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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A. General Introduction

Balancing the responsibilities of work and family is a growing challenge for modern society. Nearly 50% of workers admit they find it difficult to balance the responsibilities of the two domains (Parker & Wang, 2013). Workers often juggle the demands of work and family roles, which may include employee, spouse/partner, parent, or caregiver to elderly parents. As a result of the multiple roles employees hold, they can face a variety of demands that conflict with each other. Balancing family and work responsibilities can be an especially daunting task for parents. Working parents may find themselves in situations where they sacrifice spending quality time with their children in order to meet work demands.

Work-family conflict, defined as inter-role conflict that arises when the demands of work and family roles are incompatible (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1995), has received considerable scholarly attention in the field of organizational psychology and organizational behavior.

An employees’ experience of work-family conflict can lead to negative work and personal outcomes, such as lowered job satisfaction and family satisfaction, voluntary
turnover, and declining physical health (Adams, G., King, L. & King, 1996; Carr, Boyar, & Gregory, 2008; Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007; Russell, & Cooper, 1997).

Moreover, employees with high work-family conflict also tend to be negatively evaluated by their supervisors in performance appraisals, because the supervisors perceive work-family conflict as diminishing workers’ effectiveness (Li, Bagger, & Cropanzano, 2017). However, existing research has only examined how supervisors perceive subordinates with high work-family conflict (Hoobler, Wayne, & Lemmon, 2009; Li et al., 2017), while overlooking the likelihood that supervisors struggling to fulfill both work and family roles may also face negative judgment from their followers.

Due to traditional gender role expectations, how gender affects the experience of work-family conflict has attracted plentiful research attention. Gender stereotypes suggest that women should bear more family responsibilities and therefore working women should report higher levels of work family conflict. In turn, individuals are more likely to perceive a woman’s family responsibilities as a burden that interferes with her responsibilities at work (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004). However, men stereotypically are expected to be more involved in paid work and less involved in family responsibilities (Hill, 2005). Therefore, men are less likely to have family demands that spill over to their work roles. Challenging such lay perceptions, a recent meta-analysis involving more than 250,000 employees indicated that men and women reported similar levels of work-family conflict (Shockley, Shen, DeNunzio, Arvan & Knudsen, 2017). However, do gender role expectations still determine how men and women with challenging work-family interface are viewed? Attempting to address such gaps in work-family conflict
literature, the current research will set out to investigate how male and female leaders with work-family conflict may be perceived differently by their subordinates.

Some supervisors engage in family supportive supervisor behavior to help employees who struggle with conflicts between work and family roles (Lapierre & Allen, 2006). Family supportive initiatives by the supervisor, according to empirical evidence, is related to increased employee job performance, work engagement, and organizational commitment (Odle-Dusseau, Britt, & Greene-Shortridge, 2012; Rofcanin, Las Heras, & Bakker 2017; Straub, 2012). Nevertheless, it is likely that male and female leaders may be viewed differently based on whether they engage in FSSB or not, because traditional gender roles have a greater expectation for women to be more considerate and caring (Gupta, Jenkins, & Beehr, 1983). Another aim of the current study is to examine whether people’s perceptions of family supportive and non-supportive leaders are dependent on leader gender.

B. Theories on Leadership and Gender

Role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) was developed to account for challenges that women may face in leadership roles. According to this theory, the different expectations set for each gender stem from gender roles, which describe the behaviors and characteristics of men and women (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Gender roles influence the formation of gender stereotypes, which set the standard for characteristics associated with each gender and what behavior for each gender is acceptable and unacceptable. Communal traits, such as interpersonal sensitivity, gentleness, helpfulness, kindness, and sympathy are typically assigned to women, whereas agentic traits, such as
aggressiveness, dominance, ambition, assertiveness, and confidence, are commonly ascribed to men.

Role congruity theory posits that when a person engages in behavior or occupies a role that is incongruent with his or her gender roles, it can elicit prejudice against this person. For instance, Rudman (1998) found that women who engage in agentic behavior such as self-promotion are more likely to experience disapproval than a man for engaging in the same behavior.

Another useful theory on leadership perception is the leader categorization theory (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984), which explains how individuals make the distinction between leaders and non-leaders. Leadership prototypes are formed by the traits and behaviors an individual believes a leader should possess and engage in (Lord et al., 1984). Evaluators compare a target person with their leadership prototypes, which can lead to a match or mismatch between the target person’s traits and the traits that exist in the evaluators’ leadership prototypes. The evaluators then categorize the target person as a leader if there is a match and a non-leader if mismatch. Based on common traits in leader prototypes, such as dominance, assertiveness, and decisiveness, men are more likely to be viewed as leaders than women, and men's behaviors are evaluated as more prototypical of leader behavior than women's behaviors (Scott & Brown, 2006). Role congruity theory and leader categorization theory would suggest the presence of gender differences in perceived leadership effectiveness, but evidence suggests that such gender differences are not universally supported. A meta-analysis investigating a variety of leadership contexts for both genders demonstrated that men and women leaders do not differ in their perceived leader effectiveness (Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, & Woehr,
2014). Despite the evidence found in the meta-analysis, there are certain contexts in which gender does play a role in whether a leader will be viewed as effective. Leaders were rated more effective when their leadership roles aligned with gender roles. Specifically, male leaders tend to be rated more favorably when working in stereotypically masculine fields, such as the military. Female leaders tend to be rated more favorably when they work in occupations that require feminine traits, such as school administration (Karau, Makhijani, & Eagly, 1995). In addition, when self-ratings were examined, men tended to rate themselves higher in effectiveness as opposed to women. In addition, when self-ratings are examined, men tend to rate themselves higher in effectiveness as opposed to women. However, women are rated significantly more effective than male leaders when rated by peers, subordinates, or bosses (Paustin-Underdahl et al., 2014).

C. Work-Family Conflict and Leadership Perceptions

Work-family conflict is a type of inter-role conflict that happens when the energy, time, and demands of work and family are incompatible (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This definition insinuates a bidirectional relationship between work and family conflict. That is, work family conflict can be classified into work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). The family-to-work direction is of interest in this study, because the emphasis of the study is to examine how perceived leadership effectiveness is affected by leaders’ family responsibilities. Examples of family-to-work conflict (FWC) include having to miss a deadline at work to stay at home with a sick child or having to use time at work to take a phone call about family matters.
Maintaining family responsibilities can take away attention and time from work responsibilities, which can potentially lead to negative work outcomes. Results from previous meta-analytic studies suggest that both work-family conflict and family-work conflict can result in lowered job satisfaction and organizational withdrawal behaviors, such as absenteeism and tardiness at work (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005).

FWC may not only have negative consequences on employee work outcomes but also on how the employee is perceived by others at work. The phenomenon in which workers are negatively evaluated due to their overloaded family obligations is referred to as caregiver bias (Dickinson, 2008). Employees with high FWC may be viewed negatively due to the common misconception that having family responsibilities distracts workers’ focus from work. Cuddy et al. (2004) found that working women were perceived as less competent when compared to childless working mothers. Berdahl and Moon (2013) found that working fathers too faced workplace mistreatment, such as being taunted or excluded from important work activities, when they were more involved in childcare and domestic activities. Hoobler et al. (2009) indicated that subordinates with high FWC were more likely to be rated as poorer performers by their supervisors. Leaders, like other workers, are also likely to suffer the same negative judgment from subordinates when they experience high levels of FWC. The leadership categorization theory can shed light on the relationship between leaders’ FWC and perceived competence. According to the theory, agentic instead of communal traits are usually ascribed to prototypical leaders. It is likely that a leader with high FWC, which is
stereotypically more associated with communal roles, may not be seen as a prototypical leader.

Empirical evidence supports the notion that when a person does not match the individual’s leadership prototype, he or she will be less likely to be viewed as a leader (Hains, Hogg, & Duck, 1997; Lord et al., 1984; Palich & Hom, 1992). Therefore, it is likely that leaders with high FWC are perceived as less prototypical and therefore less competent. I hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 1**: Leaders with low family-to-work conflict will be viewed as more competent than leaders with high family-to-work conflict.

D. Family-to-Work Conflict & Leader Gender

Although previous research has found evidence of caregiver bias for both genders (Berdahl & Moon, 2013; Correll, Benard, & Paik, 2007; Fuegen, Biernat, Haines, & Deaux, 2004), I argue that such bias may be stronger for female leaders than it may be for male leaders. Ideally, a worker should be able to demonstrate full commitment to his or her organization by arranging non-work responsibilities around paid work, working long hours, and willingness to relocate or travel (Bailyn, 1993). Such standard for ideal workers is more aligned with the gender role expectations set for males. Traditional gender role expectations assume that women are the main bearers of family obligations such as raising children (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Parsons & Bales, 1995), which results in them being unfairly and inaccurately labeled as less dedicated to their job and less likely being promoted (King, 2008; Hoobler et al., 2009). Research findings indicated that working mothers were rated warmer but less competent compared to childless working women and men and working fathers (Cuddy et al., 2004). However, men may not be
penalized as harshly as women at work for being a caregiver. Instead, they are at times rewarded with the fatherhood bonus. Cuddy et al. (2004) found that working fathers’ perceived competence did not suffer and perceived warmth increased.

Male leaders’ high FWC is likely to be perceived as less threatening to their leadership roles. Pleck (1977) proposed that, due to traditional divisions of labor and gender roles men construct boundaries around their work domain. Consequently, men are expected to be better at protecting their work roles from interference by family obligations. Subordinates may assume that male leaders with extensive family obligations will want to first fulfill their financial responsibilities to their households and prioritize work roles. In contrast, female leaders may have to experience more negative consequences for high FWC compared to their male counterparts. According to the think manager-think men association (Schein, 1973), people view women’s stereotypical communal traits as incompatible with leadership expectations, which calls for individuals with agentic traits. Female leaders’ high FWC may remind their subordinates of their communal characteristics, making the negative stereotype about women leaders more salient. Hoobler et al (2009) found that, despite women reporting lower levels of FWC than men, managers perceived women as experiencing more FWC than male counterparts. Consequently, women received lowered performance ratings. In a similar vein, a female leader’s experience of FWC places her at a greater disadvantage than a male counterpart. Therefore, my second hypothesis is as follow:

**Hypothesis 2:** The negative effect of FWC on perceived leader competence will be greater for females than it will be for males.
E. Family Supervisor Supportive Behavior & Gender

Supervisors can aid their subordinates in managing their work and family demands better by exhibiting family supportive supervisory behavior (FSSB) (Hammer, Kossek, Zimmerman, & Daniels, 2007). FSSB consists of four dimensions: emotional support, instrumental support, role model behaviors, and creative work-family management. Instrumental support is the extent to which a leader provides workers with the resources or services they need to manage their work and family responsibilities (Hammer et al., 2007). Leaders can demonstrate this type of support by responding favorably to workers’ requests for scheduling flexibility or teaching their followers how to take advantage of the available family-friendly policies. Emotional support occurs when a leader listens to workers and is considerate of their feelings (Hammer, et al., 2007). An example of emotional support behavior is a leader showing genuine concern about employees’ family life and asking questions to stay updated on the employees’ family situation (Vogel, Koonce, & Robinson, 2017). Role modeling refers to the leader’s actions of serving as an example of work-life balance for subordinates to follow. Leaders can engage in role modeling by sharing with workers their personal strategies for managing work and family. The last dimension of FSSB is creative work-family management, which focuses on leaders’ ability to devise work practices that simultaneously meets workers’ needs to balance work-family roles and satisfy the organization’s goals for effective performance (Hammer et al., 2007). Subordinates of family-supportive supervisors demonstrated increased job performance, work engagement, and affective commitment to the organization (Mills, Matthews, & Woo, 2014; Rofcanin et al., 2017).
Existing research on FSSB has not yet paid attention to its effect on perceived leader effectiveness. Leaders who demonstrate FSSB are likely to be viewed as more competent leaders, because they are cognizant of the potential negative impact FWC can have on employee and organizational outcomes. However, role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) might suggest that the positive effect of FSSB on perceived leader competence is moderated by leader gender. Because people tend to ascribe more communal traits to women, women are expected to show sensitivity and understanding towards others. When a female leader does not engage in FSSB, she behaves in a way that is incongruent with her gender roles and therefore might be evaluated negatively (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Previous research has indicated that women were penalized when they demonstrated agentic traits (Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Glick, 2001). Male leaders, on the other hand, are less likely to experience diminished perceived competence when they choose not to engage in FSSB. Because they are not commonly associated with communal traits, the expectation for them to display FSSB may not be as high as it is for female leaders. In sum, compared to men, women’s perceived leadership competence may be affected more by FSSB. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 3:** The positive effect of FSSB on perceived leadership competence will be greater for female leaders than it will be for male leaders.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

A. Participants

The participants of the study were students enrolled in introductory psychology and management courses at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Of the 261 participants who completed the study, 135 participants had to be removed for missing a manipulation or attention check, indicating withdrawal from study, or taking less than five minutes to complete the measures. The final sample consisted of \( n = 126 \). The average age of participants was 20 \((SD = 3.67)\). The participants were 66% female, 31% male, 2% transgender, and 1% trans man or trans woman. The bulk (84)% of participants indicated their race as Caucasian, 91% participants indicated they had never been married, 7% married, and 2% divorced. Most of the sample (87%) of the sample had work experience. Only 4% of the participants indicated they had children. Participants were recruited via SONA. Students who completed the survey on SONA received one research credit. Professors in the College of Business were asked to give the survey to students for extra credit. The study was approved by the UAH institutional review board (See Appendix A for approval letter)
B. Design

The study utilized a 2 (leader gender: male, female) x 2 (FWC: low, high) x 2 (FSSB: low, high) design, with all three factors manipulated between subjects. The independent variables of the study were leader gender, FSSB, and FWC. The dependent variable was a leader’s perceived competence.

C. Materials

The questionnaire measured the following variables.

1. Competence.

An adapted version of a questionnaire created by Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, and Xu (2002) was used. Participants were presented with six adjectives to assess the leader’s competence on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The adjectives included were: competent, confident, capable, efficient, intelligent and skillful.

2. Gender role beliefs.

The Gender Role Attitude Scale (GRAS) examined attitudes about female gender roles, marriage gender roles, traditional gender roles, male gender roles, and egalitarian gender roles (Zeyneloglu & Terzioglu, 2011). The original scale consisted of 38 items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Sample items for the gender egalitarian beliefs scale were “Equal chances should be given to women and men for professional development” and “Domestic work should be divided evenly among partners in a household”. Sample items used to measure traditional gender roles included “A woman should not work if the man is able to financially take care of the household” and “Men should deal with tasks away from the home such as shopping and paying the bills”. 
3. Ambivalent sexism.

Participants’ sexist attitudes towards women were assessed using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The inventory consisted of a 22-item and measures two dimensions of ambivalent sexism, hostile and benevolent sexism. The subscale for hostile sexism included 11 items that measured overt negative attitudes about women (e.g., “women are too easily offended”). The remaining items assessed benevolent sexism which are seemingly positive but patronizing attitudes about women (e.g., “women should be cherished and protected by men”). Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

4. Control variables.

Participants’ parental status, gender, ambivalent sexism, gender role ideology, were entered as covariates. Gender of a participant is analyzed because participants may be inclined to evaluate same-sex others more favorably. Research has demonstrated that females and males are more inclined to have a stronger preference for leaders who are the same gender as them (Stoker, Vander Velde, & Lemmers, 2012; Vecchio & Boatwright, 2002). These findings are consistent with social identity theory, which proposes that individuals are more likely to show a preference for characteristics that remind them of their in-groups (Tajfel, 1979).

Participants’ parental status may result in differential ratings of leaders’ competence. When supervisors and subordinates share similarities in values, habits, or perspectives, it can promote greater trust in subordinates and increase levels of job satisfaction (Thompson, Brough, & Schmidt, 2006). Participants who are parents may
identify more with leaders who experience FWC, because they share the experience of balancing parenthood and work. As a possible consequence, participants with children may be more forgiving of leaders who deal with FWC and not judge them as harshly as non-parent participants.

Controlling for gender role ideology is important, because participants who endorse traditional gender roles may be more likely to rate male leaders as competent than individuals who endorse egalitarian gender roles. Findings from Hoyt and Burnette (2013) support this view. Their study found that endorsement of traditional attitudes about women in authority was associated pro-male bias in leadership evaluation, while the endorsement of progressive attitudes was associated with pro-female bias.

Ambivalent sexism may also result in women receiving lower competence ratings in comparison to men. Hostile sexism reflects the direct negative attitudes that are held against women who violate traditional gender roles. On the other hand, benevolent sexism is “subjectively positive and affectionate attitude, portraying women as weak beings who ought to be protected and provided for by men” (Gaunt, 2013). Research has demonstrated that both dimensions of sexism convey the notion that women are less competent than men (Dardenne, Dumont, & Boddier, 2007; Ramos, Burreto, Ellemers, Maya, & Ferreira, 2018).

Procedure

Participants completed an online Qualtrics survey that was randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions. In four of the conditions, participants read a vignette about a male leader who experiences high or low FWC and engaged in high or low FSSB.
In the remaining four conditions, participants read the same vignette describing a female leader who experiences high or low FWC and engages in high or low FSSB (See Appendix B).

The vignette included a brief paragraph including background information on the leader to establish whether he or she experienced FWC and a memo from the leader addressed to the subordinates. In the memo, the leader discussed changes to company policies that were family-supportive or not family-supportive.

The three independent variables were manipulated in the vignette. First, the leader’s gender was manipulated by the leader’s name. Second, the leader’s FWC was manipulated by altering the leader’s parental responsibilities. In the high FWC conditions, the vignette described the leader as a single parent who is the main caregiver of his or her children. The background information on the leader detailed how the leader must leave or miss work to take care of his or her child. In the low FWC conditions, the leader had no children thus had little family responsibilities interfering with work. Third, FSSB was manipulated by whether in the memo the leader promotes family-friendly policies and engages in behaviors that help workers manage their family responsibilities better.

After reading the vignette, participants completed manipulation check measures. To assess the manipulation of FSSB, participants were asked to complete six items developed to measure FSSB (Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, & Hanson, 2011) on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Sample items used to measure a leader’s FSSB included, “The leader makes subordinates’ feel comfortable talking to
him or her about their conflicts between work and non-work” and “The leader works effectively with workers to creatively solve conflicts between work and non-work”.

Regarding the manipulation check for a leader’s FWC, participants were asked the following, “Does the leader experience family-to-work conflict? Family-to-work conflict is defined as the extent to which family responsibilities interfere with meeting work responsibilities”. Participants then completed a questionnaire including measures for leadership competence, gender role beliefs, ambivalent sexism and demographic information before they are debriefed about the purpose of the study.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results section is separated into two sections. The first section deals with descriptive statistics and correlations among the covariates. The second section contains the reliability analyses and the testing homogeneity of variance assumption. The third section concerns testing the previously stated hypothesis.

A. Descriptive Statistics

The table below contains the means and standard deviations of leader’s competence for each condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Female/Lo FWC/Hi FSSB</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male/Lo FWC/Hi FSSB</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Female/Lo FWC/Lo FSSB</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Male/Lo FWC/Lo FSSB</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Female/Hi FWC/Lo FSSB</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Male/Hi FWC/Lo FSSB</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Female/Hi FWC/Hi FSSB</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Male/Hi FWC/Hi FSSB</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Covariates were analyzed prior to their inclusion in the subsequent analyses.

Table 3.2 contains the means and standard deviations of each covariate for each condition. The correlations between covariates were examined (See Table 3.3). The results of the Pearson correlation indicated that there was a weak negative association between participants’ parental status and egalitarian gender role attitudes, $r = -0.18, p = .04$.

Table 3.2  
**Descriptive Statistics for Covariates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Parental Status</th>
<th>Ambivalent Sexism</th>
<th>Egalitarian Gender Role Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Parental Status: 1 = non-parent, 2 = parent; Gender: 1 = female, 2 = male.

Table 3.3  
**Pearson Correlations Among Covariates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parental Status</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. AS</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EG</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $p < .05$
B. Quality Control

Reliability analyses were performed on the questionnaires used in the survey. Cronbach’s alpha for the competence scale was .87. The ASI had a Cronbach’s alpha of .84. The subscales of the ASI, benevolent and hostile sexism, had Cronbach’s alphas of .66 and .80 respectively. The entire GRAS has a Cronbach’s alpha of .64. The Cronbach’s alphas for the subscales of the GRAS are as follows: egalitarian ($\alpha = .82$), female ($\alpha = .45$), male ($\alpha = .79$), traditional ($\alpha = .63$), and marriage ($\alpha = .43$).

A preliminary check was conducted to ensure there were no violations of the assumption of homogeneity of variance. To test for the homogeneity of variance in the data Levene’s $F$ test were performed for all ANCOVA analyses Levene’s $F$ test were not significant for Hypothesis 1, ($F(1, 124) = 1.03, p = .313$), Hypothesis 2 ($F(3, 122) = 1.44$), Hypothesis 3 ($F(3, 122) = .65, p = .582$, and the three-way ANCOVA, ($F(7, 118) = .1, p = .896$. The non-significant results indicated that group variances were roughly equal and the homogeneity of variance assumption was met.

C. Hypothesis Testing

To test all hypotheses, a series of analysis of covariances (ANCOVA) were conducted. The independent variables were leaders’ gender, FSSB, and FWC. The dependent variable was the competence ratings leaders received. The following covariates were entered for analyses, participants’ parental status, gender, ambivalent sexism attitudes, and egalitarian gender role beliefs. A familywise alpha of .05 was used.

A one-way ANCOVA indicated that leaders’ competence differed by family-to-work conflict, ($F (1,120) = 9.07, MSE = 6.60, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .07$) (See Table 3.4).
Sidak pairwise comparisons on the adjusted means found that competency ratings were higher for leaders with low family-to-work conflict ($M = 3.96, SE = .21$) than leaders with high family-to-work conflict ($M = 3.06, SE = .14$). Results also indicated that leaders’ competence differed by participants’ egalitarian gender role attitudes, ($F(1,120) = 8.59, MSE = 8.0 p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .07$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported (See Figure 3.1).

![Leader's Family Work Conflict](image)

**Figure 3.1** Average Competence Ratings for The Effect of FWC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>\eta_p^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Gender</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.520</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.056*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>.009*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05
Hypothesis 2 proposed that there was a significant interaction between leader gender and family-to-work conflict on perceived competence. Figure 3.5 depicts the average competence ratings for the interaction of gender and FWC. A two-way ANCOVA indicated that the interaction was not significant, \( F(1,118) = .41, MSE = .37, p = .523, \eta^2_p = .00 \) (See Table 8). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. The main effect of leaders’ gender on perceived competence was significant, \( F(1,118) = 6.73, MSE = 6.13, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .05 \). Sidak pairwise comparisons on adjusted means indicated that male leaders received higher competence ratings \( (M = 3.76, SE = .14) \) than female leaders \( (M = 3.29, SE = .13) \). The main effect of leaders’ family-to-work conflict on perceived competence was significant, \( F(1,118) = 11.89, MSE = 10.83, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .08 \). Leaders with low family-to-work conflict received higher competence ratings \( (M = 4.05, SE = .21) \) than leaders who had high family-to-work conflict \( (M = 3.00, SE = .14) \). The covariate, egalitarian gender role attitudes, had a significant effect on competence ratings. Participants who held stronger egalitarian gender role attitudes perceived the leader as more competent, \( F(1,118) = 10.13, MSE = 9.23, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .08 \).

![Figure 3.2 Average Competence Ratings for The Effects of Gender and FWC](image-url)
Table 3.5
Two-Way ANCOVA Using Leaders’ Competence as the Criterion Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta_{p}^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*FWC</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ Gender</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *$p < .05$

A two-way ANCOVA was conducted to test Hypothesis 3 regarding the interaction between leaders’ gender and engagement in family supportive supervisory behavior. The interaction between leader gender and FSSB was not significant, ($F$ (1, 118) = 1.05, $MSE = .27, p = .307, \eta_{p}^2 = .01$) (Table 3.6).

Hypothesis 3 was not supported. The main effect of leaders’ engagement in family supportive supervisory behavior on perceived competence was significant, ($F$ (1, 118) = 338.98, $MSE = 87.74, p < .05, \eta_{p}^2 = .74$). Leaders who engaged in family supportive supervisory behavior ($M = 4.56 SE = .08$) received higher competence ratings than those who did not ($M = 2.75 SE = .06$). The main effect of leader gender on perceived competence was not significant, ($F$ (1, 118) = 1.16, $MSE = .30, p = .284, \eta_{p}^2 = .01$).
Figure 3.3 Average Competence Ratings for the Effects of Gender and FSSB

Table 3.6
Two-Way ANCOVA Using Leaders’ Competence as the Criterion Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>87.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.74</td>
<td>339.98</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*FSSB</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ Gender</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05

A supplementary analysis was conducted to look at the interaction between the three independent variables. The results of the three-way ANCOVA indicated there was not significant three-way interaction between leaders’ gender, family-to-work conflict, and family supportive supervisory behavior, \( F(1,114) = .11, MSE = .03, p = .746, \eta^2 = .00 \). FSSB was found to have a significant effect on competence ratings, \( F(113) = 238.88, MSE = 63.00, p < .05, \eta^2 = .68 \) (See Table 3.7). Leaders who engaged in family
supportive supervisory behaviors received higher ratings ($M = 4.55\ SE = .07$) than leaders who did not ($M = 2.79,\ SE = .08$)

Table 3.7

Three-Way ANCOVA Results Using Leaders’ Competence as the Criterion Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSSB</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>238.88</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*FSSB</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*FWC</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSB*FWC</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>FSSB</em>FWC</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Status</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ Gender</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The aim of this experiment was to explore how leaders’ gender, experience of family-to-work conflict, and family supportive supervisory behavior may affect perceptions of leaders’ competence. First, I found that the competence of leaders who experienced low levels of family-to-work conflict were rated higher than leaders with high family-to-work conflict, supporting Hypothesis 1. In addition, male leaders were also rated as more competent than female leaders, but leader gender did not interact with family-to-work conflict. Second, results showed that leaders who performed family supportive supervisory behaviors received higher competence ratings than leaders who did not perform family supportive supervisory behavior. The interaction between leader gender and family supportive supervisory behavior was not significant.

Theoretical Implications

The finding that leaders with lower family interference received higher competence ratings than their low family-to-work counterparts showed that leaders are subject to caregiver bias. Suffering from family interference at work is likely viewed as hindering leaders from handling work tasks and to perform effectively in their role. The leadership categorization theory and gender role congruity theory provide the theoretical basis for this finding. According to both theories, males and agentic traits are associated
with leadership. Experiencing competing demands between work and family roles is likely to trigger the activation of communal traits, which are incongruent with traits of a prototypical leader and results in less positive evaluations. Prior studies emphasized how supervisors rated subordinates less favorably when they experienced FWC (Hoobler et al., 2009; Li et al., 2017), but there was a lack of research on whether leaders experience the same bias. This finding of the current study showed that leaders who have a higher status in an organization are not shielded from caregiver bias.

I expected that the negative effect of FWC on perceived leader competence would be greater for female leaders than it would be for male leaders. Although both leader gender and FWC had main effects on perceived leadership competence, the moderating role of leader gender was not supported. That is, female leaders with high FWC were not judged more harshly than male leaders with high FWC. This null finding may be attributed to a shift in division of household labor in which men are taking a more active role in childcare and other household activities (Wood & Repetti, 2004). Most of the participants in the current study were college students, who were very likely influenced by the shift in traditional gender roles and tended to see male and female leaders equally when they faced the same challenges from home life.

Higher competence ratings were given to leaders who were family supportive. This finding aligns with prior research by Matthews, Mills, Trout, and English (2014), which found that family supportive behavior positively relates to managerial effectiveness. FSSB not only has positive effects on the subordinates work outcomes such as higher job satisfaction, job performance, and work engagement (Hammer et al., 2007; Mill et al., 2014; Rofcanin et al., 2017) but also can enhance the favorable
appraisal of a leader. However, the effect of FSSB on perceived leader competence was not moderated by leaders’ gender. In other words, male and female leaders benefitted equally from their engagement in FSSB. This finding signaled that the behavior leaders engage in is more important than the gender of the leader. Hamlin and Sawyer (2011) found that managers were rated more effective when they actively supported staff, kept staff informed of decisions that affected them, and displayed genuine care and concern for staff. Similarly, leaders should be viewed more favorably when they perform FSSB, because supportive supervisory behavior provides subordinates with access to resources (e.g., flexible work schedules, telecommuting) that help employees cope with competing demands from work and home.

Practical Implications

In the workplace, it is important that managers serve as role models on how to balance the pressure of family and work demands. The findings of the study revealed it may be beneficial for leaders to not divulge to subordinates about their family-work conflicts to maintain subordinates’ trust in their competence. Organizations should offer work-life balance programs, such as paid time off and flexible work schedules, which teach managers strategies on ways to cope with family interference with work. Managers should then share strategies they learned with subordinates.

Family supportive supervisory behavior is an important resource that helps employees better deal with work-family conflict. Leaders who perform family supportive behavior are viewed in a positive light by their subordinates due to their concern for employee’ well-being and willingness to enforce policies that help mitigate the negative effects of family-to-work conflict. Leaders should maintain an open dialogue with
workers about their potential family issues, so they can better help workers fulfill their work responsibilities. Organizations should consider implementing training for managers on how to properly provide family support to subordinates through coaching managers on how to employ the four dimensions of FSSB (Hammer et al. 2011; Kossek, 2016; Odle-Dusseau, Hammer, Crain, & Bodner, 2016).

Methodological Limitations and Future Research

A major limitation of the study pertains to the sample and vignettes, which limit the external validity of the study. Even though most participants had job experience, their work experience may not be as extensive as workers who have been in the workforce for an extended period. Therefore, the results may not be generalizable to full-time working adults. Also, there were few participants who were parents and therefore the results may not be applicable to working parents who have a clearer understanding about work-family interface. Due to the hypothetical nature of the vignettes, the dynamics in real organizations and leader-follower relationships were oversimplified. A consequence of the simplicity of the vignettes is that they may not be representative of real workplace situations. Another limitation related to the use of vignettes was the manipulation of FWC. For the purposes of this study FWC was manipulated by parental responsibilities. However, this manipulation is not representative of the different forms FWC can take. Future research should utilize survey studies in real organizations to better understand the leaders’ work-family conflict and its effects on a variety of outcomes.

Another limitation relates to the number of participants obtained. The sample size was 54 participants short of the 180 sample size suggested by the G*Power analysis. I
used four attention check questions throughout the survey, and 32 participants had to be removed for missing at least one attention check question. 76 respondents were eliminated because they missed at least one of the manipulation check questions. Additionally, 19 participants indicated they did not want their data analyzed and 8 participants were removed for taking less than five minutes to complete the survey.

Future research can explore how subordinates perceive the motives of leaders who perform FSSB. For instance, an employee may believe that a manager performs FSSB for either altruistic or self-serving reasons. A leader can be perceived as family-supportive for self-serving reasons when he or she experiences work-family conflict and benefits from the implementation of family-friendly policies. Therefore, leaders’ competence may be negatively impacted for engaging in self-serving behavior.

Future work can also investigate how the quality of the leader-subordinate relationship interacts with leader FWC to influence perceptions of leaders’ competence. Drawing from the leader-member exchange theory (Kauppila, 2016; Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999), a high-quality leader-member relation begins when subordinates go beyond the expectations of their role and enter a leader’s in-group, which leads to mutual trust. Possibly having a high-quality relationship with subordinates minimizes the negative perceptions of leaders who experience high FWC. Subordinates who have poorer relationships may be inclined to be less lenient of leaders who experience family interference at work.

Conclusion

In summary, the study suggests that leaders’ experience of family-to-work conflict and the performance of family supportive behavior influence perceptions of
leaders’ competence. Leaders’ family-to-work conflict negatively impacted the perception of leaders’ competence. Unexpectedly, leaders’ gender did not interact with leaders’ family supportive supervisory behavior or family-to-work conflict. Performing family supportive supervisory behaviors was positively related to perceptions of leaders’ competence. The results provide evidence that leaders’ behavior is more important than their gender. The findings of the study have practical implications for leaders’ behavior and organizational policies. To maintain subordinates’ confidence in their ability to lead, managers should refrain from disclosing to subordinates when they are having trouble managing their work and family roles. Organizations should invest in training programs that teach managers how to devise solutions to their family-to-work conflict issues.
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VIGNETTES

Vignette 1: Low FWC and Engages in FSSB

Please read the following background information.

(Helen/John) is the lead manager for a startup financial service company called Madison INC. (Helen/John) has developed good relationships with (his/her) subordinates. When workers are struggling with family responsibilities, (Helen/John) is always willing to listen and have an open dialogue to help find a solution to their issues. (He/She) holds weekly meetings to assess the team’s progress and redirect employees’ efforts to reach organizational goals. (Helen/John) also creates individual development plans with employees to help them achieve their professional goals. Outside of work, (Helen/John) is single with no children and spends her free time engaging in hobbies (he/she) enjoys.

Dear Employees,

Our organization values our employees and wants to provide them with the tools necessary to thrive. At times striking a balance between work and family life may be difficult, but our organization is here to support employees, so they can successfully manage both spheres of their life. To assist employees in the management of family responsibilities, there have been revisions to some of the company’s policies. Periodic emails will be sent to employees soliciting their feedback or suggestions on how work can be organized, so that organizational goals and workers’ family responsibilities are met. A greater flexibility in work schedules will be permitted, employees will be permitted to remotely work from home two days a week and select the start and end times of work days. To reduce the costs of childcare, our organization has partnered with local childcare facilities and employees will receive a discounted rate. The aim of these policy changes is to help all manage all employees’ work and non-work needs to foster a productive work environment.

Vignette 2: Low FWC and Does Not Engage in FSSB

Please read the following background information

(Helen/John) is the lead manager for a startup financial service company called Madison INC. (Helen/John) has developed good relationships with (his/her) subordinates. When workers are struggling with family responsibilities, (Helen/John) is always willing to listen and have an open dialogue to help find a solution to their issues. (He/She) holds weekly meetings to assess the team’s progress and redirect employees’ efforts to reach organizational goals. (Helen/John) also creates individual development plans with employees to help them achieve their professional goals. Outside of work, (Helen/John) is single with no children and spends her free time engaging in hobbies (he/she) enjoys.

Imagine you are an employee at Madison INC. and Helen/John sends out the following memo:
Dear Employees,

Our organization values our employees and would like to ensure we create an environment that minimizes distractions from employees’ family life from interfering with their ability to make positive work contributions. With keeping this objective in mind, there have been revisions to some of the company’s policies. There will be zero tolerance for taking personal phone calls while at work. Employees should refrain from discussing family and personal matters while clocked in. The solicitation of employees’ suggestions via email regarding ways the organization can assist employees in meeting work and family duties has ceased. The attendance policy has been updated. Workers are no longer permitted to leave work early for family matters. The option of selecting the start and end times of work days and working remotely from home are no longer allowed. All workers are required to work a schedule of 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. All employees are expected to abide by these policies, and no exceptions will be made under any circumstances. The policy changes will go into effect immediately.

Vignette 3: High FWC and Does Not Engage in FSSB

Please read the following background information.

(Helen/John) is the lead manager for a startup financial service company called Madison INC. When workers are struggling with family responsibilities, (Helen/John) does not give words of encouragement to employees and expects for them to find a solution on their own about how to handle their family issues. (Helen/John) expects for employees to prioritize work as their number one responsibility. Outside of work, (Helen/John) is a single parent to a seven-year-old boy, Tyler. At work, she often finds her thoughts drifting to how her son is doing. Frequently, (Helen/John) must leave work early or not attend work to handle responsibilities to Tyler such as attending his baseball games, taking him to dentist appointments, or nursing him when he’s sick. Since (Helen/John) doesn’t have any friends or relatives that live near all responsibilities of childcare are left on her.

Imagine you are an employee at Madison INC. and (Helen/John) sends out the following memo:

Dear Employees,

Our organization values our employees and would like to ensure we create an environment that minimizes distractions from employees’ family life from interfering with their ability to make positive work contributions. With keeping this objective in mind, there have been revisions to some of the company’s policies. There will be zero tolerance for taking personal phone calls while at work. Employees should refrain from discussing family and personal matters while clocked in. The solicitation of employees’ suggestions via email regarding ways the organization can assist employees in meeting work and family duties has ceased. The attendance policy has been updated. Workers are no longer permitted to leave work early for family matters. The option of selecting
the start and end times of work days and working remotely from home are no longer allowed. All workers are required to work a schedule of 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. All employees are expected to abide by these policies, and no exceptions will be made under any circumstances. The policy changes will go into effect immediately.

Vignette 4: High FWC and Engages is FSSB

Please read the following background information

(Helen/John) is the lead manager for a startup financial service company called Madison INC. (Helen/John) has developed good relationships with her subordinates. When workers are struggling with family responsibilities, (Helen/John) is always willing to listen and have an open dialogue to help find a solution to employees’ issues. (She/he) holds weekly meets to assess the team’s progress and redirect employees’ efforts to reach organizational goals. (Helen/John) also creates individual development plans with employees to help them achieve their professional goals. Outside of work, (Helen/John) is a single parent to a seven-year-old boy, Tyler. At work, she often finds her thoughts drifting to how her son is doing. Frequently, (Helen/John) must leave work early or not attend work to handle responsibilities to Tyler such as attending his baseball games, taking him to dentist appointments, or nursing him when he’s sick. Since (Helen/John) doesn’t have any friends or relatives that live nearby all responsibilities of childcare are left on her.
Imagine you are an employee at Madison INC. and (Helen/John) sends out the following memo:

Dear Employees,

Our organization values our employees and wants to provide them with the tools necessary to thrive. At times striking a balance between work and family life may be difficult, but our organization is here to support employees, so they can successfully manage both spheres of their life. To assist employees in the management of family responsibilities, there have been revisions to some of the company’s policies. Periodic emails will be sent to employees soliciting their feedback or suggestions on how work can be organized so that organizational goals and workers’ family responsibilities are met. A greater flexibility in work schedules will be permitted, employees will be permitted to remotely work from home two days a week and select the start and end times of work days. To reduce the costs of childcare, our organization has partnered with local childcare facilities and employees will receive a discounted rate. The aim of these policy changes is to help all manage employees’ work and non-work needs to foster a productive work environment.
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRES

Family-to-Work Conflict

1. Does the leader experience family-to-work conflict? Family-to-work conflict is defined as the extent to which family responsibilities interfere with meeting work responsibilities.
   Yes
   No

2. To what extent do you believe (Helen/John) is experiencing family-to-work conflict?
   Most of the time
   About half the time
   Not at all

Family Supportive Supervisory Behavior Scale

Five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

1. Makes subordinates’ feel comfortable talking to her about their conflicts between work and non-work.
2. The leader and subordinates can talk effectively to solve conflicts between work and non-work.
3. Subordinates can depend on the leader to help them with scheduling conflicts if needed.
4. The leader effectively works with workers to creatively solve conflicts between work and non-work.
5. Asks for suggestions to make it easier for employees to balance work and non-work demands.
6. The leader is able to manage the department as a whole team to enable everyone's needs to be met.

Competence (Fiske et al., 2002)
Five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)
1. Competent
2. Confident
3. Capable
4. Efficient
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

Hostile Sexism
1. Women exaggerate problems at work
2. Women are too easily offended
3. Most women interpret innocent remarks as sexist
4. When women lose fairly, they claim discrimination
5. Women seek special favors under guise of equality
6. Feminists are making reasonable demands
7. Feminists are not seeking more power than men*
8. Women seek power by gaining control over men
9. Few women tease men sexually
10. Once a man commits, she puts him on a tight leash
11. Women fail to appreciate all men do for them

Benevolent Sexism
12. A good woman should be put on a pedestal
13. Women should be cherished and protected by men *
14. Men should sacrifice to provide for women
15. In a disaster, women need to be rescued first
16. Women have a superior moral sensibility
17. Women have a quality of purity few men possess
18. Women have a more refined sense of culture
19. Every man ought to have a woman he adores
20. Men are complete without women *
21. Despite accomplishment, men are incomplete without women
22. People are often happy without heterosexual romance *

* Note *Reverse coded

Gender Role Attitude Scale (Zeyneloğlu, S., & Terzioğlu, 2011).

Five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

Egalitarian Gender Role Attitudes
1. Men and women in the same profession should be paid equally.
2. Partners should make decisions together.
3. Equal chances should be given to women and men for professional development.
4. A widowed woman should be able to live by herself.
5. Assets should be shared equally when spouses divorce.
6. The decision to have a child should be made by both partners.
7. Domestic work should be shared equally between partners in the family.
8. Daughters and sons should be benefit equally from the family’s financial means.

Traditional Gender Role Attitudes
1. A girl should obey her father’s wishes until she is married.
2. The head of the household is man.*
3. Men should deal with tasks away from home such as shopping and paying the bills.*
4. Girls should be dressed in pink while boys should be dressed in blue.*
5. Men and women should be employed in different professions.*
6. A man’s man task in the house is breadwinning.*
7. A woman should not work if the man can financially take care of the household.*

Female Gender Role Attitudes
1. A woman’s basic task is motherhood.
2. A woman should be able to go out by herself at night
3. Girls should be allowed to flirt.
4. The future wife of a man should be a virgin.
5. A woman should consult a female doctor in the hospital.
6. The last decision regarding the choice of her husband should be made by her father.
7. Women should be able to live by themselves when they gain their financial freedom.
8. A woman’s first sexual encounter should be after she is married.

Marriage Gender Role Attitudes
9. A man should marry again if his wife is not able to get pregnant.
10. A husband should make the decisions regarding his wife’s life.
11. Every wish of the man should be realized at home.
12. Wives should remain silent instead of arguing when in a conflict with their husbands.
13. A woman is considered more precious if she delivers a boy.
14. Contraception in marriages should be the responsibility of women only.
15. A husband cheating on a wife should be regarded as normal.
16. A married woman should reject a sexual encounter with her husband if she does not desire it.

Male Gender Role Attitudes
1. Men should be employed in high status professions.
2. Men should decide how to use the family income.
3. Boy’s education should be prioritized in the family.
4. Men’s education level should be higher than women’s in marriages.
5. A man should be older than a woman in a marriage.
6. A man should physically punish his wife if necessary.

_Disclaimer*_Reverse coded_

**Demographic Questions**

1. How old are you?

2. I identify my gender as…
   - Man
   - Woman
   - Transgender
   - Genderfluid
   - Trans Man
   - Trans Woman
   - I prefer not to answer

3. What is your classification?
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior

4. Do you consider yourself to be:
   - Gay/Lesbian
   - Heterosexual/Straight
   - Bisexual
   - Prefer not to answer

5. Please specify your ethnicity. Select all that apply.
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - Black/African American
   - White/Caucasian
   - American Indian/Alaska Native
   - Asian
   - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   - Other

6. Please select your marital status.
   - Married
   - Widowed
   - Divorced
   - Separated
   - Single, never married

7. How many children do you have?
   - 0
   - 1-3
8. How many jobs have you held?
   0
   1-3
   4-6
   7-9
   10+

9. What is your current employment status?
   Full-time
   Part-time
   Self-employed
   Not employed

10. What is the gender of your supervisor?
    If not currently employed, base your response on a previous job.
    Female
    Male

11. If your supervisor has children, do you believe he or she experiences family-to-work conflict?
    Family-to-work conflict is defined as the extent to which family responsibilities interfere with meeting work responsibilities.
    Yes
    No

12. Have you ever experienced family-to-work conflict?
    Yes
    No
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