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ABSTRACT

This study addressed how role salience and work-family conflict relate to leadership practices for women managers. The sample (N = 197) was comprised of single and married women, ages 22-55, with and without dependent children living at home, holding middle or upper management positions within various for-profit organizations. Forty-four women’s organizations/associations and 50,000 women managers in the U.S. were solicited by email, in addition to distributing printed surveys to Human Resource managers of businesses for distribution to their women managers.

The number of years in the workforce and estimation of employer support of family needs were demographic variables that showed statistically significant relationships with leadership practices. The results indicated there were no significant differences in leadership practices between women managers with or without dependent children living at home. Additionally, women managers were able to be differentiated based on their salience for work, family and both work and family roles. Measured role salience differed from women managers’ expressed role salience.

Women managers with a measured role salience for work and both work and family had significantly more Work Interfering with Family (WIF) conflict than managers with a family salient role. There was no significant difference in Family Interfering with Work (FIW) conflict among the women managers with any salient roles.
When expressed role salience was considered, there were no significant differences in WIF or FIW conflict.

Results of the study indicated that there were no significant differences in the leadership practices of women managers with a role salience for work, family, and both work and family. Women managers identified as having WIF conflict did not significantly engage in more leadership practices than those identified as having FIW conflict. Recommendations for future research and for practice are also provided.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

During the last 30 years, the roles of men and women in the workforce, and to a lesser extent in the home, have changed dramatically (Roehling & Moen, 2003). The change was supported by the Women’s movement, which successfully advocated for the equal opportunity of women in the workplace (Friedan, 1963), and by the steady decline in the earning power of men’s wages, making women’s employment a necessity for many families in the 1970s (Mishel, Bernstein, & Schmitt, 2001; Wilkie, 1991).

Until the 1960s, the traditional breadwinner/homemaker lifestyle was the norm for middle-class married couples, and it gave way to the dual-earner couple, defined as a dyad in which both members work for pay (Deutsch & Saxon, 1998; Higgins, Duxbury, & Lee, 1994; Roehling & Moen, 2003). As women streamed into the workplace, they entered fields previously thought fit only for men (Coltrane, 1966; Steil, 2000). With the increase in women’s labor force participation, a related increase in dual-earner couples occurred (Barnett, 2004). By the year 2000, the gap in labor force participation between single and married women dropped from 35% to 8% (Heymann, 2000). In 2004, dual-earner couples represented 51% of married couple families (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2005a). In recent years, a dramatic increase in women’s labor force participation has occurred among women with very young children: 32% of mothers with children under age six worked in 1970; whereas in 2004, 62% of them did (Friedman,
Considering dual-earner families, the labor force participation rate for married mothers with children under age 18 in 2004 was 68% and for married mothers of infants the rate was 52% (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2005b).

Specifically looking at the growth trend of the labor market for women, it is interesting to note that the largest increase in female employment since 1983 has been in managerial and professional occupations (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 2004). In 2002, women in these occupations increased by 12.2% from 1983 and represented 33.7% of the total labor force in the category of management, executive and administrative (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 2004). Considering women in corporate management positions, a 2002 study of women corporate officers reported that women held 15.7% of corporate office positions in Fortune 500 companies, which was up from 12.4% in 2000 and 8.7% in 1995 (Koss-Feder, 2003). Additionally, women were noted to comprise 5.2% of the top earning corporate officers compared to 4.1% in 2000 and 1.2% in 1995 (Koss-Feder).

These data indicate that women are much more of a presence in the workforce today than they have been historically, and they are particularly gaining ground in managerial and professional positions, although their progress has been slow. Some experts indicate that equality in top management positions between men and women, will not balance out for another 20-30 years (Crampton & Mishra, 1999). Research relating to working women is vast; however, research specifically targeting women managers is lacking. Considering the growing trend of women in management, empirical research relating to women managers, especially those with dependent children, is an area worthy of continued research.
The increase of dual-earner couples has prompted changes in the responsibilities of these men and women in their work and family roles. Combining the roles of family and work can be particularly challenging for the professional woman manager as she works towards fulfilling the expectations both roles hold. The roles of mother and wife are likely to conflict with those of manager and leader, particularly when young children are in the home (Duxbury, Higgins, & Lee, 1994; Marshall & Barnett, 1993; Roehling, Moen, & Batt, 2003). Role salience, or the importance of the identity characterized by a range of behaviors attributed to a social role (Stryker & Serpe, 1994), plays a part in this conflict. Greenhaus and Beutrell (1985) proposed that conflict between family and work roles is more likely to occur when both work and family have a high salience for the individual. Empirical research conducted by Cinamon and Rich (2002a) supported this theory.

The distinct role salient profiles of work, family and dual (high importance of both work and family roles) were identified by Cinamon and Rich (2002a) among a sample of married working women and men. These profiles were similar to the theoretical research based role orientations identified by Parasuramon and Greenhaus (1993), and proposed to exist among women managers. Cinamon and Rich found that members of the work profile and dual profile had higher levels of work-family conflict than members of the family profile.

Work-family conflict is viewed as a form of interrole conflict in which the demands of work and family roles are mutually incompatible so that meeting the demands in one domain makes it difficult to meet the demands in the other domain (Greenhaus & Beutrell, 1985). Considering work-family conflict among career women,
Greenhaus, Parasuraman, Granrose, Rabinowitz, and Beutell (1989) found in their study of a matched set of 119 men and 119 women who were partners in a two-career relationship, that work salience affected work-family conflict among women only. Their results indicated that highly job involved women devoted extensive time to work and/or experienced high levels of work induced stress, both of which contributed to work-family conflict. Other research has shown that the work-family conflict is bidirectional (e.g., Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998) such that family can interfere with work (FIW) and work can interfere with family (WIF).

Although research has identified both direct and moderator effects of salience on well-being within specific social roles (see Krause, 1994; Luchetta, 1995; Martire, Stephens, & Townsend, 2000; Pleck 1985; Simon, 1992; Thoits, 1992, 1995) and role salience effects on well-being as it interfaces with work-family conflict (Noor, 2004), research is lacking on the relationship of role salience and work-family conflict for women managers as leaders in their organizations. It is unclear whether or not the importance of family role, work role, or both work and family roles to a woman manager has any relationship to her capacity for being an effective leader in her organization. This research is important in order to inform professionals in the counseling field as they work with women entering the work force, or with those already in the work force, who are seeking assistance with work related issues. Research outcomes may also inform industry for optimizing placement of women employees in managerial positions in preparation for further advancement to upper levels of management.

As the number of women in upper management positions has slowly risen, there have been a variety of views that attempt to explain why women are not represented in
greater numbers. One of these explanations is the “glass ceiling” which has often been cited as an artificial barrier based on attitudinal or organizational bias which prevents qualified people from advancement to upper management (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1991). From a feminist perspective, Heilman (2001) viewed the glass ceiling as a natural consequence of gender stereotypes and the biased evaluations people generate, as a result of holding these stereotypes, inhibit women from progressing upward to the top of organizations. She argued that gender stereotypes and the expectations they produce about what women are like and how they should behave can result in a devaluation of their performance, denial of credit for their successes, or their penalizations for being competent.

Research has shown that traditional stereotypes of women and men are predominate in both work settings and non-work settings with upper level managerial positions characterized generally in masculine terms (Heilman, 2001; Schein, 2001). In this respect, men and women are thought to differ in terms of agentic and communal traits with men being aggressive, independent and decisive, whereas women are characterized as helpful and concerned about others (Heilman).

Moreover, the literature also contains increasing indications that women incur additional disadvantages in the workplace when it becomes evident that they are mothers (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). According to expectation states theory (Wagner & Berger, 1997), a categorical distinction among people is a status characteristic when widely-held cultural beliefs associate greater status worthiness and competence with one category of the distinction than another. Using expectation states theory, Ridgeway and Correll (2004) proposed that when motherhood becomes a salient descriptor of a worker it, like
other devalued social distinctions including gender, downwardly biases the evaluations of
the worker’s job competence and suitability for positions of authority. These authors
based their theory of motherhood being a status characteristic largely on indirect
evidence. This means that the outcomes of the research implied that widely-shared
cultural beliefs associate primary caretakers with lower status and lesser general
competence (beyond the specialized realm of nurturance) compared to similar others who
are not in the mother role.

It should be noted that some of the empirical research which supported their
theory had been conducted with college students and not with employed personnel.
Some researchers (e.g., Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004; Etaugh & Folger, 1998) of those
studies justified their use of student samples by stating that students were going to make
decisions about work and family roles in the near future; and some acknowledged that
students’ perceptions of work and family roles were likely based on stereotypic
assumptions.

In summary, there are a number of views which attempt to explain the lack of
women in upper management levels. One of these explanations is the glass ceiling.
Feminism views the glass ceiling barrier as the result of gender stereotypes (Heilman,
2001) which depict men as agentic/achievement oriented and women as
communal/service oriented. Another explanation suggests that motherhood negatively
biases the evaluation of the worker’s job competence and suitability for authority
positions compared to similar nonmothers (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Exploring the
relationships between role salience and leadership practices for both mothers and
nonmothers may provide data to assist in challenging gender role stereotypes while
informing the business and counseling communities of women’s potential as leaders in their organizations.

*Leadership*

Planning, organizing, leading and controlling/coordinate are four major functions associated with traditional views of management (McNamara, 1999). In order to be an effective member of an organization, one needs to be able to emphasize different skills at different times (McNamara). It is important to realize that effective leadership is imperative for molding a group of people into a team and shaping the team into a force that serves as a competitive business advantage (Kotelnikov, 2005). In this regard, the literature supports various explanations for behavioral and leadership style differences or similarities between women and men in leadership positions.

Ridgeway (2001) proposed that sex differences in influence and leadership occur because people presume that men are more competent and legitimate as leaders than are women. Her argument was based on the existence of gender stereotypes which contain beliefs associating greater overall competence with men more than women in addition to ascribing each sex particular skills. She asserted that in mixed sex contexts or contexts culturally associated with men, women’s efforts to assert authority would create resistance and dislike and, therefore, reduce their effectiveness as leaders. However, in situations that were culturally associated with women, they would not encounter resistance to their assertion of authority because gender status gives women a slight advantage in those situations.

From the perspective of social role theory of sex differences and similarities (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000), Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) argued that sex
differences and similarities vary with social contexts. They asserted that managers and other leaders occupy roles defined by their specific position in a hierarchy and also function under constraints of their gender roles. These authors argued that gender roles have different implications for the behavior of female and male leaders because not only do their roles have different content (ascribing concern for others to women; ascribing assertiveness and decisiveness to men) but there is often inconsistency between the predominantly communal qualities that perceivers associate with women and the predominantly agentic qualities that they think are required to succeed as a leader.

Eagly and Johnson (1990) found both the presence and absence of differences between the sexes in different settings in their meta-analysis of studies comparing leadership styles of women and men. In organizational settings, female and male leaders did not differ which was in contrast to the gender stereotypic expectation that women lead in an interpersonally oriented style and men lead in a task oriented style. However, in laboratory experiments and assessment studies gender stereotypic expectations prevailed. In these studies, contextual dimensions and leader power were likely omitted in scenarios, which allowed respondents to rely on gender stereotypes when judging another’s behavior (Ragins, 1991; Vecchio, 2002). Additionally in each setting, there was a tendency for women to adopt a more democratic or participative style and a less autocratic or directive style than men.

From a feminist perspective, leadership is enacted within a gendered context (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001). This means contexts exist on a continuum ranging from male dominated, hierarchical, power-expressive to transformational
contexts stressing empowerment of followers. The sex composition of the group, task characteristics, and shifting standards of acceptable behavior are variations of context that form a setting which is more or less congenial to women and affect what is and is not effective for women operating in a particular context (Yoder, 2001).

Leadership styles can be thought of on a continuum with one end being highly masculinized and the other end represented by transformational leadership. On the masculinized end, agentic leader behavior is valued. The group is mostly composed of male followers who are task oriented. It generally appears as a hierarchical organization that identifies leadership in terms of dominance and resistance to unwanted demands of others (Yoder, 2001). Transformational leadership, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of the leader’s vision in giving direction and meaning to followers; stresses influence, not power; empowerment of self and others; valuing group outcomes and cohesiveness; and satisfaction and development of individuals as indicators of leader effectiveness rather than emphasis on only task performance (Yoder). Although transformational leadership may be considered as a feminizing reaction to the masculinized model of hierarchical leadership (Yoder), much of the research on effective transformational leadership portrays male leaders (e.g., Conger, 1999) such as U.S. presidents (Fiol, Harris, & House, 1999). This suggests that transformational leadership is not the exclusive domain of women nor does it construct an uncongenial context for men due to its seemingly communal characteristics (Yoder).

To summarize, no one leader style has proven to be best in all contexts (Larson, Hunt, & Osburn, 1976; Nystrom, 1978; Schriesheim, 1982). Studies have shown that
gender role stereotypes affect leader behaviors in different contexts and also affect the acceptability of those behaviors, especially those of women, as they are perceived by others. Using a measure of transformational leadership in the current research appears to be appropriate for measuring leadership practices for women.

Statement of the Problem

Understanding how role salience and work-family conflict relate to women’s managerial leadership practices is an important area of research. Women have proven they are capable of overcoming some of the glass ceiling barriers, slow as progress may be, as evidenced by the increasing number of women in managerial and professional positions. Nevertheless, women continue to face numerous challenges in their progression to upper levels of management as they attempt to fulfill work and family responsibilities as well as satisfy role expectations in both domains, often times leading to work-family conflict. Gender role stereotypes also continue to be obstacles for women in their professional careers. As a result of these factors, women managers’ competence as leaders in their organizations and their commitment to their careers has been questioned.

Rationale

Although research has addressed sex differences and similarities in leadership behaviors, styles, and effectiveness, it has not addressed how factors such as role salience and work-family conflict relate to leadership practices for women managers. This is an important area of research for the counseling field in order to expand the knowledge base about women managers, specifically targeting women with children, and to assist in dispelling myths and gender stereotypes that have become obstacles to advancement.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current research is to investigate the relationship between role salience, work-family conflict and women’s managerial leadership practices. Therefore, the following six questions will be investigated:

1. Is there a relationship between demographic variables and leadership practices of women managers, specifically: age, marital status, length of service with organization, ages of children living at home, and length of time in current position?

2. How do leadership practices of women managers with children compare to those of women managers without children?

3. Can women managers be differentiated based on their salience for work and family roles?

4. What is the relationship between role salience and work-family conflict for women managers?

5. Does role salience relate to leadership practices for women managers with children and for women managers without children?

6. What is the relationship between work interfering with family (WIF) and leadership practices and between family interfering with work (FIW) and leadership practices?

Implications

Research outcomes may inform industry for optimizing placement of women employees in managerial positions for further advancement. In addition, outcomes may
inform professionals in the counseling field who are working with women on issues related to work.

**Delimitations**

The sample in this study is limited to women in middle to upper level management positions in for-profit organizations in the United States. Women will be selected between the ages of 22 and 55 years, single and married, with and without dependent children living at home.

**Organization of the Study**

In order to gain a greater awareness of this area, a review of the evolution of the dual-earner couple and gender-difference myths will be provided in Chapter II. In addition, role salience with emphasis on work and family and the emergence of work-family conflict, will be discussed. Numerous obstacles that women encounter as managers, and as mothers, will be reviewed highlighting gender role stereotyping research. A discussion of leader behavior including sex differences, similarities and contextual effects, along with a discussion of women’s leadership effectiveness will conclude Chapter II. The methodology and measures utilized to answer the current research questions will be outlined in Chapter III. In Chapter IV, the results of the research will be presented. Finally in Chapter V, a discussion of the results, conclusions, and future research recommendations will be offered.

**Definition of Terms**

For purposes of clarification the following definitions will be used throughout this study:

**Dual-Earner Couple** – a dyad in which both members work for pay.
**Glass Ceiling** – an artificial barrier based on attitudinal or organizational bias which prevents qualified people from advancement to upper management.

**Role Salience** – the importance of the identity characterized by a range of behaviors attributed to a social role.

**Work-Family Conflict** – a form of interrole conflict in which the demands of work and family roles are mutually incompatible so that meeting the demands in one domain makes it difficult to meet the demands in the other domain.

**Leadership** – a relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow; identifiable by a collection of practices and behaviors rather than only a position.

**Leadership practices** – the degree in which the leader demonstrates capacity in the Five Practices of: (1) Challenging the Process (search for opportunities, experiment and take risks); (2) Inspiring a Shared Vision (envision the future, enlist others); (3) Enabling Others to Act (foster collaboration, strengthen others); (4) Modeling the Way (set the example, plan small wins); and (5) Encouraging the Heart (recognize individual contribution, celebrate accomplishments).
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

More than any other time in history, today’s workforce is composed of an increasing number of women, especially in managerial and professional positions, albeit their progress into these areas has been slow (U. S. Dept. of Labor, 2004). Dual-earner couples are striving to manage work and family responsibilities while attempting to satisfy role expectations in both domains (Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997). For women, this has presented multiple new challenges in their progression to upper level management positions and as a result, their leadership capabilities and commitment to their careers have been called into question. Research in these areas to inform and dispel myths is important for professionals in the counseling field to address. A discussion of the evolution of the dual-earner couple (Roehling & Moen, 2003) and gender-difference myths (Barnett, 2004) will begin the review. It should be noted that this discussion does not necessarily reflect the work history of women of color. Role salience (Noor, 2004), with an emphasis on work and family, and the emergence of work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) will follow. Various obstacles that women encounter as managers, as well as being working mothers, will be reviewed with a focus on gender role stereotyping research. Finally, a discussion of leader behavior including sex differences, similarities, and contextual effects will then be followed by a discussion of women’s effectiveness as leaders and strategies for enhancement (Yoder, 2001). The
chapter will conclude with a summary and an outline of the specific hypotheses of the proposed research.

*Evolution of Dual-Earner Couples*

Throughout the last quarter of the twentieth century, a dramatic change occurred in the roles of men and women in the workforce of industrialized society. The prevailing belief at the beginning of the twentieth century positioned women as better suited for the home and men as better suited for the workplace (Albee & Perry, 1998; Coltrane, 1996; Mintz, 2000). Belief in the stereotype of viewing women as the weaker sex, needing protection from the cruelties of the word, and viewing men as stronger and better suited to the rigors of the workplace (Albee & Perry; Ferree, 1990) allowed employers of that time to refuse to hire single women of marriageable age, to fire women when they married, and to refuse to hire married women (Kessler-Harris, 2001).

These beliefs also kept men out of the home as they were based on the idea that men’s inherent nature did not suit them to the domestic world (Chadorow, 1974). Men were expected to devote their full energies to the workplace where their special talents could be applied (Barnett, 2004). To satisfy the provider role, married men often worked long hours, relinquishing any real relationship with their children and relegated their wives to full-time parenting (Mintz, 2000).

An example of the conflict between family and career is found in the history of women in teaching (Weiler, 1997). Although teaching was one of the few career options available to educated women in the early 1900s, it was not a family-friendly occupation for women as it excluded married women but not married men (Padmanabhan, 2000). The bans on married female teachers remained in many communities until the late 1950s.
and pregnancy bans, that is, dismissing women teachers when they announced their pregnancies, remained until the late 1960s (Barnett, 2004).

From a feminist perspective, these types of bans were based on gender-difference myths (Barnett, 2004) which were contested during World War II when female labor restrictions were lifted due to shortages of civilian male labor (Kossoudj & Dresser, 1992). Single and married women, with or without children, were employed to do heavy factory work previously thought suitable only for men (Albee & Perry, 1998). Once the war was over, women were pushed out of the factories to make room for the returning soldiers and the myth of the uniquely caring, nurturant mother took hold (Kossoudj & Dresser). According to Barnett, this version of the gender-difference myth saw only mothers as having the special innate abilities needed to promote children’s healthy development. This belief permitted employers to fire pregnant women and kept many women from seeking employment when their children were young (Williams, 2001).

In the 1970s, external pressures stemming from the economy forced more and more women into the workplace and the myth of the uniquely nurturant mother was refuted (Barnett, 2004). By 2001, the portion of households with two employed parents doubled since 1950, making dual-earner couples the largest group of families in the workplace (Friedman, 2001). This trend is likely to continue as more women with children continue to enter the labor force (Roehling & Moen, 2003).

The rise in number of dual-earner couples has spurred changes for these men and women in order to combine responsibilities of work and family. For example, the length of the average work week has changed little over the past twenty years; however considering an average couple in 1997 as compared to an average couple in 1970, the
aggregate amount of time that couples spend at work has increased to ten hours more per week (Jacobs & Gerson, 1998; Mishel et al., 2001). Because of the lack of time, working couples may have difficulty maintaining the home, nurturing relationships within the family, and caring for children and aging family members (Roehling & Moen, 2003). To cope, many couples delay or limit childbearing; turn down jobs that require a heavy workload, travel or relocation; and reduce their commitment to work in order to meet the needs of the family (Roehling & Moen). Yet, traditional gender role schemas still prevail when dual-earner couples are forced to make choices between the career of the husband or the wife (Roehling & Moen). For example, men are more likely than women to relocate the family for their job (Bielby & Bielby, 1992) and to travel for work (Moore, 2002; Roehling & Bultman, 2002). Moreover, the presence of children in the home decreases the chances that the wife will travel for work, but does not affect the husband’s propensity to travel (Roehling & Bultman).

For professional woman managers, combining the roles of family and work can be very challenging as they work toward fulfilling responsibilities in each domain. The roles of mother and wife are likely to conflict with those of manager and leader, particularly when young children are in the home (Duxbury et al., 1994; Marshall & Barnett, 1993; Roehling et al., 2003). Contemporary cultural beliefs about the mother role include a normative expectation that mothers will and should engage in “intensive” mothering that prioritizes meeting the needs of dependent children above all other activities (Hays, 1996). According to Hays, the cultural logic of intensive mothering in American society today assumes that the good mother will direct her time and emotional energy toward her children without limit. Another normative belief in American society,
however, is that the ideal worker be unencumbered by competing demands and be always there for his or her employer (Acker, 1990; Hays; Williams, 2001). According to this ideal worker belief, the best and most competent worker is the committed worker who demonstrates intensive effort on the job through actions that appear to sacrifice all other concerns for work (Epstein, Seron, Oglensky, & Saute, 1999; Williams).

Ridgeway and Correll (2004) asserted that the normative beliefs of the good mother and ideal worker create an inverse cultural connection between performance of the motherhood role and performance of the committed worker role which leads to the assumption that a good mother must give less effort and priority to work demands and, therefore, be a less committed worker. Based on empirical research on stereotypes associated with motherhood (e.g. Cuddy et al., 2004) and indirect evidence which implies status and competence of the motherhood role (e.g., Crittenden, 2001; Deaux & Kite, 1987; England, 1992; Kilbourne, England, Farkas, Beron, & Weir, 1994), Ridgeway and Correll proposed that the motherhood role of primary caretaker is culturally associated with reduced performance capacity for tasks outside the realm of child care. According to these authors, “The normative assumption that mothers are less committed workers combines with diffuse perceptions of reduced ability to create cultural expectations for lower general competence for mothers compared to otherwise similar nonmothers” (p. 692). Continued research in this area is important to assist in dispelling stereotypes and reducing barriers as they relate to women managers, as well as to inform professionals in the counseling, psychology and business communities of women managers’ efficacy as leaders.
Role Importance or Salience

An important part of social structure in this country comes from the roles with which individuals identify. These roles give individuals a definition of who and what they are (Reitzes & Mutran, 1994). Roles are attached to statuses, which Merton (1957) defined as positions in society. An individual holding a status plays a number of roles associated with it. Status is also associated with identity, defined as the meaning one attributes to himself or herself by virtue of holding a particular role in a social structure that he or she subsequently views as self descriptive (Thoits, 1995). An individual has many roles and, as a result, has many identities; however, these identities are not equally salient to the individual (Noor, 2004).

Researchers have used the concept of identity salience to explain the choices that people make among a range of behaviors linked to various social roles (Stryker & Serpe, 1994). Role salience or importance was described by Noor (2004) as providing individuals with meaning, self-worth and purpose. It has also been called role centrality (Martire et al., 2000), role commitment (Brown, Bifulco, & Harris, 1987), and personal involvement (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). Greenhaus and Beutrell (1985) proposed that conflict between family and work roles is more likely to occur when both work and family have a high salience for the individual. Salience of family and work roles was the focus in the research of Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993).

Based in part on empirical research (e.g., Devanna, 1987; Hochschild, 1989; Greenhaus et al., 1989; Schneer & Reitman, 1990), Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) theorized that women managers varied in their salience toward work and family roles which were reflected in three orientations: career-primary, family-primary, and career
and family. These authors identified the career-primary orientation as represented by strongly career committed women, giving top priority to achieving success in their career, and subordinating their personal and social lives. Family-primary orientation was represented by women having emphasis primarily on family; pursuing careers within the constraints of family demands and obligations. This group was thought to reflect the majority of married women in dual-earner relationships whose career is tied to the need to be responsive to the family. The career and family orientation was represented by women having equal emphasis on career and family, expecting to combine a rapidly advancing career with rigorous involvement in marriage and parenthood. The career and family orientation was likely to produce extensive role conflict and stress. This role conflict was referred to by Greenhaus and Beutrell (1985) as work-family conflict.

Using the perspective of role theory, Greenhaus and Beutrell (1985) defined work-family conflict as friction in the degree to which individuals find that role pressures from the work and non-work domains are incompatible in some respect. In early research, work-family conflict was measured unidirectionally (Cinamon & Rich, 2002b) in terms of work interfering with family. However, more recent research (e.g., Carlson et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998) has shown that the relationship between work and family is bidirectional, that is, family can interfere with work (FIW) in addition to work interfering with family (WIF). WIF conflict arises when work-related activities interfere with home responsibilities (e.g., bringing work home to complete interferes with family activities), and FIW conflict occurs when family role responsibilities hinder work activities (e.g., canceling an important meeting because one’s sick child needs to be taken home from school). Although these two types of work-family conflict are strongly
correlated, they are conceptually distinct constructs supported by empirical evidence (Duxbury et al., 1994; Frone et al., 1992; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991).

According to Kinnunen and Mauno (1998), the best predictors of WIF conflict are work domain variables and the best predictors of FIW conflict are mainly family domain variables. Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) found this relationship to exist among women managers as they examined the literature relating to the interdependence of women managers’ career and family involvements.

Based on the literature establishing the presence of relationships among these variables and acknowledging the mutual interdependence between women managers’ careers and other life pursuits, Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) proposed that women’s family experiences had direct and indirect effects on their career outcomes and that career experiences had direct and indirect effects on their family outcomes. What they described were facets of work-family conflict. These authors argued that extensive family activity involvements could have direct and indirect negative effect on women managers’ career achievements by

(1) producing career-family time conflicts, (i.e., time devoted to one role makes it difficult to participate in the other role); resolved through reduced career involvement or time commitment to the job,

(2) producing symptoms of strain (e.g., fatigue, irritability) that can intrude into the job domain inhibiting involvement, performance or success; resolved through social support derived from different sources (e.g., family, friends) and supportive behaviors including emotional support and/or direct assistance,
(3) reinforcing organizational stereotypes that women with children are not serious about their careers which in turn limit women’s opportunities for development and advancement; dispelled by some women adopting a “supermom” strategy combining extensive career involvement and efforts to spend extended time with children, and

(4) provoking spouse’s feelings of competition or jealousy to which women could respond by limiting their career involvement.

Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) asserted that limiting career involvement could appear as restricting time devoted to the job, seeking less demanding jobs and/or refusing a promotion, less psychological investment in a career, cutting back on job-related travel, or unwillingness to relocate. These types of strategies for managing work-family conflict, however, can impede women managers’ career advancement and earning potential (Markham, 1987; Olson & Frieze, 1987; Williams, 2001).

Reviewing the literature from a career perspective, Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) proposed that women’s level of involvement in their careers could impact the family domain directly or indirectly by

(1) affecting their personal well-being in terms of stress and conflict, (e.g., time conflicts between career role, spouse or parent roles and personal free time); resolved by minimizing their family involvements, limiting time with friends/nurturing friendships and reducing personal free time,

(2) influencing their decisions regarding marriage and parenthood, (e.g., women strongly committed to their managerial careers have tended not to marry, or if they are married, tend not to have children), and
(3) affecting the quality of their family relationships (e.g., children compound the problems of career-family conflicts in terms of caring for children at home; sometimes resolved by extending temporary leaves to permanently leaving the work force due to short maternity leaves and limited availability of flexible work schedules. Moreover, women’s career experiences are more likely to strain their marriages when they pose a threat to their husbands, for example, when wives are employed in nontraditional jobs, achieve higher occupational status or attain higher or equivalent salaries than their husbands. Parasuraman and Greenhaus indicated that research (e.g., Simpson & England, 1981; Spitze & Smith, 1985; Wilk, 1986) suggests that the marital stability and happiness of women managers are strongly affected by husbands’ reactions to their employment, status, success, and earnings.

Similar to the theoretically based role salience orientations of women managers that Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) described, Cinamon and Rich (2002a) found three distinct profiles among both men and women in their empirical research with married lawyers and individuals working in the computer software and hardware field. These authors investigated participants’ (N=213) simultaneous attributions of relative importance of family and work roles and the contribution of these attributions to the understanding of work-family conflict. Those who ascribed high importance to the work role and low importance to the family role were identified as having a work profile. The work profile included the oldest participants who invested many hours at work and fewest hours in housework and received the least spousal support. Individuals who attributed high importance to the family role and low importance to the work role were identified as having a family profile. The family profile included participants who
worked less hours in formal employment relative to the others, invested the most hours in housework and received much spousal support. Persons who assigned high importance to both the work role and family role were identified as having a dual profile. This profile included the youngest participants who invested many hours in both roles.

With respect to work-family conflict, significant differences emerged between the profiles, $F(2, 208) = 3.76, p < .01$. As Cinamon and Rich (2002a) hypothesized, members of the work profile and dual profile demonstrated higher levels of WIF conflict than did individuals in the family profile. Sheffé paired comparisons showed that differences were significant ($p < .01$). However, contrary to what Cinamon and Rich hypothesized, participants from the family profile did not show a significantly higher level of FIW conflict relative to members of the other profiles. These results partially supported the earlier research of Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, and Beutell (1996) in which it was found that for men and women entrepreneurs ($N = 111$) work involvement, representing work salience, led to WIF conflict whereas family involvement, representing family salience, led to FIW conflict.

In an additional analysis with the same sample, Cinamon and Rich (2002b) investigated sex differences between the three profiles and significant sex differences were found, $x^2 = 7.90; df = 2; p < .01$. As hypothesized, more women than men fit the family profile, whereas more men than women fit the work profile. There were no significant differences in the number of men and women in the dual profile. Considering sex distributions within each profile, men were equally distributed in the three profiles (approximately 33%). However, similar numbers of women fit the family and dual profiles (approximately 40%) but they were underrepresented in the work profile when
compared to men. The researchers argued that these results, along with the fact that more than one-third of both men and women ascribed high importance to both work and family roles, indicated significant deviation from traditional gender-based attitudes toward social roles. They noted that family was an important domain for many men, and work was an important domain for many women.

One of the limitations of this study, however, concerns the sample. Participants were between the ages of 20 and 50, married, Israeli computer workers and lawyers in the middle and upper-middle socioeconomic levels. Generalizability of the results to their counterparts in Western countries without further research is inappropriate, despite some research (e.g., Adler & Izraeli, 1994) which suggested that this population shares similar conditions and occupational characteristics as their Western counterparts.

In summary, individuals’ salience for various social roles is said to provide them with meaning, self worth and purpose (Noor, 2004). Some research has found that individuals who combine work and family domains have salience for work, for family, or equally for both work and family roles. The conflict that emerges between work and family roles has been identified as work-family conflict, and it can originate in either work or family domains. Conflict can arise from work interfering with family life (WIF) or family demands interfering with work (FIW).

Work-Family Conflict

After examining the literature on conflict between work and family roles, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) proposed a model of work-family conflict involving the following three sources of conflict resulting from role pressure incompatibility. (1) Time-based conflict was said to occur when either time pressures associated with membership
in one role made it physically impossible to comply with the expectations of another role; or that pressures produced a preoccupation with one role even when one was attempting to meet the demands of another role. (2) Strain-based conflict was said to be associated with symptoms such as fatigue and irritability and existed when strain in one role affected one’s performance in another role. In effect, the roles were incompatible to the extent that the strain created by one made it difficult to comply with the demands of another. (3) Behavior-based conflict was proposed to occur when specific patterns of behavior in one role were incompatible with expectations of behavior in another role.

Work-family conflict has been associated with diminished satisfaction and lower levels of psychological well-being (e.g., Frone et al., 1992; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). While WIF conflict is more associated with work-related outcomes such as job and life satisfactions (Kossek & Ozeki) and job satisfaction and burnout (e.g., Bacharach, Bamberger, & Conley, 1991; Burke, 1988; Gignac, Kelloway, & Gottlieb, 1996), FIW conflict is associated more with measures of psychological distress (Frone et al., 1992; Klitzman, House, Israel, & Mero, 1990).

The literature also provides evidence of research involving salience of life roles. For example, O’Neil and Greenberger (1994) found that individuals with a strong commitment to both work and parental roles showed higher levels of role stress than did individuals who were highly committed to only one of the roles. However, the literature does not contain research addressing the relationship of role salience and work-family conflict to leadership practices in the work domain, specifically as it applies to women managers. This is an important area for research because, “A major obstacle for women
who aspire to achieve a managerial position is the presence of constraints imposed upon them by society, the family and women themselves” (Crampton & Mishra, 1999, p. 88).

**Barriers Facing Women as Professionals and Parents**

Although the number of women in management has increased in recent years, the advancement of women in upper management has not kept pace (Crampton & Mishra, 1999). There are varied views that have been asserted to explain why there are so few women at top organizational levels. Forbes, Piercy, and Hayes (1988) described a school of thought that identifies intense competition for top executive positions as a barrier for women to overcome. This perspective proposes that until women reach general management positions in significant numbers, it is unlikely that they will be chosen as chief executives of major corporations. The identification of time and supply for the disparity of women at top organizational levels has been described as having to “fill the pipeline” (Forbes et al.). As a rebuttal to this argument, women now represent 33.7% of the management, executive, administrative category in the labor market (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004), yet women still comprise only about 5% of top earning corporate officer positions (Koss-Feder, 2003). In their study of almost 2,000 female executives, Forbes et al. found that there had been a major shift into vice president and executive vice president positions, although there had been only a slight increase in women presidents. Additionally, they found that women comprised only 5-6% of newly appointed executives. These data indicate that progress into the upper levels of management continues to be slow for women despite their increased numbers in management positions.
An article in the July issue of *Economist.com* (2005) (the online version of *The Economist* weekly magazine covering politics, economics and international affairs) discussed a survey of an unspecified number of top businesswomen in America who gave three main explanations for why so few women reach upper levels of management. Each of these was viewed as a barrier to advancement. One reason mentioned was the exclusion of women from informal networks, such as the almost traditional practice of sales teams taking potential clients to establishments which specifically exclude most women. It was pointed out, however, that this male “clubbishness” was being countered by an increasing number of business women forming their own networks. Another barrier noted was the lack of role models. This was in reference to the fact that there are too few women in top positions to mentor women in lesser positions. It was stated that for many successful businesswomen, having a supportive father or role models earlier in life was important. Other obstacles identified for women to overcome were negative attitudes and stereotyping women’s lack of capacity for leadership. The statement was made that “everyone” is unconsciously biased and there is strong evidence that men are biased against promoting women inside companies. This statement, however, was supported only by referring to the landmark case of *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins* (1989) in which Ann Hopkins sued her employer when she was not given a partnership and she eventually won her case in the Supreme Court. Although the *Economist.com* article does not represent scholarly research, it does show evidence of an awareness that women continue to face specific obstacles for advancement to upper levels of management.

The types of barriers thus far mentioned have commonly been referred to as the “glass ceiling.” Morrison, White, and Van Velsor (1987) asserted that the glass ceiling
presents an impenetrable barrier at some point in a woman’s career. The coining of the phrase, glass ceiling, is often credited to Hymowitz and Schellhardt, authors of the 1986 *Wall Street Journal* article entitled: “The Glass Ceiling: Why Women Can’t Seem to Break the Invisible Barrier That Blocks Them From the Top Jobs” (Cornell University ILR School, 2005). In 1991, the U.S. Department of Labor defined glass ceiling as “those artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified individuals from advancing upward in their organization into management-level positions” (p. 2). Some of these barriers have been referred to as myths, preconceived ideas, or unsupported notions (Crampton & Mischra, 1999). From a feminist perspective, Heilman (2001) viewed the glass ceiling as a natural consequence of gender stereotypes, and the biased evaluations they produce inhibit women from progressing upward to the top of organizations. She argued that gender stereotypes and the expectations they create about what women are like and how they should behave can result in devaluation of their performance, denial of credit to them for their successes or their penalizations for being competent.

*Gender Stereotypes*

Much research has been conducted on gender stereotypes. Stereotyped beliefs about the attributes of men and women are pervasive, widely shared and have proven to be very resistant to change (Dodge, Gilroy, & Fenzel, 1995; Lueptow, Garovich-Szabo, & Lueptow, 2001). Overall, men and women are thought to differ both in terms of achievement-oriented traits, often referred to as agentic traits, and in social-/service-oriented traits, often referred to as communal traits (Bakan, 1966). As a result, men are characterized as aggressive, forceful, independent and decisive, whereas women are
characterized as kind, helpful, sympathetic and concerned about others (Heilman, 2001). Research has shown that traditional stereotypes of women and men predominate in work settings as well as non-work settings with upper level managerial positions generally characterized in masculine terms (Heilman, 2001; Schein, 2001). For example, empirical findings have consistently indicated that a good manager is described predominantly by masculine attributes (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989; Powell & Butterfield, 1989; Schein, 2001) and that stereotypical male qualities are thought necessary for being a successful executive (Martell, Parker, Emrich, & Crawford, 1998).

Thus, management has traditionally implied maleness and this has often carried with it particular managerial and leadership qualities women are assumed to lack (Hearn, 1994). In general, gender stereotypes promote the idea that women are more emotional, intuitive, and socially oriented, whereas men are more dominant, rational, and instrumentally or task-oriented (Willemsen, 2002). According to Heilman (2001), gender bias in evaluations results from having stereotypic conceptions about what women are and what they should be like coupled with the belief that good management is also a manly business. Because gender bias exists in work setting evaluations, there is no assurance that women will advance to the same organizational level as an equivalently performing man (Heilman).

Managerial gender role stereotyping was also the subject of research conducted by Schein in the early 1970s. Her two empirical investigations showed that both men (Schein, 1973) and women (Schein, 1975) who were middle managers perceived successful middle managers as possessing characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments more commonly ascribed to men in general than to women in general. As a follow-up
study, Brenner, Tomkiewicz, and Schein (1989) replicated Schein’s studies. Their sample consisted of 420 men and 173 women who were middle-line managers from nine firms located in the northeastern United States. The Schein Descriptive Index (Schein, 1973) was the measure used to define both gender role stereotypes and characteristics of successful middle managers. Three forms of the measure were used: one with men’s descriptions, one with women’s descriptions, and one with successful managers’ descriptions. Intraclass correlation coefficients from two randomized-groups analyses of variance were computed to determine the degree of similarity between the descriptions of men and managers and women and managers. For the men responding, there was a significant relationship between the rating on the questionnaires eliciting descriptions of men and on those for descriptions of managers (r = .72, p < .01), whereas there was a near zero, nonsignificant correspondence between the ratings for the descriptions of women and managers (r = -.01). This supported the hypothesis that the male respondents perceived managers as possessing characteristics more commonly ascribed to men than to women. These results were similar to Schein’s (1973) results with male managers.

Among the female respondents, however, the research replication did not support the hypothesis that managers were seen as possessing characteristics more commonly ascribed to men than to women. For the women, there was a significant relationship between the ratings on the questionnaires that described men and managers (r = .59, p < .01) and a similar correspondence between the ratings of the descriptions of women and managers (r = .52, p < .01). According to Brenner et al. (1989), this outcome appeared to be a result of a changed view of women rather than a change in perceptions of men or perceptions of requirements for managerial success.
Although not specifically focusing on women managers, the literature offers increasing indications that women incur additional disadvantages in the workplace, due to stereotyping, when they make known they are mothers (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). For example, Budig and England (2001) found in their research that employed mothers on average have a 5 percent wage penalty per child. The percentage was arrived at after controlling for factors that affect wages, such as years of job experience. Ridgeway and Correll proposed a theory which stated that motherhood has disadvantaging effects on women’s workplace outcomes which are derived from the devalued social status attached to being a primary caretaker for dependent children. In their work, they examined evidence that the role of mother and its defining nurturance skills were culturally associated with low status. In addition, they considered evidence that motherhood was also associated with a perceived lower general competence particularly for the instrumental, agentic activities of the workplace. Ridgeway and Correll argued that when motherhood becomes a salient descriptor of a worker, it negatively biases the evaluation of the worker’s job competence and suitability for authority positions compared to similar nonmothers. They asserted that this is due to perceived opposition between the cultural definitions of the good mother and the ideal worker, as well as perceived time demands of “24/7” jobs, such as those of business executives and high level professionals, which appear as more intensive and inflexibly structured.

An empirical study conducted by Cuddy et al. (2004) provided some indications that contemporary beliefs continue to support the idea that the motherhood role is associated with lower ability and competence. The researchers asked a sample of undergraduates (N = 122) to act as clients assessing business consultants from several
written profiles. The profile varied the sex of the consultant (woman or man) and whether she or he was a parent. Evaluations of consultants were based on trait ratings of competence and warmth; and behavioral intentions of requesting, promoting and training the consultant. Cuddy et al. found that women lost perceived competence and gained perceived warmth when they became mothers and looked significantly less competent than warm. Respondents also expressed less interest in hiring, promoting and educating the working mother compared to the childless woman. Additionally, competence ratings predicted positive behavioral intentions in which participants expressed more interest in hiring, promoting, and educating consultants who they viewed as competent. These researchers asserted that the apparent increase in working mothers’ perceived warmth did not help them professionally and their apparent loss in perceived competence seemed to hurt them. On the other hand, childless working women and men were perceived as significantly more competent than warm. When working men became fathers, they maintained perceived competence and gained perceived warmth, thereby, looking equally warm and competent. Compared to childless workers, working fathers were perceived as higher in warmth, but unlike working mothers, they were not perceived as significantly more warm than competent. Working fathers did not lose perceived competence when they gained a child as working mothers did. According to Cuddy et al., their results suggested that in the workplace, working mothers are viewed as less competent and less worthy of training than their childless female counterparts and working mothers are also viewed as less competent than they were before they had children.

It is necessary to keep in mind when reviewing these results that the population used in the study was composed of college students. Although these results cannot be
generalized to professional human resource personnel in charge of the hiring process, they do provide some support that the role of primary caretaker is culturally associated with reduced performance capacity for tasks outside the realm of child care.

In summary, women managers face numerous barriers in their progression to upper levels of organizations. Explanations for the lack of women in upper level management positions range from competition and exclusion from informal networks to glass ceiling and gender stereotyping. Although some attitudes are turning to favor women, others are not. Gender role stereotyping, with a current popular focus on motherhood as a hindrance to advancement, continues to be an obstacle for women managers to overcome. The woman business professional would benefit by going into her job knowing that there will be some barriers and realize that she, like other women before her, has the capability to break those barriers. Research focusing on role salience and leadership practices among mothers and nonmothers could provide data that may assist in clarifying misconceptions about women managers’ competence and commitment to their career and advancement.

Understanding perceived differences in male and female leadership characteristics allows for working toward an environment where employees feel valued and accepted for what they can contribute to their organizations (Lee et al., n.d.). In fact, research has not clearly shown that a particular leader style is optimal in all situations (Larson et al., 1976; Nystrom, 1978; Schriesheim, 1982). According to Vecchio (2002), sex differences in leader behavior and effectiveness may be driven by biologically based differences that are reinforced by socialization processes or differing gender stereotypes that influence role expectations, perceptions and evaluations.
Women Managers as Leaders

To understand what leader behavior, style and effectiveness encompass for women managers, it is important to first consider how leadership is related to the managerial role. Traditional views of management associate it with four major functions: planning, organizing, leading and controlling/coordinating (McNamara, 1999). According to McNamara, to be an effective member of an organization one needs to be able to emphasize different skills at different times. Some authors believe that leadership and management are qualitatively different and mutually exclusive (Yukl, 1994; McNamara), while others assert that managing and leading are distinctly separate activities but do not view leaders and managers as different types of people (Yukl).

Leadership is about creating conditions under which followers can perform independently and effectively toward the accomplishment of some common objectives (Kotelnikov, 2005). Additionally, leadership is influencing people to get things done to a standard and quality above their norm and doing it willingly (O’Neil, 2000a). It is “the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations” (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p.30). Effective leadership is imperative for molding a group of people into a team, shaping them into a force that serves as a competitive business advantage that positively affects productivity and, ultimately, the bottom line (Kotelnikov; O’Neil, 2000b).

Leadership Behavior

Research results vary in explaining behavioral differences or similarities between women and men in leadership positions. Ridgeway (2001) proposed that sex differences in influence and leadership occur because people presume that men are more competent and legitimate as leaders than women are. Ridgeway asserted that according to
expectation states theory (Wagner & Berger, 1997), gender is deeply entwined with social hierarchy and leadership because the rules for the gender system that are encoded in gender stereotypes contain status beliefs. These status beliefs are “shared cultural schemas about the status position in society of groups such as those based on gender, race, ethnicity, education, or occupation” (p. 637). According to Ridgeway, status beliefs are central to the formation of social hierarchies and by applying expectation states theory, she argued that it is the status element of gender stereotypes that cause such stereotypes to act as distinctively powerful barriers to women’s achievement of positions of authority, leadership, and power.

Gender stereotypes contain beliefs associating greater overall competence with men than women while also ascribing each sex particular skills, such as mechanical ability for men and domestic skills for women (e.g. Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Williams & Best, 1990). Ridgeway argued that in a mixed sex context or one in which gender is linked by cultural beliefs to the task or goal, gender status beliefs shape men’s and women’s assertiveness, the attention and evaluation of their performances, ability attributed to them on the basis of performance, the influence they achieve, and the likelihood that they become leaders. In other words, expectation states theory predicts that in mixed sex contexts or contexts culturally associated with men, women’s efforts to assert authority will evoke resistance and dislike, which diminishes their ability to get others to comply with them. As a result, their power and effectiveness as leaders is reduced.

On the other hand, in situations that are culturally linked with women, they will not encounter such resistance to their efforts to assert authority (i.e., over children or over
less expert others in a feminine context such as domestic tasks) because gender status slightly advantages women in those situations (Ridgeway, 2001). In support of these predictions, two studies (Carli, 1990, 2001) have shown that when women in mixed sex groups present their ideas in an assertive or self-directed style, they are perceived as untrustworthy or disliked and achieve less influence over men compared to similarly acting men or less assertive women. Additionally, some studies with college students have shown that self-promoting behavior that highlights competence produces positive outcomes for men but makes women appear less likeable and less hirable (Rudman & Glick, 2001).

In a related perspective, a controversy exists in the popular and academic literature about whether there are differences in leadership styles of women and men, when style is defined as relatively stable patterns of behavior that are manifested by leaders. Advocates of difference claim that women are less hierarchical, more cooperative and collaborative, and more oriented to enhancing others’ self-worth (e.g., Book, 2000; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1995) than are men. On the other hand, some social scientists have typically either claimed that female and male organizational leaders do not differ or have minimized the importance of differences that were observed (e.g. Powell, 1990).

In addition to these views, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) argued that sex differences, as well as similarities vary with social contexts. From the perspective of social role theory of sex differences and similarities (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000), Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt argued that managers and other leaders occupy roles defined by their specific position in a hierarchy and also function under constraints of
their gender roles. These authors defined gender roles as shared beliefs that apply to individuals on the basis of their socially identified sex and “are assumed to follow from perceivers’ observations of men and women as concentrated in different social roles in the family and paid employment” (p. 783). Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt pointed out that agentic and communal attributes are aspects of gender roles that are relevant to understanding leadership. Agentic characteristics were ascribed more to men than women and were described as primarily assertive, controlling, and confident tendencies, such as being aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, competitive, and influencing others (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt). Communal characteristics were ascribed more to women than men and were described as primarily a concern with the welfare of others such as being affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic nurturant, interpersonally sensitive, not drawing attention to oneself, speaking tentatively, and accepting others’ direction (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt). They argued that gender roles have different implications for the behavior of female and male leaders because not only do their roles have different content but there is often inconsistency between the predominantly communal qualities that perceivers associate with women and the predominantly agentic qualities that they think are required to succeed as a leader.

These implications were explained by Eagly and Karau (2002) based on their role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. These researchers argued that perceived incongruity between the female gender role and typical leader roles tends to create prejudice toward female leaders and potential leaders that is: (1) a less favorable evaluation of women’s potential for leadership because leadership ability is more stereotypic of men than women and (2) a less favorable evaluation of the actual
leadership behavior of women than men because agentic behavior is perceived as less desirable in women than men. When female leaders behave agentically to fulfill their leader roles and fail to exhibit the communal behaviors, they can be negatively evaluated for the violations although they may also receive some positive evaluation for their fulfillment of the leader role (e.g., Ridgeway, 1982; Butler & Geis, 1990; Walker, Ilardi, McMahon, & Fennell, 1996).

In their meta-analysis of studies comparing leadership styles of women and men, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found both the presence and absence of differences between the sexes in different settings. In contrast to the gender stereotypic expectation that women lead in an interpersonally oriented style and men lead in a task oriented style, female and male leaders did not differ in these two styles in organizational setting studies. However, these two aspects of leader style were found to be gender stereotypic in lab experiments and assessment studies (defined as studies wherein the styles of individuals are assessed, but individuals are not selected for leader roles). The results obtained in the lab and assessment studies may be due to scenarios generally omitting information on leader power and contextual dimensions which allows respondents to introduce gender role stereotypes when judging another’s behavior (Ragins, 1991; Vecchio, 2002). Eagly and Johnson also found, in all three types of leadership studies, there was a tendency for women to adopt a more democratic or participative style and a less autocratic or directive style than men.

In summary, the research on sex differences in the behavior of leaders has yielded results that are equivocal. Researchers have used expectation states theory and social role theory to explain differences, as well as similarities, in the behavior of female and male
leaders. Currently, no one leader style has proven to be best in all contexts (Larson et al., 1976; Nystrom, 1978; Schriesheim, 1982). Studies have shown that gender role stereotypes affect leader behaviors in different contexts and also affect the acceptability of those behaviors, especially those of women, as they are perceived by others. Additionally, it has been shown that gender role stereotypes are enacted more often in laboratory experiments than in organizational settings when information about leader power and contextual aspects are omitted from scenarios. Acknowledging these outcomes, it appears that continued investigations in organizational settings to assist in dispelling gender stereotypes are warranted.

Leadership Effectiveness

In order to explore what makes a leader effective, Yoder (2001) asserted that the sex of the leader and the sex congeniality of the context in which the leader operates must be taken into consideration. In this model, leadership effectiveness is operationalized as positive leader and follower satisfaction, enhanced group and individual performances, and team cohesiveness. How women carry out their role as a leader is linked with the fact that they are women, which taps into stereotypic notions accompanying gender roles (Yoder). From a feminist perspective, leadership is enacted within a gendered context (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Ridgeway, 2001). More explicitly, contexts exist on a continuum ranging from male dominated, status and power based contexts, to transformational contexts stressing empowerment of followers (Yoder). According to Yoder, the sex composition of the group, task characteristics, and shifting standards of acceptable behavior are variations of context that form a setting which is more or less
congenial to women and affects what is and is not effective for women operating in a particular context.

In the literature, two different portrayals of leadership are given (Yoder, 2001). One is highly masculinized: almost if not totally composed of male followers; task oriented, drawing on male stereotypic skills and evaluated almost exclusively for its goal attainment; and a hierarchical organization that defines leadership behavior in terms of dominance and resistance to unwanted demands of others (Yoder). Agentic or instrumental leader behavior is valued and is stereotypically regarded as appropriate for most men but not most women (Street, Kimmel, & Kromrey, 1995).

The other portrayal of leadership proposes transformational or charismatic leadership by emphasizing influence, not power, and empowerment of self and others (Yoder, 2001). Transformational contexts value an array of group outcomes including unit cohesiveness and individuals’ satisfaction and development as opposed to masculinized contexts which tend to stress task performance as the most critical indicator of leader effectiveness (Yoder). In women-uncongenial contexts, research has shown that women who adopt behaviors shown to be effective or neutral for men are consistently disadvantaged. For example, although assertiveness may be compatible with role expectations for leaders, it involves a gender role violation for women that men do not face (Gervasio & Crawford, 1989). Women exhibiting assertiveness (considered gender deviant) makes them threatening to others (Carli, 1995), disliked by others (Butler & Geis, 1990; Carli, 2001), and also proves to be ineffective and less influential, especially with men, than gender congruent women (Carli, 1990, 1999, 2001).
Strategies to enhance women leaders’ effectiveness in masculinized contexts have been documented by various researchers. Referring to empirical research studies (e.g., Ragins, 1991; Snodgrass, 1992; Trempe, Rigny, and Haccoun, 1985), Yoder (2001) argued that because social status and power are confounded with gender, women leaders are disadvantaged even before acting as leaders. She asserted that there is a need to simultaneously bolster women’s status and minimize status differentials between women leaders and their followers to begin making women effective in masculinized contexts. Several individual strategies for women to take were recommended by Yoder (2001) based on empirical studies. These strategies included

(1) breaking down status distinctions and being respectful in order to camouflage dominant speech acts and remaining in charge, using humor to lighten tense exchanges, and talking and listening to subordinates rather than adopting a command-and-control style that relies on having and using higher status (e.g., Troemel-Ploetz, 1994);

(2) adopting a group-oriented rather than self-oriented motivational intent (e.g., Ridgeway, 1982);

(3) adopting an orientation that valued cooperation and concern over group outcomes rather than self-interest (e.g., Shackelford, Wood, and Worchel, 1996);

(4) becoming solidly entrenched in a group before attempting to innovate changes (e.g., Wahrman & Pugh, 1974; Shackelford et al., 1996); and

(5) exhibiting exceptional competence – acknowledged by Yoder to be “an unfair requirement – but one that works” (p. 820).

Studies have shown that women who demonstrate superior competence on a task, relative to the skills of the group, have more influence than women who prove themselves less
competent than the superior woman (Carli, 1995; Shackelford et al., 1996) and to one whose competence is demonstrated to be equivalent to that of a male partner (Pugh & Wahrman, 1983).

Yoder (2001) also identified organizational supports that could facilitate women’s effectiveness including (1) supplying leaders with the resources necessary to reward and help others in terms of mentoring (e.g., Shea, 1994); (2) legitimating women leaders by providing endorsements through expressions of confidence (e.g., Brown & Geis, 1984); and, (3) legitimating not only the qualifications of women leaders but in followers’ awareness of their skills (e.g., Yoder, Schleicher, & McDonald, 1998). Legitimization enhances men’s as well as women’s influence (Brown & Geis).

In contrast to the model of hierarchical power and control, transformational leadership approaches are at the other end of the continuum emphasizing the role of the leader’s vision in giving direction and meaning to followers; regarding communication of high expectations as a central activity of leaders; stressing empowerment of followers by leaders who support individual growth as well as respect and trust subordinates; and deemphasizing control strategies traditionally associated with leadership (Yoder, 2001). According to Hollander and Offerman (1990), a transformational leader is one who changes the outlook and behavior of followers by striving to go beyond the bounds of the usual to initiating the change in follower thinking that will redirect follower action.

Along these same lines, Kouzes and Posner (2002a) defined leadership as a relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow and is identifiable by a collection of practices and behaviors rather than only a position. These authors proposed that a distinguishing feature about the process of leading is the
distinction between mobilizing others to do and mobilizing others to want to do which is dependant on the credibility of the leader. Credibility is sustained by the leader’s actions based on Five Practices – challenging by being dynamic and flexible; inspiring others by being forward-looking and moving others to action; enabling others to act by fostering trust; modeling by being clear about their beliefs and putting them into practice; and encouraging others by recognizing and celebrating significant accomplishments. In Kouzes and Posner’s model, effectiveness is determined by the degree in which the leader demonstrates capacity in all Five Practices.

Transformational leadership could be thought of as a feminizing reaction to the masculinized model of hierarchical leadership (Yoder, 2001); however, much of the research on effective transformational leadership portrays male leaders (e.g., Conger, 1999) such as U.S. presidents (Fiol et al., 1999). This suggests that transformational leadership is not the exclusive domain of women nor does it create an uncongenial context for men due to its seemingly communal characteristics (Yoder). Although transformational leadership may work similarly for women and men, it requires not only a leader who engages in transformational behaviors but also a context that is amenable to it (Yoder). Research appeared to indicate that transformational leadership is most appropriate during times of initial organization, growth and revitalization (Baglia & Hunt, 1988).

In conclusion, there is no one solution for making women more effective as leaders because there is no one definition of leadership. Leadership style appears to exist on a continuum ranging from a power based, male-dominated, hierarchical model with effectiveness determined by task accomplishment to a transformational model
emphasizing empowering others with effectiveness defined in terms of strong bonds among group members and followers’ development and satisfaction in addition to task completion. Research has shown that no one style works effectively in all contexts and is determined by such contextual factors as: the type of task, the composition of the group, and the organization’s goals and values (Yoder, 2001).

Summary

The increase in the number of women entering the workforce during the last 30 years has caused an increase in the number of dual-earner couples and has presented new challenges for them in managing responsibilities of work and family. The largest increase in the labor market for women has been in managerial and professional occupations and it is within this segment that conflict between work and family roles likely exists particularly for mothers of young children (Duxbury et al., 1994; Roehling et al., 2003). A feminist viewpoint offers an explanation of how women, particularly mothers, are disadvantaged in the workplace due to traditional gender role stereotypes and how they encounter barriers to progressing in their organizations due to these beliefs. Although there is a body of research which addresses dual-earner couples and work-family conflict, research particularly targeting women managers, specifically mothers, is much more limited. No research to date has attempted to explore women’s managerial leadership practices considering both mothers and nonmothers.

Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) provide a theoretical framework for identifying women managers’ role orientation (or salience) for either work, family, or equally for both work and family. In their theory, equal importance for work and family produces extensive role conflict and stress, which Greenhaus and Beutrell (1985)
identified as work-family conflict. Research (e.g., Carlson et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998) has shown work-family conflict to be bidirectional with not only work interfering with family (WIF), but also family interfering with work (FIW). Empirical research (e.g., Cinamon and Rich, 2002a) has supported Parasuraman and Greenhaus’ theory; however, due to the composition of their sample, generalizing results to women managers is inappropriate. Further research with a sample of women managers is necessary in order to determine if that they can be differentiated based on their salience for work, family or both work and family roles as suggested.

Moreover, research involving role salience has been limited. Some researchers (e.g., Martire et al., 2000; Pleck, 1985) have supported the direct effect of role salience on well-being while others have not. Other researchers (e.g., O’Neil & Greenberger, 1994) have found that individuals with strong commitment to both work and parental roles showed higher levels of role stress than did persons who were highly committed to only one of the roles. Additionally, other researchers have found that individuals with role salience for work and both work and family demonstrated higher levels of WIF than did individuals with role salience for family (e.g., Cinamon & Rich 2002a; Parasuraman et al., 1996). Although Parasuraman et al. found entrepreneurs with role salience for family to have greater FIW conflict than other profiles, Cinamon and Rich’s sample of lawyers and computer workers with role salience for family did not. To date, research is lacking which investigates women managers’ role salience for work, family, or both work and family; its relationship to work-family conflict; and its relationship to women managers’ potential effectiveness as leaders. If individuals with salience for work and both work and family have greater WIF conflict than do those with salience for family,
perhaps they also have more capacity for being effective leaders. This will be explored in the current research.

Research has shown the glass ceiling to consist of artificial barriers based on attitudes or organizational bias preventing women from advancing into upper management level positions (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991). These barriers have been referred to as myths, preconceived ideas, unsupported notions (Crampton & Mischra, 1999) and a result of gender stereotypes (Heilman, 2001). Traditional stereotypes of women and men have been shown to predominate in work settings as well as non-work settings with upper level managerial positions generally characterized in masculine terms (Heilman, 2001; Schein, 2001). Additionally, current theories suggest that motherhood has disadvantaging effects on women’s workplace outcomes (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Cuddy et al., 2004). Empirical research investigating the possible connection of role salience, motherhood, and leadership practices could provide data to assist in dispelling the existing gender role stereotypes.

The managerial function encompasses leadership (McNamara, 1999) and how effective the leader is ultimately affects the organization’s bottom line results (Kotelnikov, 2005; O’Neil, 2000b). Although controversy exists about whether there are differences in leadership style of women and men, no one style has been shown to be optimal in all contexts (Larson et al., 1976; Nystrom, 1978; Schriesheim, 1982). Leadership styles can be thought of on a continuum. At one end is the hierarchical, power and control style of leadership. At the other end is the transformational leadership approach that emphasizes the leader’s vision in giving direction and meaning to followers, relies on communicating with followers, stresses empowerment and the
development of followers, and is in contrast to the hierarchical power and control style. Transformational leadership and hierarchical power and control leadership may appear to be consistent with the gender role aspects of communal and agentic attributes (Yoder, 2001). However, much of the research on effective transformational leadership portrays male leaders (Conger, 1999). This suggests that this style may work similarly for women and men by eliciting positive reactions from followers. Using a measure of transformational leadership in the current research appears to be appropriate for measuring leadership practices for women.

The purpose of the current research is to determine if there are linkages between role salience, work-family conflict and women’s managerial leadership practices. As a result of this review, the following hypotheses are being proposed:

*Research Hypotheses*

1. There are no relationships between demographic variables and leadership practices of women managers.
2. Women managers with children are as effective as leaders as are women managers without children.
3. Women managers can be differentiated into three groups based on their attributions of importance for work and family roles.
4. Women managers with salient roles for work and both work and family will have greater WIF than those with a family salient role; whereas women managers with salient roles for family and both work and family will have greater FIW than those with a work salient role.
5. Women managers with salient roles for work and both work and family will have a greater level of leadership practices than those with a salient role for family.

6. Women managers having WIF conflict will use leadership practices more frequently than those having FIW conflict.

**Derivation of Research Hypotheses**

Women have proven they are capable of overcoming some of the glass ceiling barriers as evidenced by the increasing number of women in managerial and professional positions. It is within this segment that conflict between work and family roles likely exists particularly for mothers of young children (Duxbury et al., 1994; Roehling et al., 2003). From a feminist perspective, women, particularly mothers, are disadvantaged in the workplace due to traditional gender role stereotypes (Rideway & Correll, 2004) and continue to encounter barriers to progressing in their organizations due to these beliefs (Rideway & Correll; Cuddy et al., 2004). Research focusing on women managers, specifically identifying mothers, is limited and no research to date has attempted to investigate women’s managerial leadership practices with motherhood as a variable.

Research involving role salience has been limited. Researchers have found that individuals with role salience for work and both work and family demonstrated higher levels of WIF conflict than did individuals with role salience for family (e.g., Cinamon & Rich, 2002a; Parasuraman et al., 1996). Although Parasuraman et al. found entrepreneurs with role salience for family to have greater FIW conflict than those with other profiles of role salience, Cinamon and Rich’s sample of lawyers and computer workers with role salience for family did not have greater FIW conflict than other profiles. To date,
research is lacking which investigates women managers’ role salience for work, family or both work and family; its relationship to work-family conflict; and its relationship to women managers’ potential effectiveness as leaders. If individuals with salience for work and both work and family have greater WIF conflict than do those with salience for family, perhaps they also have more capacity for being effective leaders.

Chapter III will present the methodology and measures that will be used in the current research. Chapter IV will present the results of the study and Chapter V will discuss the results.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The method of investigating the proposed research questions is described below. In addition, an overview of the measures and instruments is given and the procedures for gathering information from participants are explained. Finally, the statistical hypotheses are outlined and the statistical methods to be used in the analyses are identified.

Participants and Procedure

The sample was comprised of single and married women, with and without dependent children living at home, holding middle or upper management positions within various for-profit organizations. In the current research, women between the ages of 22 and 55 years were selected because they tend to face considerable problems in juggling childcare and work more than those with other family responsibilities like care of the elderly or sick relatives (Noor, 2004). Participants were solicited through women network organizations and list-servers of professional women in business associations via email. Forty-four women’s organizations/associations (see Appendix A) were contacted. In addition, an online marketing communications company (Blue Sky Factory, Inc.) emailed invitations to participate in the research to approximately 50,000 women managers in middle or senior management positions in the U.S. Participants were encouraged to forward the email link to other professional women managers whom they believed would be interested in the study. According to Stevens (1992), a sample size of 50 was needed.
as indicted by a power analysis for multivariate statistics with five dependent variables and a power of .80. Since there are three categorical variables (work, home/family, both work and home/family), 150 participants were required.

The email contained a brief description of the study and an invitation to participate by clicking a link to the website. The first page of the website contained an informed consent page (see Appendix B) that described the research and process of their participation. If potential participants agreed to proceed, they clicked on the icon “Continue to Next Page” and proceeded to the survey portion of the research. If they did not decide to continue with the survey, they were instructed to close the window to exit the webpage. If a participant read part of the informed consent page and returned later, the program recognized the “cookie” of the visitor’s computer and sent the visitor to the same page as previously accessed. The survey questions were designed in a format that allowed respondents to point-and-click with the mouse on their selected Likert scale response. There also were a few text-boxes with pull-down menus for selection of the best option. After participants submitted their responses, they were given the option of providing their email address to receive an abbreviated version of the study results.

A web-based approach to survey completion was used over a traditional email-based approach to ensure anonymity. The host server protected its web pages with a variety of security procedures including passwords and monitoring systems. Participants’ email addresses, if provided, were downloaded separately from the survey data. If participants chose to receive the study results, their email address was not linked to any set of responses. Guidelines for internet research were followed as outlined by Michalak and Szabo (1998).
Additionally, printed surveys with an informed consent page (see Appendix C) and return envelopes were distributed to several Human Resource Managers of businesses in Collier County, FL and Summit County, OH for distribution to their women managers. Completed surveys did not contain any personal identifying information about the respondent. Compiled responses were added to those received from the web-based approach.

Materials

In this section, an overview of the demographic questionnaire and each of the measures is given. Reliability and validity data is also presented.

Demographic Questionnaire. Information related to the following demographic variables was obtained: age, marital status, spouse/partner’s occupation, number of years in the workforce, reason for working, type of employer organization, number of years with employer organization, number and ages of dependent children living at home, number of years out of the workforce due to childcare, estimation of support from employer and important people in the respondent’s life. These variables were selected to see if they relate to leadership practices of women managers. The demographic questionnaire was placed at the end of the survey.

The Salience Inventory (SI; Super & Nevill, 1986). The SI assesses the perceived importance of life roles in terms of the values that individuals expect to realize within roles, as well as the commitment to and participation in five major life roles: student, worker, homemaker (including spouse and parent), leisurite, and citizen. The SI was chosen for the current research because of its theoretical underpinnings in Super’s (1980) theory of career development and the psychometric rigor in which it was developed. It
was also chosen as a means of investigating Parasuraman and Greenhaus’ (1993) theory that women managers vary in their salience toward work and family roles which places them in one of three orientations. These orientations focus on career, family, or both career and family.

The SI was developed in conjunction with the Work Importance Study (WIS), an international consortium of vocational psychologists from various European, American, Asian, Australian and African countries (Nevill & Calvert, 1996). The objective of the WIS was to assess the relative importance of the work role in the context of other life roles; and to better understand the values that individuals seek or hope to find in these roles (Nevill & Super, 1986). According to Nevill and Calvert, the SI “integrates the basic components of Super’s theory that a career constitutes an individual’s relative commitment to, participation in, and values attained in the roles that interact across the life span” (p. 401). The SI measures role salience in terms of commitment (attitudes/emotions) and participation (overt behavior) concerning various life roles. High commitment and high participation indicate high salience; low commitment and low participation indicate low salience (Nevill & Super).

The SI is a 170 item inventory that can be administered to individuals from adolescence through adulthood in 30 to 45 minutes. The three major components of role salience (Super, 1982) are represented in the three subscales. The Participation subscale is behavioral in content and addresses what an individual actually has done within each of the five roles. The Commitment subscale is affective in content and assesses how an individual feels about each of the five roles. Each of these two subscales consists of ten stems with the same five roles rated for each stem on a four point Likert scale (1 =
never/rarely, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, and 4 = almost always/always). The Value Expectation subscale also is affective in content, but it assesses attitudes toward roles by rating the degree to which one expects to realize specific values within in each of the five roles.

Unlike the ten stem format utilized in the Participation and Commitment subscales, the Value Expectations subscale consists of fourteen stems corresponding to the 14 items identified by the WIS researchers as universal values: Ability Utilization, Achievement, Aesthetics, Altruism, Autonomy, Creativity, Economics, Life Style, Physical Activity, Prestige, Risk, Social Interaction, Variety, and Working Conditions. Each of the five roles is rated on a four point Likert scale that reflects one’s expectation of realizing each of the 14 values within each of the roles. A total summed score is generated for each subscale across each of the five roles with higher scores reflecting greater role salience. Scores for the Participation and Commitment subscales will be utilized in the current study to assess individuals’ commitment related to the roles of worker (work) and to homemaker (home/family) with their behavioral involvement.

The SI lacks sufficient data to make norm comparisons. It is possible to determine the relative importance of any one of the five roles and intrapersonal comparison of Participation, Commitment and Value Expectations can be made within any one role by comparing raw scores (Nevill & Super, 1986). In the current study, the Participation and Commitment subscales of the SI will be used to categorize respondents according to their role salience for work (W), home/family (H/F) or both work and home/family (Both). Because the measure is ipsative (based on participant’s own high and low point scores), only the participant’s Participation (P; performance) and Commitment (C; emotional
investment) scores can be compared to each other in order to determine which role is more important or has equal importance to the participant. In other words, participants in the study will be grouped according to their own scores and not compared to a norm group. Determination of role salience was made for practical use in a counseling text.

When scores were equal, or there was a ± 1 point between PH/F, CH/F and PW, CW the participant was placed in the combined group of Both. When there was more than a 1 point difference between PH/F, CH/F and PW, CW the participant was placed in the role that had the higher points. Also, to get an expressed versus measured component for role salience, participants were asked what was more important to them in terms of work, home/family or both work and home/family.

Since the SI was developed through an evaluation of relevant content domains, content validity was an intrinsic part of its development. The WIS researchers derived and refined definitions of roles based on results of field trials and identified activities that would adequately represent those roles. The best items were selected on the basis of respondent reactions, item scale correlations and project staff consensus on appropriateness and coverage of item content. Each role was ranked on the items representing all three of the salience dimensions. The resulting version consisted of 240 items with 14 items for Participation, 14 items for Commitment, and 20 items for Value Expectations subscales. The American version subsequently was revised to shorten the scales, resulting in the 170 item format.

Nevill and Super (1986) reported that the Participation, Commitment and Value Expectations subscales of the SI are conceptually and empirically distinct. The interscale correlation for Value Expectations and Participation ranged from .41 to .59 which
empirically supports that they are distinct. However, the other interscale correlations did not support that the subscales were as empirically distinct. Interscale correlations ranged from .64 to .73 for Value Expectations and Commitment, and from .49 to .77 for Participation and Commitment subscales. Nevill and Super noted that the similarity in format of the Participation and Commitment subscales created a response set that caused the behavioral Participation measure to correlate more highly with the affective Commitment measure than was anticipated. However, the Value Expectations subscale, a measure of affective commitment, did have the expected lower correlation with the Participation subscale (Nevill & Super) and a higher correlation with the Commitment subscale.

Construct validity also has been demonstrated through observation of expected age and gender differences in the relative rankings that were consistent with expected developmental tasks and changes (Nevill & Calvert, 1996). Differences in the relative rankings of the five roles comparing high school, college and adult samples supported the SI as valid in reflecting development trends (Nevill & Super, 1986). For example, Nevill and Super found that high school students ranked leisure activities as most important followed by work, family, study, and community service. By college age, the maturing of role values was evident in greater affect (commitment rankings) related to work and family with moderate emphasis on leisure activities. By adulthood, rankings indicated increasing participation in work, balanced by high commitment and value expectations rankings in family, with moderate importance of leisure activities and community service.
Two measures of reliability were computed for the SI. Nevill and Super (1986) reported internal consistency (alpha coefficients) for an adult sample for the five roles in the three subscales which ranged between .82 and .95. Janotta (2003) reported alpha coefficients for all roles of .91 and .96 for the Participation and Value Expectations subscales respectively. Nevill and Super also reported test-retest reliabilities for the five roles, for a college sample only, ranging from .59 to .83 for the Participation subscale, .60 to .77 for the Commitment subscale, and .37 to .67 for the Value Expectations subscale over a two week period. Nevill and Super reported that since the reliabilities became increasingly lower as the test progressed and respondents complained of the repetitiveness, fatigue or boredom may have caused random guessing by respondents. This hypothesis was tested, and it was found that regardless of the order of administration, the reliabilities for the Value Expectations subscale were lower than for either the Participation or the Commitment subscales. These low test-retest correlations do not necessarily mean the SI is unreliable. According to Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991), the test-retest model is not able to separate the reliability of the measure from it’s stability with respect to most variables of interest in sociobehavioral research. For this reason they recommend that it not be used or used with caution.

Nevill and Super (1988) reported that work salience, defined by SI scores on the Commitment to Work subscale, predicted career maturity, as assessed by the Career Development Inventory (CDI; Super, Thompson, Lindeman, Jordaan, & Meyers, 1979). Nevill and Super further noted that work salience better predicted career maturity than did either socioeconomic status or gender. They also supported Hackett and Betz’s (1981) earlier findings that although a sample of college women was more committed
than was a sample of college men to both the work and home/family roles, they expected to realize fewer values through work than did men.

*Work-Family Conflict Scale (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999).* This 22 item scale measures the direction and the nature of work and family conflict. The direction is based upon where the conflict originates: work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW) (Frone et al., 1992; Gutek, et al., 1991). The scale is also intended to consider the nature of work and family conflict by distinguishing between strain-based and time-based conflicts (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Kelloway et al. (1999) developed the scale by conducting a longitudinal study over a six month period with employees (N = 236) from two organizations in Canada (healthcare and retail grocery chain). Respondents completed the scale, along with two other outcome measures, at the beginning and end of the six months. The authors reported a four factor structure as a result of their confirmatory factor analysis in which all items significantly loaded on their assigned factor.

The Work-Family Conflict Scale was designed to assess the four dimensions of work and family conflict. These dimensions comprise the four subscales. Kelloway et al. (1999) reported the following sets of internal consistencies (scale was administered twice) for the conflict subscales: time-based WIF, .83, .83; strain-based WIF, .75, .76; time-based FIW, .75, .76; strain-based FIW, .85, .84. Although these internal consistencies appear to be low, Kaplan and Saccuzzo (1997) indicated that reliability estimates in the range of .70 to .80 are acceptable for most purposes of basic research in which there is only an attempt to gain approximate estimates of whether two variables are
related. In clinical settings however, these authors asserted that high reliability was extremely important and a test with a reliability of .90 might be insufficient.

The 22 items use a four point Likert scale (from 1 = never to 4 = almost always) with higher scores indicating higher conflict. Although Kelloway et al. established a four factor structure in their factor analysis, Noor (2004) was unable to substantiate the four factors of the scale with her sample of English women with children (N = 147). In Noor’s study, only a distinction between WIF conflict and FIW conflict was established. Noor reported alpha coefficients for the 11 item WIF scale and 11 item FIW scale as .84 and .81, respectively.

WIF and FIW is the focus in the current study for using this scale. A factor analysis with the current sample was conducted in order to assess the construct validity of the scale in the current sample.

*Leadership Practices Inventory (3rd ed.)* (*LPI; Kouzes & Posner, 2003*). The LPI is in its third edition and has been a leading instrument used for self-evaluation of leadership practices since the late 1980s (*Kouzes & Posner, 2002b*). The LPI was developed through a multi-year study in which over 1,100 managers responded to a detailed survey about their personal best experiences as leaders. From these case studies and using quantitative research methods, the conceptual framework was generated and consists of five leadership practices: Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, Encouraging the Heart (*Kouzes & Posner*). Behavioral statements were generated from the actions that comprise these practices. According to Kouzes and Posner, several iterative psychometric processes resulted in the instrument being administered to over 350,000 managers and non-
managers across a variety of organizations, disciplines and demographic backgrounds. Validation studies over a twenty year period conducted by the authors, as well as other researchers, consistently confirmed the reliability and validity of the LPI and the five practices of exemplary leaders model (Kouzes & Posner).

The LPI contains thirty statements – six statements for measuring each of the five leadership practices. In 1999, the LPI was reformulated by changing from a five point Likert scale to a 10 point Likert scale. A higher value represents more frequent use of leadership behaviors ranging from (1) I almost never do what is described in the statement to (10) I almost always do what is described in the statement (Kouzes & Posner, 2002b). Some statements were modified or altered slightly, some questions were added and some eliminated as a result of iterative feedback sessions with respondents and subject matter experts, as well as empirical analyses of various sets of behaviorally based statements (Kouzes & Posner). Refinements in the instrument continue with a database involving over 100,000 respondents (Kouzes & Posner).

Both a Self and Observer form of the LPI have been developed. In addition, subsequent forms of the LPI (Self and Observer) have been developed for use with various populations. For example, there is a version for use with college students (LPI Student), for use with non-managers (LPI Individual Contributor), and for use with a group of people (LPI TEAM) (Kouzes & Posner, 2002b). Participating individuals first complete the LPI Self and then request five to ten people familiar with their behavior to complete the LPI Observer. Each form of the LPI takes approximately ten minutes to complete and can be either hand or computer scored (Kouzes & Posner).
The most current analysis of psychometric properties of the LPI was conducted by Kouzes and Posner (2002) with a total sample size of 17,908 (Self = 2,072; Manager = 1,426; Direct Report = 5,234; Co-Worker/Peer = 5,591; and Other = 3,585). According to these authors, the results are consistent with those reported for the earlier edition of the LPI. Based upon mean scores, Enabling was the most frequently reported leadership practice being used, followed by Modeling. Similar mean scores were obtained for Challenging and Encouraging, and Inspiring was perceived (both by leaders and their constituents) as the leadership practice least frequently engaged in.

Comparing means between Self and Observer, Kouzes and Posner (2002b) reported that empirical tests of differences between leaders (using the LPI Self form) and their constituents (using the LPI Observer form) revealed no statistically significant difference at the .001 level of probability on Challenging and Modeling. Although the mean differences between these two groups were statistically significant on Inspiring, Enabling and Encouraging, they noted that there was little practical significance for the difference.

Internal reliability, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, is strong with all scales above the .75 level (Kouzes & Posner, 2002b). There is a tendency for the reliability coefficients from the LPI Self (ranging between .75 and .87) to be somewhat lower than those for the LPI Observer (ranging between .88 and .92). Other researchers have reported similar levels of internal consistency. For example, reliabilities for the Self and Observer ranged from .71 to .82 in a study of women in executive positions in banking and higher education (Ottinger, 1990), between .82 and .84 for adults enrolled in community leadership development program (Adams, 1999), above .70 for female
college student affairs officers (Brightharp, 1999), and between .73 and .90 for healthcare managers (Strack, 2001). Studies with non-U.S. populations have also obtained reliabilities above .70 (Kouzes & Posner).

Test-retest reliability for the five leadership practices has been reported to be consistently at the .90 level and above (Kouzes & Posner, 2002b). Kouzes and Posner asserted that in general, scores on the LPI have been relatively stable over time. For example, they indicated that comparing LPI scores every two years from participants in The Leadership Challenge Workshop™ since 1987 showed consistency across the five leadership practices for each time-period comparison.

Kouzes and Posner (2002b) examined the validity of the LPI in a number of ways: content-related, construct, concurrent and discriminant. Support for content-related validity was assessed by noting that the items on the LPI are related to statements that workshop participants generally make about their own or others’ personal-best leadership experiences. Construct validity was demonstrated by using factor analysis to determine the extent to which the instrument items measure the underlying theoretical construct it is supposed to measure. A five component solution for the LPI (both Self and Observer versions) was generated using a principal component analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization. Kouzes and Posner reported the following:

Five factors [sic] were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and accounting for 60.5 percent of the variance. Five interpretable factors [sic] were obtained – consistent with the five subscales of the LPI – although a few item-factor loadings share some common variance across more than one factor. The stability of the five factor solution was tested by factor analyzing the data from different
subsamples. In each case, the factor structure was essentially similar to the one involving the entire sample. (p. 14)

Comparable factor structures have been reported by other researchers. Carless (2001) obtained data from subordinates (N = 1,389) in an Australian international banking organization. She used a covariance matrix along with maximum likelihood as the method of estimation for examining three models. In her analyses, the chi-square difference test showed that a single order, five factor model (Model 1) was a significantly better fit than a single factor model (Model 2); and a higher order model (Model 3) with five first order factors was a slightly poorer fit. Carless noted, however, that intercorrelations between subscales in Model 1 were high; average correlation was reported as .89. Goodness of fit statistics for Model 1 were as follows: $\chi^2 = 281.8, df = 39.5, p < .001$; goodness of fit (GFI) = .86; adjusted goodness of fit (AGFI) = .84; non-normed fit index (NNFI) = .91; expected cross-validation index (ECVI) = 2.15; and relative noncentrality index (RNI) = .92.

With a sample of U.S. and Canadian community activists, Jurkowski’s (1997) analysis, supported the structural integrity of the LPI framework: GFI = .90; AGFI = .91; $\chi^2 = 221.8; df = 23; N = 166$. Additionally, Nolan (1992) used a structured interview protocol within a school setting and found that participants validated 81 percent of the salient principal scores by identifying the same behaviors in their experiences.

Concurrent validity was established by comparing the results of the LPI to results of other instruments. Kouzes and Posner (2002b) asserted that the LPI demonstrated excellent concurrent validity and “leadership scores are consistently associated with important aspects of managerial and organizational effectiveness such as workgroup
performance, team cohesiveness, commitment, satisfaction and credibility” (p. 15). For example, in one of their studies, Posner and Kouzes (1988) examined the relationship between leaders’ effectiveness and their leadership practices, as measured by the LPI. Responses (N = 514) were only obtained from the LPI Observer to minimize potential self report bias. Using stepwise regression analysis, leader effectiveness was entered as the dependent variable and the five leadership practices as the independent variables. The regression equation was reported as significant ($F = 318.9, p < .0001$) and the leadership practices model explained 76 percent of the variance in constituents’ assessments of their managers’ effectiveness.

The LPI has been correlated with numerous other sociological and psychological instruments. For example, McNeese-Smith (1999) found that motivation by power among nurse managers (N = 19) correlated positively ($r = 0.45, p = .55$) to the managers’ LPI Self composite score for leadership. Additionally, Brown and Posner (2001) found that composite indices for learning styles and leadership practices were significantly correlated ($r = 0.33, p < .001$). Studies such as these enhance the confidence that the LPI measures what it is purported to measure (Kouzes & Posner, 2002b).

One method used by Kouzes and Posner (2002b) to examine discriminant validity of the LPI was to determine how well LPI scores could group managers into various performance based categories. Based on the LPI. Observer scale, they separated managers (N = 1,426) into the lowest third performance group and the highest third performance group. According to the authors, approximately 85 percent of respondents was used to create the canonical discriminant function and 15 percent was used to create a hold out sample for classification purposes. One discriminant function was derived and
it correctly classified 92.6 percent of the known cases and 77.8 percent of the cases in the holdout sample \((p < .001)\). When the middle third of the sample was included in the analysis, 71.1 percent of the known cases and 67.9 percent of the sample were correctly classified \((p < .001)\).

The LPI was chosen for the current study over a number of other instruments such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1985), Profile of Aptitude for Leadership (PAL; Training House Inc., 1991), Leadership Competency Inventory (LCI; Kelner, 1993). All of these instruments have been reported to have reliability and validity problems or concerns (Gebart-Eaglemont, 2006; Pearson, 2006; Pittenger, 2006; Schmitt, 2006). Despite high interscale correlations, the LPI was chosen due to its ongoing analysis and refinement, reliability, validity, longevity and high use. It was used in the current research to examine leadership practices of women managers.

**Statistical Hypotheses and Analyses**

1. There is no significant \((p < .05)\) difference between the leadership practices of participants with and without children as measured by the five subscales of the LPI. Data will be analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance (2x5 MANOVA).

2. Participants with role salience for work and both work and home/family will have significantly \((p < .05)\) higher scores on the WIF subscale of the Work-Family Conflict scale than those with home/family role salience; whereas, participants with role salience for home/family and both work and home/family will have significantly \((p < .05)\) higher scores on FIW subscale of the Work-Family Conflict scale.
Conflict scale than those with work role salience. Data will be analyzed by using multivariate analysis of variance (3x2 MANOVA).

3. Participants with salient roles for work and both work and home/family will have significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores on the five LPI subscales than those with a salient role for family. Data will be analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance (3x5 MANOVA).

4. Participants identified as having WIF conflict will have significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores on the five LPI subscales than participants identified as having FIW conflict. Data will be analyzed by using multivariate analysis of variance (2x5 MANOVA).

Prior to analyzing the statistical hypotheses, descriptive statistics and a correlation matrix for the research variables will be reported. Additional analyses of covariance will be conducted when applicable. In addition, the preliminary analysis of participants’ demographic variables of age, marital status, number of years in the workforce, having dependent children living at home, estimation of support from employer and important people in the respondent’s life, will be conducted as they relate to leadership practices. A factor analysis of the Work-Family Conflict Scale and scale reliability data will also reported.

In summary, this chapter presented the method of participant selection, materials used to comprise the survey participants were to complete, statistical hypotheses and method used for the analyses. The results of the preliminary analyses and the analyses of the statistical hypotheses are presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter begins with descriptive statistics and the results of the factor analysis conducted on the Work-Family Conflict Scale. The preliminary analysis of participants’ demographic variables and a correlation matrix of the research variables are provided along with the internal consistency reliabilities for the sample on all of the subscales. Finally, the results of the analyses used to investigate each of the statistical hypotheses are reported.

Descriptive Statistics

Completed printed self-report surveys were returned from business organizations in Collier County, FL and Summit County, OH in addition to web based responses from an e-mail invitation to women managers in middle and senior management and to women’s associations/organizations. The number of completed web based self-report surveys received was 221 and all of the 35 printed surveys distributed were returned. Of these surveys, 162 (73%) of the web based surveys and 100 % of the printed surveys were usable for a total sample of 197. Survey responses were discarded due to survey incompleteness or respondents not meeting the criteria (e.g., unemployment, student, working for a non-profit organization, operationing a home based business). A summary of the frequency distribution of the demographic characteristics is provided in Table 1.
Table 1

*Frequency Distribution of Demographic Characteristics (N = 197)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range (years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed partner and living together</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Never Married</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment of Spouse/Committed Partner</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Committed Partner Employed</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Committed Partner Not Employed</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse/Committed Partner Occupation (n = 149)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/executive/self-employed</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades/Laborer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Technical</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

*Frequency Distribution of Demographic Characteristics (N = 197)* (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay at Home for Childcare/Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Children Living at Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Dependent Children</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Have Dependent Children</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Work Force to Care for Children at Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Left Work Force</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, Did Not Leave</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Work Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Years or Less</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Employer Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

*Frequency Distribution of Demographic Characteristics (N = 197) (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Worked for Present Employer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Years or More</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Working</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Necessity</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Satisfaction</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, the greatest number of respondents 86 (44%) were in the age range of 41-50. Considering marital status, 143 respondents (73%) reported either being married or having a committed partner and living together, whereas 149 (76%) reported that their spouse or live-in committed partner worked. Sixty three of these 149 respondents (32%) most often described their spouse/committed partner’s occupation as professional/executive/self employed.
In response to the question asking for the number and ages of dependent children living at home, over half (58%) of the current sample reported having dependent children. Specific age data of dependent children, however, was not interpretable due to the way the question was asked. In one question, respondents were asked to provide the number of children they had using the categories of 0, 1-2, 3-4, and over 4. In the next question, respondents were asked to indicate the applicable age ranges of their children from under 1 year old, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-13 years, 14-18 years and over 18 years old. In retrospect, respondents were not asked for the ages of their children when they provided the number of children. As a result, the responses from these two questions could not be linked. Therefore, specific age data of dependent children were discarded from analyses.

When asked about leaving the work force to care for their children at home, 128 respondents (65%) reported that they did not leave the work force. Inconsistent responses were received from the remaining 69 respondents (35%) who reported information about leaving the work force to care for their children. Twenty-eight of the 69 respondents (41%) did not report any amount of time from work. Twenty-two (32%) gave their responses in number of years; however, several respondents gave three answers (years, months, and weeks) instead of only one. It is apparent that this question was worded in a way that did not illicit the information desired, and therefore it was discarded from analyses.

When asked about the number of years they had been in the work force, 55% reported working over 21 years and most of the 197 respondents (82%) reported being employed in business. Forty-two percent of respondents reported working for their
present employer between 1-6 years. The greatest number of respondents 129 (65%) reported their reason for working was out of economic necessity.

The current sample was asked how supportive they felt by their employer and by the important people in their lives. Their responses are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2

*Employer and Important People Supportiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Supportiveness of Family Needs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Supportive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Not Supportive</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Supportive</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Supportive</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important People Supportiveness to Career Needs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Supportive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Not Supportive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Supportive</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Supportive</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the largest number of respondents felt supported by their employer and by important people in their lives. Over one third (38%) of the respondents reported they felt their employer was very supportive of their family needs. Likewise, nearly half
(46%) of the respondents reported they felt the important people in their lives were very supportive of their career needs.

In general, the “average” respondent in this sample is a woman manager in the business field, married, between the ages of 41-50, with a working spouse, has children living at home, and did not leave the work force to care for her children. She has been in the work force for 21 or more years, has been with her present employer between 1-10 years, works due to economic reasons, and feels her employer is supportive of her family needs and important people in her life are supportive of her career needs.

**Preliminary Analyses**

Respondents were asked to complete the Salience Inventory (SI; Super & Nevill, 1986) in order to investigate the research hypothesis that women managers can be differentiated into three groups based on their attributions of importance for work and family roles. The three categories of work (W), home/family (H/F), both work and home/family (Both) were obtained using the SI Participation (P) and Commitment (C) subscale scores of respondents. As indicated in Chapter III, when scores were equal, or there was a ± 1 point between PH/F, CH/F and PW, CW the participant was placed in the combined group. When there was more than a 1 point difference between PH/F, CH/F and PW, CW the participant was placed in the role that had the higher points. Placing respondents (N = 197) into the three categories based on their SI scores resulted in the following groupings: Work = 56 (28%), Home/Family = 90 (46%), both Work and Home/Family = 51 (26%). To get an expressed versus measured component for role salience, respondents were asked what was more important to them in terms of work,
home/family or both work and home/family. Respondents’ expressed role salience varied from their measured role salience as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

*Comparison of Respondents’ Measured vs. Expressed Role Salience (N = 197)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Measured Role Salience</th>
<th>Expressed Role Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/Family</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Work and Home/Family</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 provides the comparative demographic percentages of respondents by measured and expressed role salience. This summary is given to explore the data further by the categories of work, home/family and both work and home/family.

Table 4

*Comparative Demographic Percentages of Respondents Grouped by Measured and Expressed Role Salience for Work (W), Home/Family (H/F) and Both Work and Home/Family (Both)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Measured Role Salience</th>
<th>Expressed Role Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Characteristic</td>
<td>N = 56</td>
<td>N = 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/ partnered/living together (as compared to not married)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have dependent children living at home</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left work force to care for children at home</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for working</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Comparative Demographic Percentages of Respondents Grouped by Measured and Expressed Role Salience for Work (W), Home/Family (H/F) and Both Work and Home/Family (Both) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Measured Role Salience</th>
<th>Expressed Role Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W (N = 56)</td>
<td>H/F (N = 90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W (N = 7)</td>
<td>H/F (N = 63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic necessity
57% 71% 65% 57% 74% 62%

Personal satisfaction
20% 19% 29% 43% 13% 25%

Both economic and personal
23% 10% 6% 0 13% 13%

As shown in Table 4 above, divergent demographic information was reported by respondents when they were grouped by both measured and expressed role salience. Although the sample size was small for the work category of respondents when they were grouped by expressed role salience, respondents in the work categories varied the most when comparing the two groups for being married, having children, working for personal satisfaction and working for both personal and economic satisfaction.

The Work-Family Conflict Scale (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999) was subjected to a principal axis factor analysis in order to assess the construct validity of the scale with the current sample. The construct validity of this scale has limited empirical support as compared to the other measures used in this study. Although Kelloway et al. established a four factor structure in their factor analysis, Noor (2004) was unable to substantiate the four factors of the scale with her sample of English women with children (N = 147).
In the current study, two factors were extracted with eigenvalues over 1.5. The two factors had eigenvalues of 7.6 and 2.8 respectively and accounted for 34% and 13% of the common variance, respectively. The scree plot, in conjunction with the variance accounted for data, supported a two factor solution. The factors were subjected to a varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization resulting in a model that accounted for 47% of the common variance. With a factor loading cutoff of .3, 11 items loaded on Factor 1, Work Interfering with Family, and 10 items loaded on Factor 2, Family Interfering with Work, with item 22 being in question. A summary of items and factor loadings is shown in Table 5. The sample specific internal consistencies for the Work Interfering with Family (WIF) and Family Interfering with Work (FIW) subscales were .90 and .84 respectively.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading 1</th>
<th>Factor Loading 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have to change plans with family members because of the</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demands of my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job demands keep me from spending the amount of time I</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would like with my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I spend time at work thinking about the things that I have to</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get done at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My family life puts me into a bad mood at work.</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job responsibilities make it difficult for me to get family</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chores/errands done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Summary of Items and Factor Loadings for the WIF and FIW Subscales Rotated by Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (N = 197) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. To meet the demands of my job, I have to limit the number of things I do with family members.</td>
<td>.812  .214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Events at home make me tense and irritable on the job.</td>
<td>.236  .574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Because of the demands I face at home, I am tired at work.</td>
<td>.184  .557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My job prevents me from attending appointments and special events for family members.</td>
<td>.654  .212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. After work, I have little energy left for the things I need to do at home.</td>
<td>.660  .268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When I am at work, I am distracted by family demands.</td>
<td>.097  .743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Things going on in my family life make it hard for me to concentrate at work.</td>
<td>.064  .763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I think about work when I am at home.</td>
<td>.624  -.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I do not listen to what people at home are saying because I am thinking about work.</td>
<td>.476  .168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I spend time at work making arrangements for family members.</td>
<td>.008  .448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Family demands make it difficult for me to have the work schedule I want.</td>
<td>.142  .578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. After work, I just need to be left alone for a while.</td>
<td>.503  .155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My job puts me in a bad mood at home.</td>
<td>.672  .120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My family demands interrupt my workday.</td>
<td>.161  .677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Family demands make it difficult for me to take on additional job responsibilities.</td>
<td>.218  .489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Summary of Items and Factor Loadings for the WIF and FIW Subscales Rotated by Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (N = 197) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading 1</th>
<th>Factor Loading 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The demands of my job make it hard for me to enjoy the time I spend with my family.</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I would put in a longer workday if I had fewer family demands.</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two factor solution is consistent with the results Noor (2004) found in her study in which only a distinction between WIF conflict and FIW conflict was established with 11 items loading on each factor. Because it was consistent with Noor’s findings, item 22 was retained in the subscale and attributed to Factor 2. On the other hand, the four factor solution established by the scale’s authors (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, the 1999), which also distinguished between strain-based and time-based conflicts, was not supported.

The Self form of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Kouzes & Posner, 2003) was used to access leadership practices. The subscales and their sample specific internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach’s alpha) were as follows: Modeling the Way (MTW), .83; Inspiring a Shared Vision (ISV), .89; Challenging the Process (CTP), .88; Enabling Others to Act (EOA), .81; and Encouraging the Heart (ETH), .91.

The means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values for the total sample for the research measures, including the subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory and the two subscales (WIF and FIW) of the Work-Family Conflict Scale, are
presented in Table 6. Table 7 presents the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values for the sample when it is categorized by measured salient roles.

Table 6

*Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Values for Research Measures (N = 197)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Practices Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTW Subscale</td>
<td>46.32</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISV Subscale</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP Subscale</td>
<td>44.48</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOA Subscale</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH Subscale</td>
<td>48.44</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-Family Conflict Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIF Subscale</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW Subscale</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Subscales are identified as follows: MTW = Modeling the Way; ISV = Inspiring a Shared Vision; CTP = Challenging the Process; EOA = Enabling Others to Act; ETH = Enabling the Heart; WIF = Work Interfering with Family; FIW = Family Interfering with Work.

Table 7

*Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Values for Research Measures by Salient Roles of Work (W), Home/Family (H/F) and both Work and Home/Family (Both)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Research Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W (N = 56)</td>
<td>MTW Subscale</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISV Subscale</td>
<td>44.96</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Values for Research Measures by Salient Roles of Work (W), Home/Family (H/F) and both Work and Home/Family (Both) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Research Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W (N = 56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTP Subscale</td>
<td>45.98</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EOA Subscale</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETH Subscale</td>
<td>49.39</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIF Subscale</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIW Subscale</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/F (N = 90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTW Subscale</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISV Subscale</td>
<td>40.71</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTP Subscale</td>
<td>42.63</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EOA Subscale</td>
<td>48.37</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETH Subscale</td>
<td>47.28</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIF Subscale</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIW Subscale</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both (N = 51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTW Subscale</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISV Subscale</td>
<td>45.37</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTP Subscale</td>
<td>46.08</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EOA Subscale</td>
<td>48.67</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETH Subscale</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIF Subscale</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIW Subscale</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Subscales are identified as follows: MTW = Modeling the Way; ISV = Inspiring a Shared Vision; CTP = Challenging the Process; EOA = Enabling Others to Act; ETH = Enabling the Heart; WIF = Work Interfering with Family; FIW = Family Interfering with Work.

A correlation matrix for the research measures, including the subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory and the two subscales (WIF and FIW) of the Work-Family Conflict Scale, are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Correlation Matrix of Subscale Research Variables (N = 197)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alpha Coefficients</th>
<th>WIF</th>
<th>FIW</th>
<th>MTW</th>
<th>ISV</th>
<th>CTP</th>
<th>EOA</th>
<th>ETH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTW</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISV</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOA</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Subscales are identified as follows: MTW = Modeling the Way; ISV = Inspiring a Shared Vision; CTP = Challenging the Process; EOA = Enabling Others to Act; ETH = Enabling the Heart; WIF = Work Interfering with Family; FIW = Family Interfering with Work

*p = .05.  **p = .01.

The significant correlations among the Leadership Practices subscales, as shown in Table 8 and the intercorrelations are consistent with previously conducted research.

For example, Carless (2001) noted that intercorrelations between subscales were high,
with average correlations of .89. Even though these correlations are high, they do not represent multicollinearity according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). These authors suggest that multicollinearity is a problem when correlations between the dependent variables are above .90. There was also a significant correlation between the WIF and FIW subscales, indicating some overlap between the subscales as well.

As part of the preliminary analyses, MANOVAs were conducted as a function of respondents’ demographic variables and leadership practices to investigate possible significant relationships. The demographic variables considered were age range, marital status, number of years in the workforce, having dependent children living at home, estimation of support from employer and important people in the respondent’s life. Number of years in the workforce and estimation of employer support of family needs were the only variables that showed a significant relationship to the leadership practices and as a result, were controlled for in the primary analyses for the statistical hypotheses.

Years in the work force showed a significant relationship with the leadership practices subscales (Wilks’ Lambda = .82, F(20, 621.16) = 1.90, \( p = .01 \), \( \eta^2 = .05 \)). The univariate test results indicated significance on all five subscales: MTW, \( p = .013 \), \( \eta^2 = .064 \); ISV, \( p = .000 \), \( \eta^2 = .103 \); CTP, \( p = .002 \), \( \eta^2 = .086 \); EOA, \( p = .002 \), \( \eta^2 = .086 \); ETH, \( p = .002 \). \( \eta^2 = .085 \). Means and standard deviations of the leadership subscales for the number of years in the work force are presented in Table 9. As indicated previously, these data reflect one missing respondent resulting in a sample size of 196.
Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations of Leadership Subscales at the Levels of Years in the Work Force (N = 196)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Way</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>43.21</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>43.07</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>48.44</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>47.95</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring a Shared Vision</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>39.36</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>37.57</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>42.90</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>48.19</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>43.41</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>46.85</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Others to Act</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>46.54</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

*Means and Standard Deviations of Leadership Subscales at the Levels of Years in the Work Force (N = 196) (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Others to Act</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>52.47</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>49.91</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>44.71</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>51.72</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>50.02</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 presents the LSD post hoc test results of multiple comparisons of the leadership subscales.

Table 10

*Multiple Comparisons (LSD) of Significant Leadership Scales at Levels of Years in the Work Force*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Years (mean)</th>
<th>Years (mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Way</td>
<td>10 or less (43.21)</td>
<td>11-15 (43.07)</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (48.44)</td>
<td>.014*</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (46.63)</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (47.95)</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

*Multiple Comparisons (LSD) of Significant Leadership Scales at Levels of Years in the Work Force (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Years (mean)</th>
<th>Years (mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 (43.07)</td>
<td>16-20 (48.44)</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (46.63)</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (47.95)</td>
<td>.010*</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (48.44)</td>
<td>21-25 (46.63)</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (47.95)</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (46.63)</td>
<td>Over 25 (47.95)</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring a Shared Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or less (39.36)</td>
<td>11-15 (37.57)</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (46.03)</td>
<td>.009**</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (42.90)</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (46.20)</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 (37.57)</td>
<td>16-20 (46.03)</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (42.90)</td>
<td>.022*</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (46.20)</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (46.03)</td>
<td>21-25 (42.90)</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (46.20)</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (42.90)</td>
<td>Over 25 (46.20)</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 or less (41.29)</td>
<td>11-15 (40.29)</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Multiple Comparisons (LSD) of Significant Leadership Scales at Levels of Years in the Work Force (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Years (mean)</th>
<th>Years (mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (48.19)</td>
<td>21-25 (43.41)</td>
<td>.005**</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (46.85)</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 (40.29)</td>
<td>16-20 (48.19)</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (43.41)</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (46.85)</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (48.19)</td>
<td>21-25 (43.41)</td>
<td>.027*</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (46.85)</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (43.41)</td>
<td>Over 25 (46.85)</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Others to Act</td>
<td>10 or less (46.14)</td>
<td>11-15 (46.54)</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (52.47)</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (48.55)</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (49.91)</td>
<td>.017*</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 (46.54)</td>
<td>16-20 (52.47)</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (48.55)</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (49.91)</td>
<td>.032*</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (52.47)</td>
<td>21-25 (48.55)</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (49.91)</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

_Multiple Comparisons (LSD) of Significant Leadership Scales at Levels of Years in the Work Force_ (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Years (mean)</th>
<th>Years (mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Others to Act</td>
<td>21-25 (48.55)</td>
<td>Over 25 (49.91)</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>10 or less (44.71)</td>
<td>11-15 (44.68)</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (51.72)</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (48.65)</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (50.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.007**</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 (44.68)</td>
<td>16-20 (51.72)</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (48.65)</td>
<td>.050*</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (50.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.007**</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 (51.72)</td>
<td>21-25 (48.65)</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 25 (50.02)</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 (48.65)</td>
<td>Over 25 (50.02)</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 10 shows that on the Modeling the Way subscale, respondents in the workforce with 10 or less years had significantly lower scores as compared to those with 16-20 years and those with over 25 years. Similarly, respondents in the workforce with 11-15 years had significantly lower scores as compared to those with 16-20 years and those with over 25 years. There were no significant differences in scores of respondents with 21-25 years in the workforce as compared to any other range of years.
For the Inspiring a Shared Vision subscale, respondents with 10 or less years in the work force had significantly lower scores as compared to those with 16-20 years and those with over 25 years. Additionally, respondents in the work force with 11-15 years had significantly lower scores as compared to those with 16 or more years.

Considering the Challenging the Process subscale, again respondents with 15 or less years in the work force had significantly lower scores as compared to those with 16-20 years and those with over 25 years. In addition, respondents with 16-20 years in the work force had significantly higher scores as compared to those with those with 21-25 years.

Respondents’ scores on the Enabling Others to Act subscale were significantly different at the same number of years as they were for the Challenging the Process subscale. Respondents with 15 or less years in the work force had significantly lower scores compared to those with 16-20 years and those with over 25 years. Those respondents with 16-20 years in the work force also had significantly higher scores compared to those with 21-25 years.

A similar pattern can be seen on the Encouraging the Heart subscale. Respondents with 15 or less years in the work force had significantly lower scores compared to those with 16-20 years and those with over 25 years. Additionally, respondents with 11-15 years in the work force had significantly lower scores compared to those with 21-25 years.

Estimation of employer support to family needs was the second demographic variable that showed a significant relationship with the leadership practices subscales (Wilks’ Lambda = .84, F(20, 624.48) = 1.61, p = .04, η² = .04). The univariate test results
indicated significance on three of the five subscales as a function of level of support:

Modeling the Way, $p = .021, \eta^2 = .058$; Inspiring a Shared Vision, $p = .033, \eta^2 = .053$; Challenging the Process, $p = .065$; Enabling Others to Act, $p = .051$; Encouraging the Heart, $p = .019, \eta^2 = .059$. Means and standard deviations of the leadership subscales for the employer support of family needs are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

*Means and Standard Deviations of Leadership Subscales at Estimations of Employer Support to Family Needs (N = 197)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Employer Support</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Way</td>
<td>Not at all supportive</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat not supportive</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat supportive</td>
<td>45.59</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td>48.63</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring a Shared Vision</td>
<td>Not at all supportive</td>
<td>38.65</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat not supportive</td>
<td>40.31</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat supportive</td>
<td>42.37</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td>45.79</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
<td>Not at all supportive</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat not supportive</td>
<td>42.37</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

*Means and Standard Deviations of Leadership Subscales at Estimations of Employer Support to Family Needs (N = 197) (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Employer Support</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging the Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.76</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling Others to Act</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.81</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouraging the Heart</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.59</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.81</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.84</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.01</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 presents the LSD post hoc test results of multiple comparisons of the leadership subscales at estimations of employer support of family needs.
Table 12

Multiple Comparisons (LSD) of Significant Leadership Subscales at Estimations of Employer Support of Family Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Support (mean)</th>
<th>Support (mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Way</td>
<td>Not at all supportive (44.29)</td>
<td>Somewhat not supportive (46.75)</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive (43.72)</td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (45.59)</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very supportive (48.63)</td>
<td>.049*</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat not supportive (46.75)</td>
<td>Supportive (43.72)</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (45.59)</td>
<td>Very supportive (48.63)</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very supportive (48.63)</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive (43.72)</td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (45.59)</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very supportive (48.63)</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (45.59)</td>
<td>Very supportive (48.63)</td>
<td>.048*</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspiring a Shared Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Support (mean)</th>
<th>Support (mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all supportive (38.65)</td>
<td>Somewhat not supportive (40.31)</td>
<td>Supportive (42.11)</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive (42.11)</td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (42.37)</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (42.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Multiple Comparisons (LSD) of Significant Leadership Subscales at Estimations of Employer Support of Family Needs (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Support (mean)</th>
<th>Support (mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspiring a Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td>Not at all supportive (38.65)</td>
<td>Very supportive (45.79)</td>
<td>.009**</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not supportive (40.31)</td>
<td>Supportive (42.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive (42.37)</td>
<td>Very supportive (45.79)</td>
<td>.048*</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive (42.11)</td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (42.37)</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive (42.37)</td>
<td>Very supportive (45.79)</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>Not at all supportive (45.59)</td>
<td>Somewhat not supportive (48.81)</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not supportive (48.81)</td>
<td>Supportive (46.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive (46.67)</td>
<td>Very supportive (51.01)</td>
<td>.020*</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not supportive (48.81)</td>
<td>Supportive (46.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

*Multiple Comparisons (LSD) of Significant Leadership Subscales at Estimations of Employer Support of Family Needs* (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Support (mean)</th>
<th>Support (mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>Somewhat not supportive (48.81)</td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (46.67)</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very supportive (51.01)</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive (46.84)</td>
<td>Somewhat supportive (46.67)</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very supportive (51.01)</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive (46.67)</td>
<td>Very supportive (51.01)</td>
<td>.008**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 12 shows that on the Modeling the Way and Encouraging the Heart subscales, respondents’ scores at the “not at all supportive,” “supportive,” and “somewhat supportive” estimation levels were significantly lower as compared to those at the “very supportive” estimation level of employer support of family needs. On the Inspiring a Shared Vision subscale, however, only respondents’ scores at the “not at all supportive” and “somewhat not supportive” estimation levels were significantly lower as compared to those at the “very supportive” estimation level of employer support of family needs.  

Table 13, shown below, presents the procedures performed in this chapter thus far.
Table 13

*Procedures Performed in Chapter IV Excluding Tests of Statistical Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic characteristics</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer and important people supportiveness</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorization of women managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured role salience (SI)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed role salience</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Family conflict Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor analysis</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale reliabilities, means and standard deviations</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Practices Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale reliabilities, means and standard deviations</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation matrix of subscale research variables</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANOVA test results of selected demographic variables</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests of Statistical Hypotheses</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant relationship was found between the number of years respondents were in the work force, estimation of employer support of family needs and leadership practices. These two variables were subsequently controlled for, when appropriate, in the tests of statistical hypotheses.
Tests of Statistical Hypotheses

The following section will present the results of the tests of statistical hypotheses. The first statistical hypothesis stated that there was no significant \( p < .05 \) difference between the leadership practices of participants with and without dependent children as measured by the five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). Number of years in the work force and estimate of employer support of family needs were covaried in the analysis. The MANCOVA of the first hypothesis was not significant (Wilks’ Lambda = .97, \( F(5, 188) = 1.27, \ p = .28 \)), and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the leadership practices of women managers with or without dependent children.

The second statistical hypothesis stated that participants with measured role salience for Work and both Work and Home/Family will have significantly \( p < .05 \) higher scores on the Work Interfering with Family (WIF) subscale than those with Home/Family role salience; whereas, participants with measured role salience for Home/Family and both Work and Home/Family will have significantly \( p < .05 \) higher scores on the Family Interfering with Work subscale than those with Work role salience. The MANOVA of the second hypothesis was significant (Wilks’ Lamda = .82, \( F(4, 386) = 10.02, \ p = .000, \eta^2 = .094 \)). The univariate test results indicated significance on the WIF subscale \( (p = .000, \eta^2 = .094) \) but not on the FIW subscale \( (p = .670) \). Table 14 presents the LSD post hoc test results of multiple comparisons of scoring on the WIF subscale of respondents grouped by salient roles.
Table 14

*Multiple Comparisons (LSD) of Scoring on Work Interfering with Family (WIF) Subscale of Respondents Grouped by Measured Salient Roles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salient Role (Subscale mean)</th>
<th>Salient Role (Subscale mean)</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work (25.02)</td>
<td>Home/Family (20.14)</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Work and Home/Family (23.43)</td>
<td>Home/Family (23.43)</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/Family (20.14)</td>
<td>Both Work and Home/Family (23.43)</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01.

Table 14 shows that the scores of respondents with a salient Work role were significantly higher on the WIF subscale as compared to those having a salient role for Home/Family. Furthermore, scores of respondents with a salient Home/Family role were significantly lower as compared to those having a salient role for both Work and Home/Family. Therefore, the first part of the second hypothesis is supported; whereas, the second part of the hypothesis is not supported. These data suggest that there is no significant difference between the scores of women managers with measured role salience for Work, Home/Family and both Work and Home/Family on the Family Interfering with Work (FIW) subscale.

Because respondents’ expressed role salience varied from their measured role salience, analyses were conducted on the WIF and FIW subscales with the expressed salience groups. Due to the small sample size (N = 7), the Work group was not included.
in the analyses. The MANOVA analyses revealed that there were no significant differences in the scores (Wilks’ Lambda = .98, F(2, 187) = 2.16, p = .12).

The third statistical hypothesis stated that participants with salient roles for Work and both Work and Home/Family will have significantly (p < .05) higher scores on the five Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) subscales than those with a salient role for Home/Family. Number of years in the work force and estimate of employer support of family needs were covaried in the analysis. The MANCOVA of the third hypothesis was not significant (Wilks’ Lambda = .93, F(10, 374) = 1.38, p = .19), and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. These results suggest that there is no significant difference between the leadership practices of women managers having salient roles for Work, Home/Family or both Work and Home/Family.

The fourth statistical hypothesis stated that participants identified as having WIF conflict will have significantly (p < .05) higher scores on the five Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) subscales than participants identified has having FIW conflict. As reflected in their scores on the WIF and FIW subscales, respondents had varying amounts of both work interfering with family conflict and family interfering with work conflict. In order to perform this analysis, it was necessary to group respondents into either a work interfering with family category or a family interfering with work category based upon their scores on the subscales. Respondents who scored at or above the mean score on the WIF subscale were placed in the WIF category. Respondents who scored at or above the mean score on the FIW subscale were placed in the FIW category. Number of years in the work force and estimate of employer support of family needs were covaried in the analysis. The MANCOVA of the fourth hypothesis was not significant (WIF category:}
Wilks’ Lambda = .97, F(5, 186) = 1.14, p = .34; FIW category: Wilks’ Lambda = .94, F(5, 186) = 2.16, p = .06; Interaction: Wilks’ Lambda = .95, F(5, 186) = 1.74, p = .13).

As a result, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. Indications are that there is no significant difference between the leadership practices of women managers identified as having WIF conflict and those identified as having FIW conflict.

In summary, there was no significant difference between the leadership practices of women managers with or without dependent children. Women managers with salient roles for Work and both Work and Home/Family scored significantly higher on the WIF subscale than those with a salient role for Home/Family. There was no significant difference, however, between the scores of women managers with salient roles of Work, Home/Family and both Work and Home/Family on the FIW subscale. There was no significant difference between the leadership practices of women managers with salient roles for Work, Home/Family or both Work and Home/Family. Finally, there was no significant difference between the leadership practices of women managers identified as having WIF conflict and those identified as having FIW conflict. A discussion of these results is presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Today’s workforce is composed of an increasing number of women, especially in managerial and professional positions (U. S. Dept. of Labor, 2004). Dual-earner couples are challenged to manage work and family responsibilities while attempting to satisfy role expectations in both domains (Hammer, Allen, & Grigsby, 1997). From a feminist perspective, women, particularly mothers, are disadvantaged in the work place due to traditional gender role stereotypes (Rideway & Correll, 2004). They continue to encounter barriers to progressing in their organizations due to these beliefs (Cuddy et al., 2004; Rideway & Correll) and as a result, their leadership capabilities and commitment to their careers have also been questioned. The current study investigated how role salience and work-family conflict relate to leadership practices for women managers. A summary and discussion of the results, along with recommendations for future research and practice are presented below.

In this study, the number of years in the workforce and estimation of employer support of family needs were demographic variables that showed statistically significant relationships with leadership practices. The results also indicated there were no significant differences in leadership practices between women managers having dependent children at home and those not having dependent children at home. Additionally, women managers were able to be differentiated based on their salience for
work, family, and both work and family roles. Moreover, women managers with a role salience for work and both work and family had significantly more Work Interfering with Family (WIF) conflict than managers with a family salient role. However, there was no significant difference in Family Interfering with Work (FIW) conflict among the women managers with any salient roles. Relative to leadership practices and role salience, results of this study indicated that there were no significant differences in the leadership practices of women managers with a role salience for work, family, and both work and family. Finally, women managers identified as having WIF conflict did not significantly engage in more leadership practices than those identified as having FIW conflict.

Demographic Variables and Leadership Practices

There was a significant relationship between number of years in the work force and all five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory. Although significant, the effect size ($\eta^2 = .05$) of this relationship overall was small and therefore, may have little practical significance. However, Cohen’s $d$ effect sizes, or the standardized mean differences among various levels of years in the work force, suggest greater practical significance.

Considering the Leadership Practices Inventory subscales, women managers in the work force with 10 or less years and 11-15 years had significantly lower scores on Modeling the Way (MTW) subscale as compared to those with 16-20 years (Cohen’s $d = .61$ and $.60$, for 10 years or less and 11-15 years, respectively) and over 25 years (Cohen’s $d = .60$ and $.59$ for 10 years or less and 11-15 years, respectively). These relationships have medium effect sizes so the strength of relationship is fairly strong. Based on these results, it may be concluded that women managers with 16-20 years and
over 25 years in the work force engaged in the leadership practice of modeling significantly more frequently as compared to those with 15 or less years in the work force, and this behavior is likely to be noticeable. The question may arise as to why scores for the 21-25 years in the work force would not be included in the groupings of significantly different scores. A closer examination of the mean scores for these three groups reveals that there is a less than two point difference between them and there was not statistical difference among the scores of these three groups. So there is no difference in the frequency that women managers with 16 or more years in the work force engaged in the leadership practice of modeling. Considering this, perhaps sample size or sampling error could account for the lack of statistical significance of the group of 21-25 years in the work force.

For the Inspiring a Shared Vision (ISV) and Encouraging the Heart (ETH) subscales, women managers’ scores for those with 16 or more years in the work force were significantly higher as compared to those with 11-15 years. Effect sizes for these relationships ranged from .43 to .86 with the lowest being for the 21-25 category (Cohen’s $d = .43$ for inspiring; .46 for encouraging). This means that the strength of the relationship was medium to large for women with 16-20 and over 25 years in the work force and somewhat smaller for women with 21-25 years. These results suggest that women managers with 16 or more years in the work force engaged in inspiring a shared vision and encouraging the heart significantly more often as compared to women managers with 11-15 years in the work force. Compared to those with 10 years or less, only the scores of women managers with 16-20 and over 25 years in the work force were significantly higher, (Cohen’s $d = .65$ and .77 respectively for inspiring; .79 and .63
respectively for encouraging) and the strength of this relationship was medium to large. Women managers’ scores for those with 21-25 years in the work force were not significantly different compared to those with 10 or less years in the work force for both inspiring and encouraging. These data suggest that the behaviors of envisioning the future/enlisting others and recognizing individual contribution/celebrating accomplishments may be more discernable among women managers with 16-20 and over 25 years in the work force as compared to those with 15 years or less and among those with 21-25 years in the work force as compared to those with 11-15 years.

Women managers’ scores on the Challenging the Process (CTP) and Encouraging Others to Act (EOA) subscales were significantly higher for respondents with 16-20 and those with over 25 in the work force as compared to those with 15 or less years. Cohen’s \( d \) ranged from .71 to .90 for 16-20 years and from .54 to .69 for over 25 years in the work force. These results support that women managers with 16-20 and over 25 years in the work force engage in the leadership practices of challenging the process and enabling others to act significantly more frequently as compared to respondents with 15 or less years in the work force and the strength of these relationships was medium to large with the strongest relationship at the 16-20 years in the work force category. Additionally on these subscales, women managers with 16-20 years in the work force had significantly higher scores as compared to those with 21-25. These relationships were medium in strength (Cohen’s \( d = .56 \) for challenging; \( .64 \) for enabling) which suggests the behaviors of experimenting/taking risks and fostering collaboration would likely be noticeable in practice.
In summary, it appears that there was not statistical difference in the frequency of using any of the five leadership practices by women managers with 21-25 years in the work force as compared to those with 10 or less years. However, the 21-25 year category of managers used the practices of inspiring and encouraging statistically more frequently than those with 11-15 years in the work force and these relationships may have medium practical significance. Women managers with 16-20 and over 25 years in the work force significantly used all five leadership practices more frequently than those with 15 or less years. The effect sizes of these relationships ranged from .54 to .90 and may have medium to large practical significance. Interestingly, the mean scores for 16-20 years in the work force are consistently higher than those for not only 21-25 but also for over 25, although the difference is not as great. It may be that women managers start becoming disengaged after 21 years of working. After all, the “average” respondent in this sample was between the ages of 41-50 with 21 or more years in the work force, had children living at home, and had been with her present employer between 1-10 years. It may be that she is contemplating retirement, may want to spend more time with her family before the children leave home, or she may be experiencing or want a change in life. This should be an area for further investigation.

Estimation of employer support of family needs was the second demographic variable that showed a significant relationship with the leadership practices subscales, specifically modeling (MTW), inspiring (ISV) and encouraging the heart (ETH). The effect size ($\eta^2 = .041$) for this significant relationship was small overall and therefore may have little practical significance. For each of these subscales however, women managers’ scores were significantly higher at the “very supportive” estimation level of employer
support of their family needs as compared to “not at all supportive” (Cohen’s $d = .53$ for modeling, $.69$ for inspiring, $.65$ for encouraging). These relationships had medium effect sizes which suggest there they may have some practical significance. These results support that women managers who felt their employers were very supportive of family needs engaged more frequently in the leadership practices of modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision and encouraging the heart as compared to those who did not at all feel their employer were supportive. This finding is supported by the work-family conflict literature in which social support has been viewed as a significant resource that can promote effective coping in the management of complex roles (Cook, 1994) and enhances employee well-being in the face of work-family conflict (Greenhouse & Parasuraman, 1994). Also, the degree of importance of family responsive employers has been viewed as a type of social support (Friedman, 1990) and, as it applied to this finding, can influence women managers’ leadership capabilities.

This particular sample of women managers, as well as the size of the sample, likely affected the statistical significance results relative to the leadership practices of challenging the process and enabling others to act for which significance at any level of support was not obtained. They may also have contributed to the lack of finding significance at the “very supportive” estimation level of employer support as compared to the other levels of support on the modeling, inspiring and encouraging subscales. Statistical significance was obtained at the “very supportive” estimation level as compared to “supportive” and “somewhat supportive” levels for modeling (Cohen’s $d = .61$ for supportive, $.37$ for somewhat supportive) and encouraging (Cohen’s $d = .49$ for supportive, $.52$ for somewhat supportive) leadership practices and for the “somewhat not
supportive” estimation level for inspiring (Cohen’s $d = .54$). These small to medium effect sizes suggest there may be some practical significance to the frequency that women managers engage in modeling, encouraging, and inspiring behaviors when they feel their employer is very supportive of their family needs as compared to those who do not feel supported, those who feel somewhat not supported, those who feel supported, and those who feel somewhat supportive.

Inconsistency in obtaining significance at the various estimation levels of employer support may also be due to not defining what constitutes employer support of family needs. Respondents were allowed to decide how supportive their employer was based on their own criteria. Providing a standard criteria for judging employer support would assist in providing more reliable responses.

*Mothers vs. Nonmothers and Leadership Practices*

From a feminist perspective, women, particularly mothers, are disadvantaged in the workplace due to traditional gender role stereotypes (Rideway & Correll, 2004) and continue to encounter barriers to progressing in their organizations due to these beliefs (Cuddy et al., 2004; Rideway & Correll). The finding in the current study that there are no differences in the leadership practices between women managers with dependent children and those without dependent children provides empirical support that mothers are not less capable of engaging in leadership practices than nonmothers. This finding is consistent with a feminist viewpoint which argues that mothers are suitable for authority positions compared to similar nonmothers, despite perceived opposition between the cultural definitions of the good mother and the ideal worker (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004).
It is possible that the LPI, a transformational leadership measure which focuses on interpersonal interaction, may have been a factor in this finding. Perhaps a different measure of transformational leadership may provide alternate findings and should be investigated.

*Differentiation by Role Salience*

The findings of this study support the theory of Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) that women managers could be differentiated by role salience for work and family roles reflected in orientations they described as career-primary, family-primary and career and family. In the current study, these orientations were depicted as work, home/family and both work and home/family respectively. It is interesting to note that the women managers’ measured role salience differed from their expressed role salience.

Almost half of the women managers had a measured role salience for home/family and the rest of the sample was split almost equally between a measured role salience for work and for both work and home/family. On the other hand, almost one-third of the sample had an expressed role salience for home/family and two-thirds of the sample had an expressed role salience for both work and home/family. Parasuraman and Greenhaus (1993) asserted that the family-primary orientation reflected the majority of married women in dual-earner relationships whose career was tied to the need to be responsive to the family. It would seem that this would be a trend for women managers in this study as 46% of the sample was categorized as having a measured role salience for home/family.

It may also be that more women managers perceive both their work role and family role as equally important although this was not the case when salience was
actually measured by participation in and commitment to the role using the Salience Inventory (SI). This difference brings up the question of using the SI as an accurate measure of work, family, and both work and family salience in this current research.

Considering the expressed role salience results, it may be possible that the women managers provided a socially desirable response that not only reflects choosing the family role as being important, which they may think is expected of them by societal norms as married women, and especially as mothers; but also allows them to choose work, which they may think fulfills personal satisfaction needs in addition to satisfying economic needs.

Work-Family Conflict, Role Salience and Leadership Practices

Similar to the results found by Cinamon and Rich (2002a) in their study with married lawyers and individuals working in the computer software and hardware field, women managers in this study with a role salience for work and both work and family, had significantly more WIF conflict ($p = .000, \eta^2 = .094$) as compared to managers with a family salient role ($p = .670$). The scores of respondents with a salient Work role were significantly higher on the WIF subscale as compared to those having a salient role for Home/Family and the effect size of this relationship was large (Cohen’s $d = .86$), suggesting there likely is practical significance. Additionally, scores of respondents with both Work and Home/Family salient role were significantly higher as compared to those having a salient role for only Home/Family. The effect size of this relationship was medium (Cohen’s $d = .56$), suggesting there may be practical significance. Although FIW conflict was greater for women managers with a role salience for family and both work and family than for those with a salience for work, it was not significantly greater as
hypothesized. This finding also is similar to the results of Cinamon and Rich in which the family profile did not reflect a significantly higher level of FIW conflict relative to members of the other profiles. Concurring with Cinamon and Rich (2002a) about the results, it may be possible that the family domain is more permeable to interference from the work domain for those with a work and both work and family role salience than those with a family role salience.

There were no significant differences in WIF or FIW conflict when expressed role salience was considered. However, these MANOVA analyses were only exploratory in nature since the Work category was not included in the analysis due to small sample size (N = 7).

There were no significant differences in leadership practices of the women managers when they were differentiated by role salience for work, family and both work and family. This finding, together with the previous finding that there were no significant differences between the leadership practices of women managers with children and without children, provides empirical data of how role salience is related to leadership practices of mothers vs. nonmothers. Role salience is not related to leadership practices of women managers regardless of whether or not they have dependent children.

Finally, the results of this study indicated that there was no significant difference between the leadership practices of women managers identified as having WIF conflict and those identified as having FIW conflict. Even though women managers with a salience for work and both work and family had significantly higher WIF conflict than those with a salience for family, as indicated previously, their leadership practices were not significantly different than those identified as having FIW conflict. Since for the FIW
conflict group, \( p = .06 \), it may be worth replicating with a larger sample to see if a
difference could be detected.

Not finding significant differences among women managers distinguished by
motherhood, role salience or work-family conflict brings into question what changes are
occurring in this culture. It is possible that a change in direction is occurring and a
broader perspective is developing about expectations and capabilities of women
managers.

*Limitations of the Study*

One of the limitations of this study was not requesting respondents to indicate
their race. Although women of color were solicited to participate in the study, a means to
distinguish women of color in the sample was not provided.

Another limitation concerns instrumentation. The three instruments used in the
investigation were self-report. These types of instruments may have a limitation of
respondent bias in reporting (Mariush, 1999). In this study, respondents may have
consciously or unconsciously distorted their responses based on a response set for social
desirability.

An additional limitation which may be problematic deals with theoretical and
measurement issues. The focus of this investigation may be more complex than what the
theoretical construction of the Salience Inventory and the Work-Family Conflict Scale
allow and what these instruments are measuring can accommodate (i.e., are they
measuring what they intended to measure). Perhaps significant differences in women
managers’ leadership practices were not found when they were categorized by role
salience or by having either WIF conflict or FIW conflict because the instruments were
utilized in ways which were not fully consistent with their theoretical basis. For example, a third category of “both work and home/family” was formed using the Salience Inventory which was not part of its theoretical constructs. In addition, the Work-Family Conflict Scale measures WIF conflict and FIW conflict for each respondent. It does not categorize respondents as having either WIF conflict or FIW conflict. Categorizing respondents into one group or the other was done in this study to conduct the analyses and was not necessarily part of the instrument’s theoretical construction.

Although multicollinearity in the WIF and FIW subscales and the LPI subscales was not a problem, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), because the correlations between the dependent variables were not above .90, nevertheless, the subscales may not be independent constructs. These correlations then, create a limitation in the study due to the possibility that these constructs are not distinct.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Future exploratory research is recommended to further investigate the results obtained in this study for measured vs. expressed role salience. Questions for consideration could be: Is the Salience Inventory an accurate measure of role salience as used in this study or does role salience have more to do with a mind set of women managers to provide a socially desirable response? What is the relationship between expressed role salience and WIF and FIW, if three categories for role salience are discernable?

Future research should also incorporate a larger sample size to determine if a more consistent significant relationship would exist between the 21-25 years in the work force and leadership practices and if the significance levels of the estimation of employer
support to family needs would be affected as it relates to leadership practices. An increased sample size could also assist in identifying women managers’ expressed role salience categories. It would also be interesting to see if a different leadership measure would yield similar results relative to mothers, nonmothers, and work-family conflict.

In order to obtain the number and ages of dependent children, survey questions could be reworded to obtain exact ages of the children along with the number of children. This would provide data that can be linked together for analysis thereby providing clearer data for interpretation. Similarly, regarding the amount of time taken from the work force to care for their children at home, the question could be reworded in order to obtain more consistent time designations. For example, all answers could be provided in years.

Although FIW conflict was not significantly different for women managers in any role salience category, it will likely take a larger sample size in order to detect any possible differences. This is worthy of future research consideration.

**Recommendations for Practice**

This study revealed that there were no significant differences in the leadership practices of women managers with children and those without children. This finding provides empirical support that contradicts the stereotypical belief that mothers are less capable than nonmothers relative to engaging in leadership practices. This finding can inform professionals in the counseling, psychology and business communities and assist them in dispelling stereotypes and help reduce barriers, as related to women managers. Human Resource personnel should be trained to dispel the myths that place what defines a good mother in direct opposition to what defines the ideal worker.
Furthermore, counseling women who are in or want to enter the business field about work-family conflict is recommended. Specifically, counselors may point out that women managers with a role salience for work and both work and family are likely to encounter work interfering with family conflict to a greater degree than those with a salience for family and provide suggestions to help alleviate this conflict. As women in managerial positions increase in the work force, the findings of this research will add to the data base of knowledge relating to women managers and their leadership capabilities.
REFERENCES


Ottinger, D. C. (1990). Differences in leadership practices and selected demographic characteristics of women executives in the top three positions of higher education and banking. *UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations, AAT 9107804.*

Padmanabhan, L. (2000, December 22). When women were second-class teachers (teaching during the early part of the 20th century). *Times Educational Supplement.* Retrieved July 20, 2005 from [http://www.tes.co.uk/search/story/?story_id=342027](http://www.tes.co.uk/search/story/?story_id=342027)


127

APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONS/ASSOCIATIONS CONTACTED BY E-MAIL

Advertising Women of New York
Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.
Altrusa International
American Business Women’s Association, Neapolitan Chapter
American Business Women’s Association – National
Association for Women in Communications
Association for Women in Computing
Association of Railway Business Women
Association of Women Professionals
Author House
Business and Professional Women/USA
Cleveland MCAP
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, INC.
Financial Women’s Association
Forum – Collier County
Gamma Chapter of Eta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc.
Gamma Phi delta Sorority, Inc.
Greater Cincinnati Women’s Network
Hudson Business and Professional Women’s Club
International Association of Culinary Professionals
Iota Phi Lambda Sorority, Inc.
Kane/Miller book Publishers
Lee County Business Women
Les Dames Escoffier
National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women’s Clubs, Inc.
National Association of Professional Mortgage Women
National Association of Women in Construction
Northeast Ohio Home Economists in Business
Orca Book Publishers
Pearson Education – USA
Pi Beta Phi Sorority
Scholastic USA
The Health Club of Naples
The McGraw-Hill Companies
The Women’s Alliance
Virtual We Chamber Network of South Florida
West Coast Business Professionals
Women Employed
Women in Management
Women’s eNews
Women’s Executive Club of South Palm Beach
Women’s Network of Collier County
Women’s Network of Northeast Ohio
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INFORMED CONSENT FOR E-MAIL SURVEY

Informed Consent and Introduction

Thank you for your interest in this research project entitled The Relationship Between Role Salience, Work-Family Conflict and Women’s Managerial Leadership Practices. This research is being conducted by Mary B. Nuosce, MS, a doctoral student in the Department of Counseling at The University of Akron in Ohio. Please read this page carefully before you agree to participate.

Your participation in this online survey will assist in furthering counseling’s understanding what relationships exist between the importance of the work and family roles, work-family conflict, and leadership practices for women in middle to upper levels of management. Approximately 500 women in management between the ages of 22 and 55 are being invited to participate in this research.

The survey contains four sections of statements/questions for which either Likert scale ratings or multiple choice answers are provided. If you agree to participate you will be asked to click the icon at the bottom of this page that says “Agree to Participate” and you will be connected to a web page that will direct you to complete the four sections. If you do not choose to participate, simply close this window. At the end of the survey you will be instructed to click an icon at the bottom of the screen which will say “Submit survey and exit.” Explicit directions will be given at each section.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts that are implicit in this process. You will receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study, but your participation may help us better understand women managers as a group and assist in dispelling myths and gender stereotypes that have become obstacles to their advancement.

It is expected that it will take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete the survey. Your anonymity as a respondent will be protected throughout the study and publication of the results. No identifying information will be attached to the survey data you provide. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or may discontinue participation at any time, without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.
If you have any questions about this study, you may contact Mary Nuosce at mnuosce@uakron.edu or Dr. Cynthia Reynolds at creynol@uakron.edu or call 330-972-6748. This project has been reviewed and approved by The University of Akron Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call Sharon McWhorter, Interim Director for Research Services at 330-972-7666 or 1-888-232-8790.

I have read the information provided above and all of my questions have been answered. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. My completion and return of the survey will serve as my consent. I can print a copy of this consent form for future reference.

Note. The above consent was presented on University of Akron, Department of Counseling letterhead.
Informed Consent and Introduction

Thank you for your interest in this research project entitled The Relationship Between Role Salience, Work-Family Conflict and Women’s Managerial Leadership Practices. This research is being conducted by Mary B. Nuosce, MS, a doctoral student in the Department of Counseling at The University of Akron in Ohio. Please read this page carefully before you agree to participate.

Your participation in this survey will assist in furthering counseling’s understanding of what relationships exist between the salience or importance of the work and family roles, work-family conflict, and leadership practices for women in middle to upper levels of management. Approximately 500 women in management between the ages of 22 and 55 are being invited to participate in this research.

The survey contains three measures and a demographic questionnaire. These comprise the four sections of statements/questions for which either Likert scale ratings or multiple choice answers are provided. Explicit directions will be given at each section.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts that are implicit in this process. You will receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study, but your participation may help us better understand women managers as a group and assist in dispelling myths and gender stereotypes that have become obstacles to their advancement.

It is expected that it will take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete the survey. Your anonymity as a respondent will be protected throughout the study and publication of the results. No identifying information will be attached to the survey data you provide. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or may discontinue participation at any time, without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

If you have any questions about this study, you may contact Mary Nuosce at mnuosce@uakron.edu or Dr. Cynthia Reynolds at creynol@uakron.edu or call
I have read the information provided above and all of my questions have been answered. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. My completion and return of the survey will serve as my consent.

Please keep this consent form for future reference.

Note. The above consent was presented on University of Akron, Department of Counseling letterhead.

Printed Survey

SECTION 1
In the Salience Inventory below, you are asked to tell about some of the things you do in each of the activities to which you give some time (participation) and then to show how you feel about doing them (commitment). You may need to consider time in some questions and amount or quantity in others. Please read each statement carefully. Then select from the numbered descriptions, identified from 1 to 4 below to show how true that statement is of you in each activity.

The RATING SCALE is as follows:

1 = Never, rarely, little, none
2 = Sometimes, some
3 = Often, quite a lot
4 = Almost always, always, a great deal

The two activities are defined as follows:

Working: for pay or profit, on a job or for yourself
Home/Family: taking care of your apartment or home; fixing or cleaning up after meals; shopping; caring for dependents such as children or aging parents

Please rate every statement in each activity using the RATING SCALE above. Work rapidly. If you are not sure, guess - your first thought is most likely to be the right answer for you.
## Participation
(What you actually do or have done recently)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I have spent or do spend time in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have talked or do talk to people about. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have spent or do spend time reading about. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have taken or do take advantage of opportunities in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have been or am active in an organization that has to do with. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have improved my performance in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am active in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have accomplished something in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. As often as I can, I take part in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have some books and magazines on. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RATING SCALE is as follows:

1 = Never, rarely, little, none  
2 = Sometimes, some  
3 = Often, quite a lot  
4 = Almost always, always, a great deal

## Commitment
(How you feel about it)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is or will be important to me to be good in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am or expect to be very much involved in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would like to be remembered for what I did in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would like to be active for many years in . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I really am committed to being active in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am or will be proud to do well in. . .</td>
<td>Working _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. I really feel personally involved in... Working _____ Home/Family_____
18. I admire people who are good at... Working _____ Home/Family_____
19. I find it fulfilling to take part in... Working _____ Home/Family_____
20. I would like to have plenty of time for... Working _____ Home/Family_____

21. Which one of the following is most important to you?
   1 ____ Work
   2 ____ Home/Family
   3 ____ Both Work and Home/Family

SECTION 2

For the following statements relating to work and family conflicts, select the numbered description, identified in the RATING SCALE from 1 to 4 below, which best indicates how true that statement is for you. Then place the number from the RATING SCALE in the blank following the statement.

The RATING SCALE is as follows:
1 = Never
2 = Sometimes
3 = Often
4 = Almost always

22. I have to change plans with family members because of the demands of my job. Rating

23. Job demands keep me from spending the amount of time I would like with my family. Rating

24. I spend time at work thinking about the things that I have to get done at home. Rating

25. My family life puts me into a bad mood at work. Rating

26. Job responsibilities make it difficult for me to get family chores/errands done. Rating

27. To meet the demands of my job, I have to limit the number of things I do with family members. Rating

28. Events at home make me tense and irritable on the job. Rating

29. Because of the demands I face at home, I am tired at work. Rating
30. My job prevents me from attending appointments and special events for family members. 

31. After work, I have little energy left for the things I need to do at home. 

32. When I am at work, I am distracted by family demands. 

33. Things going on in my family life make it hard for me to concentrate at work. 

34. I think about work when I am at home. 

35. I do not listen to what people at home are saying because I am thinking about work. 

36. I spend time at work making arrangements for family members. 

37. Family demands make it difficult for me to have the work schedule I want. 

38. After work, I just need to be left alone for a while. 

39. My job puts me in a bad mood at home. 

40. My family demands interrupt my workday. 

41. Family demands make it difficult for me to take on additional job responsibilities. 

42. The demands of my job make it hard for me to enjoy the time I spend with my family. 

43. I would put in a longer workday if I had fewer family demands. 

SECTION 3

The following Leadership Practices Inventory - Self, consists of 30 statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully and using the RATING SCALE shown below ask yourself: "How frequently do I engage in the behavior described?"

Be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in the behavior.
Be as honest and accurate as you can be.
DO NOT answer in terms of how you would like to behave or in terms of how you think you should behave.
DO answer in terms of how you typically behave on most days, on most projects, and with most people.
Be thoughtful about your responses. For example, giving yourself 10s on all items is most likely not an accurate description of your behavior. Similarly, giving yourself all 1s or all 5s is most likely not an accurate description either. Most people will do some things
more or less often than they do other things.

If you feel that a statement does not apply to you, it’s probably because you don’t frequently engage in the behavior. In that case, assign a rating of 3 or lower.

The RATING SCALE is from 1 to 10. Choose the number that best applies to each statement. Then place the number from the RATING SCALE in the blank following the statement.

Ask yourself: "How frequently do I engage in the behavior described?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING SCALE</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Almost never</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Rarely</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Seldom</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Once in a while</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Occasionally</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = Sometimes</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = Fairly often</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 = Usually</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 = Very frequently</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 = Almost always</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. I set a personal example of what I expect of others. _____
45. I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done. _____
46. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities. _____
47. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with. _____
48. I praise people for a job well done. _____
49. I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on. _____
50. I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like. _____
51. I challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work. _____
52. I actively listen to diverse points of view. _____
53. I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities. _____
54. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make. _____
55. I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future. _____
56. I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do. _____
57. I treat others with dignity and respect. _____
58. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects. _____
59. I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance. _____
60. I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision. _____
61. I ask “What can we learn?” when things don’t go as expected. _____
62. I support the decisions that people make on their own. _____
63. I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values. _____
64. I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization. _____
65. I paint the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish. _____
66. I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on. _____
67. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work. _____
68. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments. _____
69. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership. _____
70. I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work. _____
71. I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure. _____
72. I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves. _____
73. I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions. _____
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SECTION 4

Choose the response that best describes you or your situation for the following demographic questions.

74. What is your age range?
   1____ 22-30
   2____ 31-40
   3____ 41-50
   4____ 51-55
   5____ Other (Please specify) _____
75. What is your current marital status?
1_____ Single/Never married
2_____ Married
3_____ Divorced
4_____ Widowed
5_____ Committed Partner and living together
6_____ Other (Please specify) ____________________________

76. If you are married/in a committed relationship, does your spouse/partner work?
1_____ Yes
2_____ No (If No, skip to # 78)

77. Describe your spouse/partner’s current occupation.
1_____ Professional/Executive
2_____ Management
3_____ Sales
4_____ Skilled Trades
5_____ Unemployed/Not in the work force
6_____ Stay at home for child care
7_____ Retired
8_____ Other (Please specify) ____________________________

78. How many dependent children do you have living at home?
1_____ 0 (If 0, skip to # 80)
2_____ 1-2
3_____ 3-4
4_____ Over 4

79. If you have dependent children living at home, what are their ages? (Check all that apply)
_____ Under 1 year old
_____ 1-5 years old
_____ 6-10 years old
_____ 11-13 years old
_____ 14-18 years old
_____ Over 18 years old

80. Have you ever left the work force to care for your child/children at home?
   1_____ Yes
   2_____ No (If No, skip to # 82)

81. How long did you stay home caring for your child/children before returning to work? 
   (Select EITHER weeks, months OR years)
   _____ # of weeks
   _____ # of months
   _____ # of years

82. How many years have you been in the work force?
   1_____ Less than 1 year
   2____ 1-5 years
   3____ 6-10 years
   4____ 11-15 years
   5____ 16-20 years
   6____ 20-25 years
   7_____ Over 25 years

83. What type of organization are you employed by?
   1_____ Business
   2_____ Medicine
   3_____ Law
   4_____ Education
   5____ Other (Please specify) __________________________

84. How many years have you worked for your present employer?
   1_____ Less than 1 year
   2____ 1-3 years
   3____ 4-6 years
   4____ 7-10 years
   5____ 11-15 years
6 _____ 16-20 years
7 _____ Over 20 years

85. Why do you choose to work?
   1 _____ More for economic necessity
   2 _____ More for personal satisfaction
   3 _____ Other (Please specify) __________________________

To answer the next 2 questions, please use the RATING SCALE from 1 to 5;
1 = not at all supportive to 5 = very supportive

86. How supportive do you feel your employer is of your family needs? _____
87. How supportive do you feel the important people in your life are of your career needs? _____
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