationships and often experience less conflict (Bass, 2008).

Connection between Personal Values, Leadership Style, and Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is most generally described as the evaluation an individual has of whether or not their job and factors associated with their job are favorable (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction can be influenced by characteristics of the organization they work for, or even the job itself (Campion & Thayer, 1985; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). These can include pay, supervision, or even social aspects of the job. For example, if an individual perceives the supervision they are receiving as favorable they will be more likely to have higher job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). This is supported by the leadership research that it is the perceptions of the leadership that matters more than just the way the leaders are leading (Malik, 2012).

Preferred leadership style and the personal values of individuals should also be taken into account when work teams are built (Ferguson, 1996). Research has shown that when individuals have democratic values, they are more effective in teams, produce better results, and have higher satisfaction with their work (Ferguson, 1996). This is why Adlerians practice the idea of having a democratic workplace so the perspective and opinions of others can be taken into account, which can enhance satisfaction (Ferguson, 2003). Alternatively, studies have also shown that the more autocratic or structured and strict an organization is, the less satisfied employees are within that organization (Nikelly, 1971).

Studies have also shown that when individuals interact in an autocratic manner, conflict is more likely to occur and satisfaction of employees will be lower (Ferguson, 1999). In addition, employees in an autocratic environment can become discouraged since their opinions are not

taken into consideration through their daily work (Ferguson, 1999). A prime example of the issues that can arise within an autocratic environment is the Lewin et al., (1939) studies in which children who had a leader with this style had fights break out where everyone either ganged up on one individual or all individuals focused their aggression towards the same source. When the leader left, the children would retaliate and oftentimes fights would break out between the children about how they were to go about completing their assigned task. A more recent study by Cushman (1989) supported the negative effect of autocrat environments by revealing that autocratic management practices result in low employee satisfaction. Similarly, another study by Ley (1966) demonstrated that personnel turnover was higher for subordinates who were being led by an autocratic leader.

The one leadership style that has consistently been found to lead to the lowest level of satisfaction and effectiveness is laissez-faire (Bass, 2008). A study focused on rail-road workers found that they were not productive if their supervisors did not show leadership skills and gave all responsibility to the subordinates themselves (Yoder, et al., 1952). Similarly, in a study by Murnighan and Leung (1976) graduate students taught classes and led a discussion of problems in their curriculum with the students enrolled in their class. The study showed that individuals who had involved leaders that solved problems at a higher rate were more satisfied as compared to individuals who were led by laissez-faire leaders (Murnighan & Leung, 1976).

For the workplace to run smoothly and for healthy relationships to form, individuals should be treated with mutual respect, both by their coworkers and their leaders (Ferguson, 1999). Mutual respect can be formed mainly by individuals encouraging one another and working together to solve problems (Ferguson, 1999). This process will also work better when individuals are able to understand their environment along and their workers (Lamb, 1979).

When individuals take the time to work better with each other, they are then contributing to the satisfaction and positive social culture of their workplace (Tomasello, 2004). The democratic leadership style is one that stresses mutual respect and being concerned with the employee well being (Bass, 2008).

This Study

Pulling from Ferguson et al.'s (2006) application of the Lewin leadership styles to parenting, this study strives to show the influence of family values on personal values and preferred leadership styles and the influence of the values - leadership style match on job satisfaction. Whether employees perceive themselves as having personal values that are reflected in their leader's style can have an influence on their satisfaction in the workplace (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Showing the lasting effects that parenthood can have on personal values and ultimately, perceived leadership style and job satisfaction is the main purpose of this study. This will be done by showing that parental values (i.e., autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire) have an influence on the values children have as they develop into adulthood, which in turn has an influence on the style these individuals prefer in their leader. To this end, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1

The perceived values of an individual's parents will predict the personal values of that individual as an adult (autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire) such that the strongest (positive) relationships will be found when there is a match between parental values and personal values.

Hypothesis 2

An individual's personal values will predict their preferred leadership style (autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire) such that the strongest (positive) relationships will be found when there is a match between personal values and preferred leadership style.

Hypothesis 3

The parenting values experienced by an individual when they were growing up will predict their preferred leadership style (autocratic = autocratic-transactional or autocratic-transformational, democratic = democratic-transactional or autocratic-transformational, laissez-faire = laissez-faire).

Hypothesis 4a

Individuals who have a preferred leadership style congruent to what they perceive as their immediate boss' leadership style (autocratic = autocratic-transactional or autocratic-transformational, democratic = democratic-transactional or democratic-transformational, laissez-faire = laissez-faire) will have higher supervisory satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4b

Individuals who have a preferred leadership style congruent to what they perceive as their immediate boss' leadership style will have higher overall satisfaction.

Chapter II: Method

Participants

The participants of this study were recruited from a Midwestern University's psychology department. Some of the participants were enrolled in introductory psychology classes and received extra credit for participating in this study. Individuals' participation was completely voluntary and they could withdraw at anytime. In the present study, 85 participants participated in the study, but 7 were removed for not completing the demographic survey or the individual personal values survey.

Of the 78 participants, 25.6% were male ($n = 20$), 73.1% were female ($n = 57$), and 1.3% indicated as other ($n = 1$). Of the 78 participants, 29.5% of the individuals were in the first year of their college education ($n = 23$); 28.2% of the individuals were in the second year of their college education ($n = 22$); 26.9% were in the third year of their college education ($n = 21$); and 15.4% were in the fourth year or higher of their college education ($n = 12$). Of the 78 participants, 72 answered questions specific to having a mother figure and 66 answered questions specific to having a father figure. Out of the 78 participants: 82.1 ($n = 64$) indicated they had both a mother and father figure growing up; 10.3% ($n = 8$) indicated they only had a mother figure growing up; and 7.69% ($n = 6$) indicated they only had a father figure growing up.

Career information. In regard to employment status, 87.2% of the individuals indicated that they were currently employed ($n = 68$), while 12.8% indicated they were not ($n = 10$). Of the 78 participants, 9.0% indicated that they had been at their most recent job for 0 – 3 months ($n = 7$); 16.7% indicated that they had been at their most recent job for 3 – 6 months ($n = 13$); 26.9% indicated they had been at their most recent job for 6 – 9 months ($n = 21$); 5.1% indicated they

had been at their most recent job for 10 – 12 months ($n = 4$); and 42.3% indicated they had been at their most recent job for 1 – 5 years ($n = 33$).

Procedure

Students were able to complete this study without actively being within a laboratory due to the study being administered through solely online surveys. The participants were asked to give implied consent before being able to continue on to the rest of the survey. The participants completed the Parental Values Inventory (Ferguson et al., 2006) for their mother and father separately. Then the participant completed the Personal Values Adult Inventory (Ferguson et al., 2006) in order to determine their personal values. The participants then completed the modified Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (Vann, Coleman, & Simpson, 2014) in order to determine the leadership style they prefer and also what they perceive their immediate supervisor's (from current or most recent past job) leadership style to be. They were also given a satisfaction questionnaire that focused on their overall job satisfaction along with supervisory satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1974).

Measures

Parental Values Inventory. The Parental Values Inventory (Ferguson et al., 2006) was utilized to determine the participants' parents' (individual raising them) values when they were raising their child (at the age of nine). The test-retest correlations for the overall scale have ranged from .46 to .78 (Median: $r = .59$) (Ferguson, et al., 2006). The scale consists of 15 items with a 7-point response scale with the following anchors: (a) one *not at all*, (b) four *moderately*, and (c) seven *very much*. See Appendix A for scale items and see Table 1 for the internal consistency of the scale. Each value (i.e., democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire) has five items specific to the value.

Personal Values Adult. The Parental Values Adult was utilized to determine the values of the participant at the age they are now (Ferguson et al., 2006). The test-retest correlations for the overall scale have ranged from .46 to .78 (Median: $r = .59$) (Ferguson et al., 2006). The scale consist of 15 items with a 7-point response scale with the following anchors: (a) one *not at all*, (b) four *moderately*, and (c) seven *very much*. See Appendix B for scale items and see Table 1 for internal consistency information. Each value (i.e., democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire) has five items specific to the value.

Vannsimpco Leadership Survey. The Vannsimpco Leadership Survey was utilized to measure preferred leadership style and perceived leadership style of either a current or most recent boss (Vann et al., 2014). This 27-item measure is considered a hybrid measure since most leaders adopt a blend of leadership styles and not a singular style (i.e., blend of transformational and democratic or blend of transactional and autocratic); therefore, this measure would be beneficial for giving a measurement that is more accurate of leadership (Vann et al., 2014). The test-retest correlation for this measure was found to be acceptable ($r = .91, p < .001$, Vann et al., 2014). All items were rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The Vannsimpco Leadership Survey measures seven leadership styles: Transactional (nine items), transformational (three items), autocratic transformational (three items), autocratic transactional (three items), democratic transformational (three items), democratic transactional (three items), and laissez-faire (three items). Only the autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire styles were used for hypothesis testing, though all seven styles were assessed. See Appendix C for scale items and see Table 1 for internal consistency information.

The Job Diagnostic Survey. The Job Diagnostic Survey was utilized to determine the satisfaction of the participants with their current or most recent job along with their supervisory

satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). This survey consists of three items that measure job satisfaction, three that measure supervisor satisfaction, and two that measure others' satisfaction with their job. All items use a five-point response scale. In order to get overall satisfaction, all three types of satisfaction were combined for an average. For more measure details see Appendix D and see Table 1 for internal consistency information.

Analysis

SPSS and R were used to analyze the data from the present study. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were run on the data to obtain means, standard deviations, correlations, and frequencies. For all analyses, parents were combined to give one parental score except for one exploratory statistic that was utilized to see if the female figure had a bigger influence than the male influence. In cases that an individual indicated they did not have a mother figure growing up, the father's parental values would just be used and vice versa. Correlations were run to check for multicollinearity among variables along with the strength of magnitude of the relationships among these variables (Keith, 2014). Hypothesis testing was completed by running multiple regressions for hypothesis one, two, and three. For hypothesis one, the independent variable for the multiple regression was parenting value and the dependent variables were personal values. Three multiple regressions had to be run in all for hypothesis one. For hypothesis two, the independent variable for the multiple regression was personal value and the dependent variables were leadership style for the preferred supervisor. Three multiple regressions had to be run in all for hypothesis two. For hypothesis three, the independent variable was parenting value and the dependent variables were leadership style for the preferred supervisor.

Hypothesis four parts A and B were tested using a profile similarity coefficient and seeing how these coefficients correlated with overall satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction. The

profile similarity coefficient (r_p) is used to show the resemblance between two individuals (Cattell, 1969). In this case, these individuals were the preferred leadership style of a supervisor and the perceived leadership style of the current supervisor of each individual. The coefficient can range from zero to +1 showing the individuals are increasing alike, zero showing there is a change of a resemblance occurring, and -zero to -1 showing that the individuals are increasingly opposite (Cattell, 1969).

Step 1: The calculation of r_p starts by finding the difference between the two individuals and then squaring it (giving you Σd^2)(Cattell, 1969). This calculation was performed for all three leadership styles: autocratic, democratic, and laissez faire.

Step 2: These values then were combined into one overall Σd^2 . Adding together all the values from the previous step in R gave us this value.

Step 3: In order to find the coefficient the following equation was used

$$r_p = \frac{2.366 * (2 - \Sigma d^2)}{2.366 * (2 + \Sigma d^2)} \quad \text{(Cattell, 1969):}$$

The value of 2.366 was the chance expected median value of Σd^2 (E). This was found utilizing a table Cattell (1969) generated showing that if the value for k was 3, the median X^2 would be 2.366.

Step 4: A correlation was then run to see how leadership styles (preferred versus current) could have an effect on the satisfaction of an individual. Correlating r_p with supervisor satisfaction and overall satisfaction completed this.

Chapter III: Results

Data Cleaning

Individuals were taken out if they answered 1 (strongly disagree) to 2 (disagree) for the ideal or current supervisor question. These responses indicated that they were not paying attention to the items they were being asked to rate or they were not rating the correct supervisor. This excluded six people from the future analysis.

For the values and styles, scale scores were used. This means that you would take individuals' democratic items and average all of their responses together to give them a scale score on their democratic values. This means that an individual would have a scale score for all three styles. They would be high or low democratic, high or low laissez-faire, high or low autocratic. This follows for parental values and leadership styles. For example, an individual may be rated higher on the autocratic side of things, but still would be able to have a correlation between democratic values and other constructs.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Statistics

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics and correlations. There were 56 significant correlations. Results will focus on those that are relevant for the hypothesis testing. Therefore, the focus will be on correlations between parenting values and personal values, personal values and leadership styles, parenting values and leadership styles, leadership styles and supervisor satisfaction, then leadership styles and overall satisfaction.

Parenting Values (PVI) and Personal Values (PVA) Correlations. There was a significant positive correlation between PVA – Democratic and PVI – Democratic ($r = .74, p < .001$). There was a strong significant positive correlation between PVA – Laissez-Faire and PVI – Laissez-Faire ($r = .77, p < .001$). There was a strong positive correlation between PVA –

Autocratic and PVI – Autocratic ($r = .75, p < .001$). This indicates that when individuals rated their parents higher on certain values, they also rated themselves higher on those values. This was supported by the correlations being weaker when the values did not match ($r = .29$ to $.51$).

Personal Values and Leadership Style Correlations. There was a significant positive correlation between PVA – Democratic and Preferred Supervisor – Democratic ($r = .43, p < .001$). There was a significant positive correlation between PVA – Laissez-Faire and Preferred Supervisor – Laissez-Faire ($r = .32, p < .05$). This indicates that individuals who rated themselves higher on certain values also preferred leaders that were higher on similar styles. There was a significant positive correlation between PVA – Laissez-Faire and Preferred Supervisor – Democratic ($r = .36, p < .05$). There was a significant positive correlation between PVA – Laissez-Faire and Preferred Supervisor – Autocratic ($r = .33, p < .05$). There was a significant positive correlation between PVA – Autocratic and Preferred Supervisor – Laissez-Faire ($r = .26, p < .05$). This indicates that individuals who rate themselves as higher when it comes to having autocratic personal values also had a higher preference for leaders that were laissez-faire as opposed to leaders who were autocratic.

Parenting Values and Leadership Style Correlations. There was a significant positive correlation between PVI – Democratic and Preferred Supervisor – Democratic ($r = .41, p < .05$). This indicates that individuals who rated their parents higher when it came to the democratic style had a higher preference for leaders that were democratic. There was a significant positive correlation between PVI – Laissez-Faire and Preferred Supervisor – Democratic ($r = .39, p < .001$). This indicates that individuals who rated their parents higher on laissez-faire style had also a higher preference for leaders that were democratic.

Table 1
Correlation Table

	Means	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. PVA - Democratic	6.02	0.80	0.68															
2. PVA - Laissez-Faire	5.99	0.90	0.46**	0.61														
3. PVA - Autocratic	3.86	1.23	0.18	0.54**	0.71													
4. PVI - Democratic	5.53	1.03	0.77**	0.53**	0.31*	0.86												
5. PVI - Autocratic	4.1	1.15	0.17	0.45**	0.79**	0.15	0.74											
6. PVI - Laissez-Faire	4.58	1.06	0.47**	0.78**	0.52**	0.68**	0.46**	0.73										
7. Preferred Supervisor - Democratic	4.14	0.43	0.43**	0.36*	0.10	0.41**	0.11	0.39**	0.74									
8. Preferred Supervisor - Autocratic	3.91	0.32	0.24*	0.33*	0.10	0.18	0.02	0.20	0.42**	0.55								
9. Preferred Supervisor - Laissez-Faire	3.17	0.82	0.04	0.32*	0.26*	-0.04	0.23	0.20	0.05	0.13	0.49							
10. Current Supervisor - Democratic	3.75	0.78	0.24*	0.30*	-0.03	0.30*	-0.01	0.28*	0.28*	0.02	-0.02	0.89						
11. Current Supervisor - Autocratic	3.76	0.56	0.14	0.44**	0.01	0.23*	-0.01	0.39**	0.33*	0.32*	0.28*	0.55**	0.79					
12. Current Supervisor - Laissez-Faire	3.29	0.82	-0.19	0.14	0.09	-0.13	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.17	0.56**	-0.02	0.19	0.62				
13. Job Satisfaction	4.85	0.69	0.32*	0.36*	0.18	0.35*	0.20	0.33*	0.33*	0.09	0.11	0.45**	0.20	0.05	0.79			
14. Supervisor Satisfaction	5.84	1.35	0.19	0.16	-0.15	0.21	-0.08	0.18	0.18	-0.10	-0.09	0.69**	0.35*	-0.20	0.18	0.9		
15. Others' Satisfaction	5.04	1.55	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.05	0.16	0.30*	0.24	0.14	0.19	0.25*	0.92	
16. Overall Satisfaction	5.27	0.81	0.21	0.21	-0.05	0.23	0.01	0.22	0.22	-0.06	0.06	0.72**	0.40**	-0.04	0.52**	0.80**	0.69**	0.87

** $p < .001$; * $p < .05$; Internal Consistencies are along the main diagonal (bolded & italicized values)

Leadership Style and Satisfaction Correlations. There was a significant positive correlation between Current Supervisor – Democratic and Supervisor Satisfaction ($r = .69, p < .001$). This indicates that as individuals' ratings of their current supervisor on the democratic style increases then their supervisor satisfaction increases. There was a significant positive correlation between Current Supervisor – Democratic and Overall Satisfaction ($r = .72, p < .001$). This indicates that as individuals' ratings of their current supervisor on the democratic style increases then their overall satisfaction also increases.

There was a significant positive correlation between Current Supervisor – Autocratic and Supervisor Satisfaction ($r = .35, p < .05$). This indicates that as individuals' ratings of their current supervisor on the autocratic style increases that their supervisor satisfaction increases. There was a significant positive correlation between Current Supervisor – Autocratic and Overall Satisfaction ($r = .40, p < .001$). This indicates that as individuals' ratings of their current supervisor on the autocratic style increases that their overall satisfaction increases. However, it should be noted that these satisfaction correlations were smaller in magnitude than those found with democratic supervisors.

Analysis of Parental Styles Influence on Personal Values

Parenting values accounted for 62% of the variance in personal values for the democratic items ($F(3, 68) = 30.88, p < .001$). Individuals' parents having democratic parenting values was the best predictor of individuals having democratic personal values ($\beta = .88, t(68) = 8.36, p < .001$). Parenting values accounted for 62% of the variance in personal values for the laissez-faire items ($F(3, 68) = 36.60, p < .001$). Individuals' parent having laissez-faire parenting values was the best predictor of individuals having laissez-faire personal values ($\beta = .69, t(68) = 5.89, p < .001$). Parenting values accounted for 67% of the variance in personal values for the autocratic

items ($F(3, 68) = 46.17, p < .001$). Individuals' parents having autocratic parenting values was the best predictor of individuals having autocratic personal values ($\beta = .73, t(68) = 9.01, p < .001$). For more details, reference Table 2 below. These findings supported hypothesis one.

Table 2

Results of Multiple Regression Analyses by Parenting Values

Parenting values	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R - squared</i>
PVA - Democratic				30.88	3, 68	< .001	0.62
PVI - Democratic	8.36	< .001	0.88				
PVI - Laissez-Faire	-1.61	0.11	-0.19				
PVI - Autocratic	1.38	0.17	0.12				
PVA - Laissez-Faire				36.60	3, 68	< .001	0.62
PVI - Democratic	0.43	0.67	0.05				
PVI - Laissez-Faire	5.89	< .001	0.69				
PVI - Autocratic	1.42	0.16	0.12				
PVA - Autocratic				46.17	3, 68	< .001	0.67
PVI - Democratic	1.38	0.17	0.14				
PVI - Laissez-Faire	0.88	0.38	0.10				
PVI - Autocratic	9.01	< .001	0.73				

This was then taken one step further to see if one parent was a better predictor of personal values than the other (mother versus father). Democratic parenting values accounted for 66% of the variance in personal values for the democratic items ($F(2, 56) = 53.23, p < .001$).

Individuals' mother's parenting values was the best predictor of individuals having a democratic personal value (mother: $\beta = .50, t(56) = 5.22, p < .001$; father: $\beta = .40, t(56) = 4.18, p < .001$).

Laissez-faire parenting values accounted for 66% of the variance in personal values for the laissez-faire items ($F(2, 56) = 54.98, p < .001$). Individuals' mother's parenting values was the best predictor of individuals having laissez-faire personal values (mother: $\beta = .55, t(56) = 4.73, p < .001$; father: $\beta = .31, t(56) = 2.68, p < .05$). Autocratic parenting values accounted for 69% of the variance in personal values for the autocratic items ($F(2, 56) = 63.36, p < .001$).

Individuals' mother's parenting value was the best predictor of individuals having autocratic

personal values (mother: $\beta = .55$, $t(56) = 5.55$, $p < .001$; father: $\beta = .36$, $t(56) = 2.70$, $p < .001$).

For more details, reference Table 3 below. These findings also gave further insight into the support behind hypothesis one.

Table 3

Results of Multiple Regression Analyses by Parenting Values

Parenting values	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R - squared</i>
PVA - Democratic				53.23	2, 56	< .001	0.66
PVI - Democratic (Mother)	5.22	< .001	0.50				
PVI - Democratic (Father)	4.18	< .001	0.40				
				9.02	2, 56	< .001	0.24
PVI - Laissez-Faire (Mother)	1.13	0.26	0.20				
PVI - Laissez-Faire (Father)	1.88	0.07	0.33				
				0.91	2, 56	0.41	0.03
PVI - Autocratic (Mother)	1.29	0.20	0.23				
PVI - Autocratic (Father)	-1.13	0.26	-0.20				
PVA - Laissez-Faire				11.87	2, 56	< .001	0.30
PVI - Democratic (Mother)	2.98	< .05	0.41				
PVI - Democratic (Father)	1.39	0.17	0.19				
				54.98	2, 56	< .001	0.66
PVI - Laissez-Faire (Mother)	4.73	< .001	0.55				
PVI - Laissez-Faire (Father)	2.68	< .05	0.31				
				13.93	2, 56	< .001	0.33
PVI - Autocratic (Mother)	4.77	< .001	0.69				
PVI - Autocratic (Father)	-1.46	0.15	-0.21				
PVA - Autocratic				2.56	2, 56	0.09	0.08
PVI - Democratic (Mother)	0.62	0.54	0.10				
PVI - Democratic (Father)	1.40	0.17	0.22				
				12.44	2, 56	< .001	0.31
PVI - Laissez-Faire (Mother)	1.51	0.14	0.25				
PVI - Laissez-Faire (Father)	2.03	< .05	0.34				
				63.36	2, 56	< .001	0.69
PVI - Autocratic (Mother)	5.55	< .001	0.55				
PVI - Autocratic (Father)	3.70	< .001	0.36				

Analysis of Personal Values Influence on Preferred Leadership Style

Personal values accounted for 23% of the variance in democratic leadership for a preferred supervisor ($F(3, 68) = 7.43, p < .001$). Individuals' having democratic personal values was the best predictor of their preferred supervisor having a democratic leadership style ($\beta = .32, t(68) = 2.81, p < .05$). Individuals' having laissez-faire personal values was also a significant predictor of individuals preferring to have a democratic leader ($\beta = .29, t(68) = 2.19, p < .05$).

Personal values accounted for 23% of the variance in autocratic leadership for a preferred supervisor ($F(3, 68) = 6.81, p < .05$). Individuals' having laissez-faire personal values was the best predictor of their preferred supervisor having an autocratic leadership style ($\beta = .33, t(68) = 2.72, p < .05$). Interestingly, individuals' having autocratic personal values was the worst predictor of their preferred supervisor having an autocratic leadership style ($\beta = -.12, t(68) = -0.92, ns$).

Table 4

Results of Multiple Regression Analyses by Leadership Style and Personal Values

Leadership style	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R - squared</i>
Preferred Supervisor - Democratic				7.43	3, 68	< .001	0.23
PVA - Democratic	2.81	< .05	0.32				
PVA - Autocratic	-1.03	0.31	-0.13				
PVA - Laissez-Faire	2.19	< .05	0.29				
Preferred Supervisor - Autocratic				6.81	3, 68	< .001	0.23
PVA - Democratic	2.72	< .05	0.33				
PVA - Autocratic	-0.92	0.36	-0.12				
PVA - Laissez-Faire	1.98	0.05	0.28				
Preferred Supervisor - Laissez-Faire				3.32	3, 68	< .05	0.13
PVA - Democratic	-1.05	0.30	-0.13				
PVA - Autocratic	0.74	0.46	0.10				
PVA - Laissez-Faire	2.20	< .05	0.33				

Personal values accounted for 13% of the variance in laissez-faire leadership for a preferred supervisor ($F(3, 68) = 3.32, p < .05$). Individuals' having laissez-faire personal values was the best predictor of their preferred supervisor having a laissez-faire leadership style ($\beta = .33, t(68) = 2.20, p < .05$). For more details, reference Table 4 above. These findings support hypothesis two.

Analysis of Parenting Values Influence on Preferred Leadership Style

Parenting values accounted for 19% of the variance in democratic leadership for a preferred supervisor ($F(3, 68) = 5.27, p < .05$). Individuals' indicating their parents had laissez-faire parenting values was the best predictor of their preferred supervisor having a democratic leadership style ($\beta = .24, t(68) = 1.71, ns$).

Parenting values accounted for 5% of the variance in autocratic leadership for a preferred supervisor ($F(3, 68) = 1.11, ns$). Individuals' indicating their parents had laissez-faire parenting values was a predictor of their preferred supervisor having an autocratic leadership style ($\beta = .20, t(68) = 1.06, ns$). Interestingly, individuals' indicating their parents had autocratic parenting values was a negative predictor of their preferred supervisor having an autocratic leadership style ($\beta = -.08, t(68) = -0.55, ns$).

Parenting values accounted for 11% of the variance in laissez-faire leadership style for a preferred supervisor ($F(3, 68) = 2.82, p < .05$). Individuals' indicating their parents had laissez-faire parenting values was a predictor of their preferred supervisor having a laissez-faire leadership style ($\beta = .36, t(68) = 1.99, ns$). Interestingly, individuals' indicating their parents had democratic parenting values was a negative predictor of their preferred supervisor having a

laissez-faire leadership style ($\beta = -.30, t(68) = -1.87, ns$). For more details, reference Table 5

below. These findings did not support hypothesis three.

Table 5

Results of Multiple Regression Analyses by Leadership Style and Parenting Values

Leadership style	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R - squared</i>
Preferred Supervisor - Democratic				5.39	3, 68	< .05	0.19
PVI - Democratic	1.71	0.09	0.26				
PVI - Autocratic	-0.26	0.79	-0.03				
PVI - Laissez-Faire	1.33	0.19	0.23				
Preferred Supervisor - Autocratic				1.11	3, 68	0.35	0.05
PVI - Democratic	0.32	0.75	0.05				
PVI - Autocratic	-0.55	0.59	-0.08				
PVI - Laissez-Faire	1.06	0.29	0.20				
Preferred Supervisor - Laissez- Faire				2.82	3, 68	< .05	0.11
PVI - Democratic	-1.87	0.06	-0.30				
PVI - Autocratic	0.84	0.41	0.11				
PVI - Laissez-Faire	1.99	0.05	0.36				

Analysis of Leadership Style Congruency Influence on Satisfaction

Overall, the profile similarity coefficient shows that individuals' ideal supervisor and their current supervisor were fairly similar ($r_p = .59$). There was a significant positive correlation between r_p and overall satisfaction ($r = .50, p < .001$). This indicates that the more similar individuals' current supervisor is to their ideal supervisor, the more satisfied they will be overall with their workplace. There was a significant positive correlation between r_p and supervisor satisfaction ($r = .53, p < .001$). This indicates that the more similar individuals' current supervisor is to their ideal supervisor, the more satisfied they will be with their supervisor. For more details, reference Table 6 below. These findings support hypothesis four: part a and part b.

Table 6*The Profile Similarity Coefficient's Relationship with Satisfaction*

Satisfaction	Mean	SD	1	2	3
1. r_p	0.59	0.34	--		
2. Overall Satisfaction	5.18	0.84	0.50**	--	
3. Supervisor Satisfaction	5.74	1.34	0.53**	0.81**	--

** $p < .001$; * $p < .05$

Chapter IV: Discussion

The objective of the present study was to apply Adlerian theory to the workplace. Specifically, this study explored how the way individuals were raised could potentially lead to preferences for a certain type of leader. This could then lead individuals to be more or less satisfied in the workplace if there were differences in the preferred leadership style and the leadership style they perceived their supervisor as having. The results generally indicate that (a) individuals' perceptions of their parents' parental values when they were growing up had an influence on their personal values; (b) their personal values had an influence on their preferred leadership style; and (c) their current supervisor being similar to their preferred leadership style had an influence on their satisfaction.

Findings

Hypothesis One. Individuals having felt they had a democratic parent was the best predictor of them having democratic personal values. Similarly, individuals feeling their parents had laissez-faire values was the best predictor of them having laissez-faire personal values. Lastly, individuals feeling that their parents had autocratic values was the best predictor of them having autocratic personal values. When the values were not similar, the parental values were not significant and in some cases, such as laissez-faire parents with a democratic individual, results were negative predictors of individuals' personal values. This supports past research that the way individuals are raised can have a lasting influence on who they become once they are an adult (Shulman & Nikelly, 1971).

Due to the exploratory analyses done for hypothesis one, further conclusions can be drawn. Overall, the mother figure seems to have the biggest influence over the personal values individuals feel they exhibit once they grow up. There were even some cases in which a father

exhibiting a certain type of parenting values could have a negative impact on the potential of individuals having those personal values. For example, autocratic parenting values were negative predictors for both laissez-faire and democratic personal values. This could mean that individuals who grew up with autocratic parents want to have less control over others or they want others to have more of an input than what they had growing up.

Hypothesis Two. Democratic personal values were a significant predictor of someone wanting a democratic supervisor and an autocratic supervisor. According to these results, individuals who feel they have personal values that are more democratic in nature prefer leaders who have more democratic practices or autocratic practices. One would think that if they were democratic in nature they would only prefer to have leaders that are democratic, but not autocratic. Perhaps, their personal values are more applicable to their social relationships instead of the workplace. This could mean that they prefer to have guidance and be told what to do in the workplace, but also like to have some impact on decisions that are made and to be included. This would then be a blend of both autocratic and democratic values.

Democratic personal values were the worst predictor for laissez-faire preferred leadership style in a supervisor, but the best for autocratic. This could be due to the lack of guidance that laissez-faire individuals provide, making democratic individuals feel that their opinions in all actuality may not matter (Yoder, Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, & Floor, 1952; Murnighan & Leung, 1976). The autocratic leader is the complete opposite of laissez-faire when it comes to the level of guidance given; they have strict goals and expectations for their subordinates (Jago, 1982). This could be one of the explanations behind the democratic personal value results.

Another interesting discovery was that individuals' who identified their personal values as autocratic were the least likely individuals to prefer a supervisor who was also autocratic. The

conclusion was drawn that individuals who typically want to be in control and have things extremely structured would not like having a leader who was the same way. This could lead to possible conflict in the workplace due to having two individuals who are trying to have the control in situations. The same situation occurred with democratic leadership for preferred supervisor. The only case in which individuals having autocratic personal values was not the worst predictor (i.e., with a negative relationship) was with the laissez-faire leadership style for preferred supervisor. This could be because laissez-faire supervisors allow the autocratic individuals to do their own thing and do not really try to have control over their actions throughout the work day (Ferguson, 2006).

Individuals who identified as having laissez-faire personal values did not show a preference for one leadership style over the other too greatly. It should be noted that the laissez-faire personal value was not a significant predictor of individuals preferring an autocratic supervisor, but it was still fairly close. This could be from laissez-faire individuals tending to just “go with the flow” and going about their work day without much guidance due to their own preferences (Ferguson, 2006).

Hypothesis Three. Contrary to what was expected, parenting values did not predict the preferred leadership style that individuals’ indicated for their supervisor at significant levels. This may indicate that the influence that their parental values had is strong, but not the parent to supervisor relationship. This was explored further in hypothesis two to see if the direct relationship from personal values to preferred leadership style was strong. This meant that the path would be more of parental values leading to personal values leading to preferred leadership style. The parental values would have an indirect effect on preferred leadership style instead of a direct effect.

There were some negative predictors that had some interesting implications. One implication was individuals' indicating their parent as having autocratic values was the worst predictor of both democratic and autocratic preferred leadership style for a supervisor. So if someone's parents had been autocratic while the individual was growing up, they would not want an autocratic or democratic leader, only a laissez-faire leader. This was similar to the case of their personal values. Someone having autocratic personal values only showed a preference for laissez-faire leadership. Similar to personal values, someone having democratic parents was also a negative predictor of laissez-faire leadership style for a preferred supervisor. Even though these relationships were not significant, they were consistent with the findings in hypothesis two. This lead to the conclusion that these results could be due to the indirect effect from parent to child (then adulthood) to preferred leadership style of a supervisor.

Hypothesis Four. The participants of this study indicated that the supervisor they currently have was fairly similar to the supervisor they would prefer to have. Therefore, it was expected that there would be a positive significant relationship between this coefficient and satisfaction (both overall and supervisor satisfaction). Both overall and supervisor satisfaction had a significant positive relationship with the profile coefficient. This indicates that the more similar the current supervisor's leadership style is to the preferred leadership style of individuals, the more satisfied individuals are going to be. Most importantly the individual's satisfaction with their supervisor was a contributing factor of overall satisfaction, which indicates that as someone becomes more satisfied with their supervisor they will also be more satisfied with the workplace overall. Studies have shown that the more satisfied individuals are, the less likely they will be to leave their jobs (Ferguson, 1999; Murnighan & Leung, 1976). Our results indicate that maybe individuals not being good leaders could not necessarily be the problem. There is a possibility

that their leadership style is just not the leadership style preferred by their subordinates.

Therefore, it could be beneficial for companies to see what type of leadership their employees desire in order to mold supervisors to gain skills that contribute to the leadership style that individuals indicate they prefer.

Limitations

One major limitation of this present study was the reliance on self-report surveys. Self-report surveys rely heavily on individuals' memory of past events (Keith, 2014). Furthermore, self-report surveys are also more susceptible to biases of the individuals (Keith, 2014). Lastly, self-report surveys, when administered as the whole study, are more susceptible to common-method variance, which may have inflated the correlations found in this research. We did try to combat this by having check items within the survey to make sure the individuals were paying attention to the questions at hand. There was also a conceptual overlap among the constructs, which could lead to possible Type I errors (false positive). However, this may be unlikely since correlations largely reflected a priori prediction.

Another limitation of the present study was the small sample size. There were recruitment efforts made, but most participants completed the study within the last two weeks of the study being open. Even though some people did give consent, they did not continue throughout the rest of the study and were then excluded from further analysis. This occurring caused the sample size to further decrease. Significant findings were discovered, but due to the sample size, these findings may be hard to generalize to other populations (Keith, 2014). The sample used in this study was also a convenience sample, which could be a possible limitation. However, there were efforts made to that people in the study had experience working with a manager or business

leader so there is no reason to believe that the sample would be drastically different from working individuals.

The last limitation of this study is that all of the participants were undergraduate students. While some had held a job for a number of years, the jobs they had held may not have been as rigorous as it would have been if organization employees were recruited for this study. The types of industries these individuals had exposure to were not of a wide variety, so we were not able to see if preferred leadership style was reliant on the industry they were in.

Future Research

One area that would be beneficial to explore in the future would be to actually replicate this study within an organization. This would allow the study to be generalizable to the workplace. Furthermore, by using an organization you would have access to the current supervisors of those who are partaking in the study. This would allow for exploration into the inconsistencies that can occur when the way one is perceived as leading is different than the way they are actually leading. Then there would be the chance to see if this has any impact on the satisfaction of individuals within the workplace. This would also allow for exploration of whether the leadership style that is preferred is dependent on the type of industry (i.e., factory versus academic versus retail).

Another possible area of research would be to see how the parents of the participants of the study felt they were raising their children. We would then be able to have both sides of the story instead of just the individuals' self-reports. This would help negate the bias that could be occurring by only having one viewpoint of the way they were raised (Keith, 2014). Furthermore, it could also give more insight into the family dynamics that were at play as the individual was growing up.

In the future, it would also be beneficial to counterbalance the surveys. This would reduce any carelessness individuals may be partaking in. Instead of going straight from answering questions based on themselves to those who raised them that are formatted similarly, having them go from rating themselves to their supervisors may reduce any error that could be occurring.

Conclusion

This study did confirm most of the hypotheses that were formed based on previous literature. Overall, it was found that individuals' parents' parenting style while they were growing up did have a significant influence on their personal values as an adult. Individuals' personal values had an influence on the type of leader that they preferred to have in the workplace. Lastly, individuals having supervisors currently that had a leadership style that was similar to that of their preferred leadership style increased their satisfaction not only with the supervisor, but also with the workplace as a whole.

References

- Amiri, M. P., Amiri, M. P., & Amiri, A. P. (2010). A dynamic model of contingency leadership effectiveness. *Clinical Leadership & Management Review*, 24(2), 1-10.
- Anjum, M. A., Karim, J., & Bibi, Z. (2014). Relationship of values and conflict management styles. *Business Review*, 9(1), 92-103.
- Argyle, M., Gardner, C., & Ciofi, E. (1958). Supervisory methods related to productivity, absenteeism, and labour turnover. *Human Relations*, 11, 23-40.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, & Managerial Applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Baum, B. H., Sorenson, P. F., & Place, W. S. (1970). The effect of managerial training on organizational control: an experimental study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 170-182.
- Berndt, T. J. (2004). Friendship quality and social development. In J. Lerner & A. E. Alberts (Eds.), *Current Directions in Developmental Psychology* (pp. 114-120). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Billig, M. (2015). Kurt Lewin's leadership studies and his legacy to social psychology: Is there nothing as practical as good theory?. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 45(4), 440-460.
- Bradford, L.R., & Lippitt, R. (1945). Building a democratic work group. *Personnel*, 22(3), 142-148.
- Buchanan, D., Fitzgerald, L., Ketley, D., Gollop, R., Jones, J. L., Lamont, S. S., Neath, A., & Whitby, E. (2005). No going back: A review of the literature on sustaining organizational change. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(3), 189-205.

- Campion, M. A., & Thayer, P. W. (1985). Development and field evaluation of an interdisciplinary measure of job design. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*, 29-43.
- Cattell, R. B. (1969). The profile similarity coefficient, r_p , in vocational guidance and diagnostic classification. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 39*(2), 131 – 142.
- Comrey, A. L., Pfiffner, J.M., & Beem, H.P. (1952). Factors influencing organizational effectiveness. VII. A survey of aircraft supervisors. *Personal Psychology, 8*, 245-257.
- Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (2004). Understanding families as systems. In J. Lerner & A. E. Alberts (Eds.), *Current Directions in Developmental Psychology* (pp. 92-98). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Crouter, A. C., & Bumpus, M. F. (2004). Linking parents' work stress to children's and adolescents' psychological adjustment. In J. Lerner & A. E. Alberts (Eds.), *Current Directions in Developmental Psychology* (pp. 78-84). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Cushman, J.H. (1989). Air traffic controllers and U.S. reach accord. *New York Times, 6*.
- De Cremer, D. (2006). Affective and motivational consequences of leader self-sacrifice: The moderating effect of autocratic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 79-93.
- Dewey, E. A. (1971). Family atmosphere. In A. G. Nikelly (Ed.), *Techniques for Behavior Change* (pp. 41-48). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Dreikurs, R. (1995). *The Challenge of Parenthood*. New York: Plume.
- Ferguson, E. D. (1996). Adlerian principles and methods apply to workplace problems. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 52*(3), 270-287.
- Ferguson, E. D. (1999). *Adlerian Theory: An Introduction*. Chicago, IL: Adler school of professional psychology.

- Ferguson, E. D. (1999). Individual psychology and organizational effectiveness. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 55*(1), 109-114.
- Ferguson, E. D. (2003). Work relationships, lifestyle, and mutual respect. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 59*(4), 501-506.
- Ferguson, E. D. (2006). Work relations that enhance the well-being of organizations and individuals. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 62*(1), 80-84.
- Ferguson, E. D. (2007). Work relations and work effectiveness: Goal identification and social interest can be learned. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 63*(1), 110-117.
- Ferguson, E. D., Hagaman, J. A., Maurer, S. B., Mathews, P., & Peng, K. (2013). Asian culture in transition: Is it related to reported parenting styles and transitivity of simple choices?. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*, 730-740.
- Ferguson, E. D., Hagaman, J., Grice, J. W., & Peng, K. (2006). From leadership to parenthood: The applicability of leadership styles to parenting styles. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 10*(1), 43-56.
- Fiaz, M., Qin, S., Ikram, A., & Saqib, A. (2017). Leadership styles and employees' motivation: Perspective from an emerging economy. *Journal Of Developing Areas, 51*(4), 143-156.
- Gandolfi, F., & Stone, S. (2017). The emergence of leadership styles: A clarified categorization. *Review of International Comparative Management, 18*(1), 18-30.
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1974). The job diagnostic survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects. *Technical Report No. 4 Department of Administrative Science Yale University*. Higgins, M. C., 1-47.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(2), 169-180.
- Illies, J. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2008). Responding destructively in leadership situations: The role of personal values and problem construction. *Journal of Business Ethics, 82*(1), 251-272.
- Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in Theory and Research. *Management Science, 28*(3), 315-336. doi:10.1287/mnsc.28.3.315.
- Kassim, M. A. M., & Ibrahim, H. I. (2016). Relationship between distributive justice, procedural justice, conflict management styles and affective commitment: A study among bank employees in northern Malaysia. *Jurnal Pengurusan, 47*, 1-21.
- Keith, T. Z. (2014). *Multiple Regression and Beyond: An Introduction to Multiple Regression and Structural Equation Modeling*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lamb, M. E. (1979). Issues in the study of social interaction: An introduction. In M. E. Lamb, S. J. Suomi, & G. R. Stephenson (Eds.), *Social Interaction Analysis: Methodological Issues* (pp. 1-10). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lamb, M. E. (1979). The effects of the social context on dyadic social interaction. In M. E. Lamb, S. J. Suomi, & G. R. Stephenson (Eds.), *Social Interaction Analysis: Methodological Issues* (pp. 253-268). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271-299.
- Ley, R. (1966). Labor turnover as a function of worker differences, work environment, and authoritarianism of foremen. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 50*, 497-500.

- Malik, S. H. (2012). A study of relationship between leader behaviors and subordinate job expectancies: A path-goal approach. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 357-371.
- Manaster, G. J. (1987). Adlerian Theory and Movement. *Individual Psychology: The Journal Of Adlerian Theory, Research & Practice*, 43(3), 280.
- Mosak, H. H. (1971). Lifestyle. In A. G. Nikelly (Ed.), *Techniques for Behavior Change* (pp. 77-84). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Murnighan, J.K., & Leung, T.K. (1976). The effects of leadership involvement and the importance of the task on subordinates' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 17, 299-310.
- Nikelly, A. G. (1971). The protesting student. In A. G. Nikelly (Ed.), *Techniques for Behavior Change* (pp. 159-164). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Parke, R. D., Power, T. G., & Gottman, J. M. (1979). Conceptualizing and quantifying influence patterns in the family triad. In M. E. Lamb, S. J. Suomi, & G. R. Stephenson (Eds.), *Social Interaction Analysis: Methodological Issues* (pp. 231-252). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Pepper, F. C. (1971). Birth order. In A. G. Nikelly (Ed.), *Techniques for Behavior Change* (pp. 49-54). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Qadir, A., & Khan, M. M. (2016). Linking personality and emotional labor: The mediating role of relationship conflict and conflict management styles. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 10(2), 212-238.
- Rast, D. E., Hogg, M. A., & Giessner, S. R. (2013). Self-uncertainty and Support for Autocratic Leadership. *Self & Identity*, 12(6), 635-649. doi:10.1080/15298868.2012.718864.

- Schacter, D. (2011). *Psychology*. Worth Publishers.
- Shulman, B. H., & Nikelly, A. G. (1971). Family constellation. In A. G. Nikelly (Ed.), *Techniques for Behavior Change* (pp. 35-40). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Simmons, N., & Striley, K. (2014). Twisted leadership: A visual example of leadership style using a human knot. *Communication Teacher, 28*(2), 80-84.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tomasello, M. (2004). Culture and cognitive development. In J. Lerner & A. E. Alberts (Eds.), *Current Directions in Developmental Psychology* (pp. 49-54). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Tucker, R. (2017). Democratic Leadership Preferred by Male Student Athletes in Middle School Athletic Programs. *Sport Journal, 1*.
- Vann, B. A., Coleman, A. N., & Simpson, J. A. (2014). *Development of the Vannsimpco Leadership Survey: A Delineation of Hybrid Leadership Styles, 28-39*.
- Vettor, S. M., & Kosinski, F. A. (2000). Work-stress burnout in emergency medical technicians and the use of early recollections. *Journey of Employment Counseling, 37*(4), 216 – 228.
- Yoder, D., Katz, D., Maccoby, N., Gurin, G., & Floor, L. G. (1952). Productivity, Supervision and Morale Among Railroad Workers. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 47*(259), 573. doi:10.2307/2281336

Appendix A: Ferguson Inventory PVi - Parent

For the following items, describe what you think your parents' (individual who raised you) values were when you were young (up to the age 9)? What were their beliefs and what values did they want you to adopt?

Mark on a scale from 1 (not at all, never) to 7 (very much, actively valued), with 4 representing 'Moderately' (moderately held values).

- ___ 1. Fair play
- ___ 2. Mutual respect
- ___ 3. Creativity
- ___ 4. Empathy
- ___ 5. Negotiation
- ___ 6. Personal wishes
- ___ 7. Appearance
- ___ 8. Freedom
- ___ 9. Different
- ___ 10. Self-centered
- ___ 11. Obedience
- ___ 12. Conformity
- ___ 13. Aggression
- ___ 14. Superiority
- ___ 15. Winning

Appendix B: Ferguson Inventory PVa - Self

Ferguson Inventory PVa – Self

For the following items, describe what your **Values** are. What are your beliefs and what values do you feel make you who you are?

Mark on a scale from 1 (not at all, never) to 7 (very much, actively valued), with 4 representing ‘Moderately’ (moderately held values).

- ___ 1. Fair play
- ___ 2. Mutual respect
- ___ 3. Creativity
- ___ 4. Empathy
- ___ 5. Negotiation
- ___ 6. Personal wishes
- ___ 7. Appearance
- ___ 8. Freedom
- ___ 9. Different
- ___ 10. Self-centered
- ___ 11. Obedience
- ___ 12. Conformity
- ___ 13. Aggression
- ___ 14. Superiority
- ___ 15. Winning

Appendix C: Vannsimpco Leadership Survey Key

Transactional Questions

____ 1 Supervisors should make it a point to reward staff for achieving organizational goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 2 Supervisors should let staff members know what to expect as rewards for achieving goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 3 Supervisors should set deadlines and clearly state the positive or negative consequences of staff members' not meeting defined goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Democratic Questions

____ 4 Supervisors should give staff authority to make important decisions.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 5 Supervisors should seek input from staff when formulating policies and procedures for implementing them.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 6 To solve problems, supervisors should have meetings with staff members before correcting issues.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Autocratic Questions

____ 7 It is the supervisor's ultimate responsibility for whether the organization achieves its goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 8 Supervisors should make quick decisions in times of urgency and be more deliberate in making decisions during times of less urgency.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 9 Supervisors should assign specific tasks to key staff members in order to achieve specific goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Autocratic-Transformational

____ 10 Supervisors should provide the goal for the organization and allow staff to work towards achieving the goal, making sure to offer them feedback concerning their efforts.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 11 Supervisors should retain control of decision making, but they should encourage high morale so followers can more effectively implement change.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 12 Supervisors are responsible for the operation of the organization or department, which includes the development of the competencies and commitment of personnel.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Autocratic-Transactional

____ 13 In addition to having responsibility for decision-making, it is essential for a supervisor to provide incentives and disincentives for staff with respect to work they have done on assigned projects.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 14 Supervisors should state clearly the incentives and disincentives to followers while maximizing oversight on the most critical decisions.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 15 Supervisors make the key decisions for the organization and get most of the credit or blame, but they should make sure that their promises for rewards and disincentives made to workers are kept.

Strongly disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Democratic-Transformational

____ 16 Supervisors should provide opportunities for staff members to be involved in decision making while serving as mentors during times of change.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 17 Supervisors should be open to others' ideas, yet he or she should guide employees to become stronger workers.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 18 Supervisors should be highly concerned about developing staff's ability to contribute to making important organizational decisions.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Democratic-Transactional

____ 19 Supervisors should be comfortable working with groups to seek their input in making decisions while providing incentives and disincentives for the quality of their work.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 20 In order to make decisions, supervisors should discuss issues with all of the staff members while considering which incentives and disincentives should be used in response to the quality of their work.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 21 Supervisors should be concerned about building consensus among staff members while making sure they understand the timelines, as well as their benefits and penalties in relation to achieving goals.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Transformational

____ 22 Supervisors should rely on personal influence and relationship building rather than on position or title to get staff to do work tasks.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 23 Supervisors should develop strategies to develop the staff's competence and commitment.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 24 Supervisors should look for ways to develop the strengths of staff members.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Laissez-faire

____ 25 Supervisors' jobs are to read reports and "see the big picture;" nearly all of their work should involve little or no direction of the staff members who make point of contact decisions.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 26 Staff members should be hired with skills necessary to make decisions in the workplace. If staff members need direct supervision, they should not be working in the organization.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

____ 27 Supervisors should hire competent and committed staff members, which relieves the "manager" from making most of the day-to-day decisions.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Appendix D: Job Diagnostic Survey

This questionnaire was developed as part of a Yale University study of jobs and how people react to them. The questionnaire helps to determine how jobs can be better designed, by obtaining information about how people react to different kinds of jobs.

On the following pages you will find several different kinds of questions about your job (current or past). Specific instructions are given at the start of each section. Please read them carefully. It should take no more than 25 minutes to complete the entire questionnaire. Please move through it quickly.

The questions are designed to obtain your perceptions of your job and your reactions to it.

There are no “trick” questions. Your individual answers will be kept completely confidential. Please answer each item as honestly and frankly as possible.

Now please indicate how you personally feel about your job.

Each of the statements below is something that a person might say about his or her job. You are to indicate your own, personal feelings about your job by marking how much you agree with each of the statements.

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Neutral	Agree Slightly	Agree	Agree Strongly

- ___ 1. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.
- ___ 2. I frequently think of quitting this job.
- ___ 3. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.

Now please indicate how satisfied you are with each aspect of your job listed below. Once again, write the appropriate number in the blank beside each statement.

Each of the statements below is something that a person might say about his or her job. You are to indicate your own, personal feelings about your job by marking how much you agree with each of the statements.

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied

- ___ 1. The degree of respect and fair treatment I receive from my boss.
- ___ 2. The amount of support and guidance I receive from my boss.
- ___ 3. The overall quality of the supervision I receive in my work.

Now please think of the other people in your organization who hold the same job you do. If no one has exactly the same job as you, think of the job which is most similar to yours.

Please think about how accurately each of the statements describes the feelings of these people about the job.

It is quite all right if your answers here are different from when you described your own reactions to the job. Often different people feel quite differently about the same job.

Once again, write a number in the blank for each statement, based on this scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied

___ 1. Most people on this job feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when they do the job well.

___ 2. Most people on this job are very satisfied with the job.