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Leadership scholars have identified the need for research investigating the developmental antecedents of leadership (Avolio, 2007; Day 2011b; Murphy & Johnson, 2011). Although leadership scholars investigated the relationship between parenting and leadership, there was a gap in the leadership literature analyzing the impact of parental psychological control. This descriptive study explored the relationship between the five factor personality model, parental psychological control, and emergent leadership behaviors in emerging adults. Participants were emailed a survey including measures of the Big Five personality traits, affective-identity motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), leadership self-efficacy, parental psychological control, and self-reported formal and informal leadership positions. Parental psychological control was not significantly related to affective-identity motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), leadership self-efficacy, or leadership position. Extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism were related to affective-identity motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), but were not related to leadership self-efficacy or leadership position. Agreeableness and openness to experience were not significantly related to any of the measures of emergent leadership. This study is significant as it is one of the first studies to successfully test the combination of the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) and PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) to measure parental psychological control and investigate the relationship between parental
psychological control and emergent leadership. This study replicated findings from previous studies (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Hendricks & Payne, 2007; Ng, Ang, & Chan, 2008) and further validated the measures used to measure emergent leader behaviors, parental psychological control, and the five-factor model of personality. The findings support the importance of access to leadership positions in emerging adulthood and contribute to the parenting and leadership literature.
Acknowledgments

I would not have accomplished my goal of completing a Thesis without some very important people in my personal and academic life. I sincerely appreciate everyone’s encouragement, motivation, understanding, and expertise in conducting research. This thesis would never have been completed without all of your support.

First, I want to thank my advisor, Dr. Gina Matkin. Gina, you always made me feel like my research was important and really mattered. Your patience with me as I stumbled through this process made completing a Thesis an enjoyable experience. You also understood my research and work habits, providing me with the flexibility I needed to complete my study. Your encouragement and support has made me a better scholar, researcher, and person.

I also want to thank my committee members, Dr. Michelle Krehbiel and Dr. L.J. McElravy. Dr. Krehbiel, without your friendship and encouragement I do not think I would be finishing this project. Your support of my goals and ambitions is an incredible motivator. Dr. McElravy, thank you for your patience with me as we worked through the methodology and statistical analysis of my study. I appreciate your ability to make me feel confident in my research and I always walked away from every conversation with you feeling energized about my research interests. I had the most supportive Thesis committee and am so thankful to all of you for everything you did for me during this process.

Finally, I want to thank my husband, Simon, and family. Simon, you encouraged me to keep trudging along, commiserated with me when I was frustrated, and celebrated my triumphs with me. I love you and appreciate that you supported us, so that I could pursue
my dreams. My mom, dad, sister, and brother all supported me in different ways, from asking about my Thesis and “when it would be done” to reminding me to get off the phone and get back to work. I appreciate your support and understanding when I couldn’t spend a lot of time with you. Completing a Master’s degree was always a goal of mine and I could not have accomplished this goal without all of you.
# Table of Contents

Abstract ......................................................................................................................... i

Acknowledgments ........................................................................................................ iii

Table of Contents .......................................................................................................... v

Figures and Tables ...................................................................................................... viii

Chapter I: Introduction ............................................................................................... 1

  Purpose Statement ..................................................................................................... 5
  Research Questions .................................................................................................... 5
  Method ....................................................................................................................... 6
  Assumptions ............................................................................................................... 7
  Significance of the Study ......................................................................................... 8
    Implications for theory and literature. ................................................................. 10
    Implications for practitioners. ............................................................................. 10
  Delimitations .......................................................................................................... 11
  Limitations ............................................................................................................... 13
  Definition of Terms .................................................................................................. 14

Chapter II: Literature Review .................................................................................... 17

  Emergent leadership ............................................................................................... 17
    The situation and emergent leadership. .............................................................. 18
    Traits of emergent leaders. ................................................................................ 20
  Parental Psychological Control ............................................................................. 26
    The history of psychological control and leadership........................................ 26
    Connecting psychological control and leadership............................................ 32
Emerging Adulthood ........................................................................................................ 38

Chapter III: Methods ........................................................................................................ 43

Participants ......................................................................................................................... 44

Measures ............................................................................................................................. 46

Psychological control scale-youth self-report. ................................................................. 46
Psychological control – disrespect scale. ........................................................................... 47
Affective-identity motivation to lead scale. ....................................................................... 48
Leadership self-efficacy scale. .......................................................................................... 48
Ten-item personality inventory. .......................................................................................... 49
Demographic questions. ...................................................................................................... 50

Variables ............................................................................................................................. 50

Data Analysis ....................................................................................................................... 51

Chapter IV: Results ............................................................................................................ 52

Purpose and Research Questions ...................................................................................... 52

Demographic Data .............................................................................................................. 52

Data Results ........................................................................................................................ 53

Hypothesis 1. ......................................................................................................................... 55

Hypothesis 2. ......................................................................................................................... 56

Chapter V: Discussion ........................................................................................................ 60

Summary of Results ............................................................................................................ 60

Parental psychological control and emergent leadership. ............................................... 63

The Big Five and emergent leadership. .............................................................................. 65

Implications .......................................................................................................................... 66
Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 1. The proposed conceptual model.............................................................. 42
Figure 2. Final AIMTL Model................................................................................. 61
Figure 3. Final LSE and Leadership Position Model............................................. 62

Tables

Table 1. Scale means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients............... 54
Table 2. Mean, standard deviations, interfactor correlations for TIPI scale............. 55
Table 3. Correlations between Big Five, psychological control, AIMTL, and LSE .... 55
Table 4. Summary of regression analysis for full AIMTL model ......................... 57
Table 5. Summary of regression analysis for full LSE model............................... 57
Table 6. Summary of regression analysis for current leadership positions............ 58
Table 7. Final linear regression model for AIMTL ................................................. 58
Chapter I: Introduction

Researchers recently began exploring how parenting impacts leadership (Murphy & Johnson, 2011; Oliver et al., 2011; Towler, 2005). The influence of parenting on leadership has also garnered attention in the media. Caprino (2014; 2014) published two articles in Forbes addressing the parenting behaviors that can both hinder and promote leadership development in children. Historically, leadership studies have focused on the developmental experiences later in life, ignoring those experiences that occur in youth and adolescence (Murphy & Johnson, 2011). Avolio (2007) recommended integrating more research on early life experiences, including parenting, to develop leadership theories that explain how leaders and leadership develops.

Few researchers have specifically investigated the role of parenting in leader emergence. Popper, Mayseless, and Castelnovo (2000) investigated parental attachment style and transformational leadership in a series of three studies involving Israeli cadets and commanders in the police force and military. Schmitt-Rodermund (2004) studied the effects of authoritative parenting and personality on early entrepreneurial behaviors of adolescents and business founders. Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, and Osteen (2005) conducted a qualitative study to explain leadership identity development in emerging adults including their early experiences and influencers. Oliver and colleagues (2011) conducted a longitudinal, mediational analysis of positive family functioning, transformational leadership, and adolescent self-concept, including nurturing parenting behaviors. Towler (2005), one of the few researchers to specifically study parental psychological control’s relationship to leadership, investigated the relationship between parental attachment style, parental psychological control, and displays of charismatic
leadership in emerging adulthood. The aforementioned studies have furthered the exploration of the developmental antecedents of leadership; however, there is still a need to study the influence of different parenting constructs and behaviors on developing leaders.

In order to study parental influences on leadership, researchers must understand the prevailing theories and constructs in the parenting literature. Baumrind’s (1996) parenting typologies include authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and neglecting/rejecting. These parenting typologies are organized using a two-dimensional conceptualization of responsiveness and demandingness. Within the dimension of demandingness, specific parenting behaviors related to maturity expectations, supervisions, and discipline are organized, including parental control. Barber (2002) defined psychological control as “control over a child or adolescent’s psychological world (e.g., feelings, verbal expressions, identity attachment bonds, etc.)” (p. 4). Barber and Harmon (2002) add that these “behaviors … are intrusive and manipulative of children’s thoughts, feelings, and attachments” (p. 15). Psychologically controlling parents attempted to control children’s thought processes, self-expression, emotions, beliefs, autonomy development, and attachment styles (Barber, 1996; 2002). Behavioral control is a different construct, defined by Barber (2002) as “control over a child or adolescent’s behavior (e.g. home responsibilities, daily activities, manners, etc.)” (p. 4). Appropriate behavioral control in the form of maturity demands was commonly associated with competent child and adolescent outcomes (Nelson & Crick, 2002). Few studies of the relationships between the facets of parental control and leadership exist.
In the study of parenting, specific attributes were correlated to specific parenting styles, much in the way leader attributes are correlated to leader emergence. Baumrind’s (1991) critical study of adolescent behaviors and parenting styles found that adolescents from authoritative and democratic families were “individuated, mature, resilient, optimistic, and perceived their parents as loving and influential” (p. 72). The author also found that these adolescents were achievement oriented and cognitively motivated, had some of the highest scores on achievement tests, were self-regulated, socially responsible, had high self-esteem, and an internal locus of control. The previously noted adolescent attributes are similar to the personality attributes correlated to emergent leadership (Hollander, 1964; Judge, Ilies, Bono, & Gerhardt, 2002; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986; Smith & Foti, 1998; Tagger, Hackett, & Saha, 1999).

Scholars in both child development and psychology recognized the influence of parenting styles and behaviors in the development of attributes, values, and attitudes (Baumrind, 1991; Baumrind, 1996; Morris, Cui, & Steinberg, 2013; Steinberg, 2001). Leadership scholars also recognized the importance of traits and personality in the leadership process (Judge et al., 2002; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Lord et al., 1986; Smith & Foti, 1998; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991). The relationships between personality traits and attributes of leaders and possible developmental antecedents have only recently been explored. Scholars investigated the relationship between genetic factors and leadership (Arvey, Rotundo, Johnson, Zhang, & McGue, 2006; Li, Arvey, Zhang, & Song, 2012), childhood and adolescent attributes and leadership in adulthood (Gottfried et al., 2011; Guerin et al., 2011; Reichard et al., 2011) and the role of various
social environment factors and adult leadership (Li, Arvey, & Song, 2011; Zhang, Ilies, & Arvey, 2009).

Most of the aforementioned studies focused on leadership in adulthood. The longitudinal analyses utilized data from childhood and adolescence and compared this data to adult motivation to lead, leadership potential, leader emergence, and transformational leadership (Gottfried et al., 2011; Guerin et al., 2011; Oliver et al. 2011; Reichard et al., 2011). In addition to studying adult leaders, researchers have explored leader emergence, which is assuming a position of leadership, within the developmental periods of childhood and adolescence (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Ehrhart, 2002; Schneider, Paul, White, & Holcombe, 1999; Shin, Recchia, Lee, Lee, & Mullarkey, 2004; Zacharatos, Barling, & Kelloway, 2000) but have largely ignored the developmental influences on leadership during emerging adulthood, the developmental period between ages 18-25 (Arnett, 2000). Thus, an opportunity exists to explore the relationship between specific parenting constructs and emergent leadership during the developmental period of emerging adulthood.

A gap in the literature exists exploring the relationship between parental psychological control and emergent leadership in emerging adulthood. The lack of research on how parental psychological control influenced emergent leadership, especially during ages 18-25, impacted the ability of researchers to gather information close to and during the time of these influences. Exploring how parental psychological control influences leader emergence could lead to improvements in leader development programs and parenting approaches.
Purpose Statement

The purpose of this survey study was to understand the relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors at a large Midwestern public university. This study controlled for personality variables by analyzing the relationship between the five-factor model of personality and emergent leadership. The five factor model of personality includes the traits of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (McCrae & Costa, 1992). The independent variable, perceived parental psychological control, was defined as the perception of parents’ control over a child or adolescent’s psychological world (e.g., thoughts, feelings, verbal expressions, identity attachment bonds, etc.) using intrusive and manipulative behaviors (Barber, 2002; Barber & Harmon, 2002). The dependent variable, emergent leadership, was defined as individuals assuming leadership roles and exerting influence over other members of the group (Chaturvedi, Zyphur, Arvey, Avolio, & Larsson, 2012; Goktepe & Schneier, 1989; Schneier & Goktepe, 1983).

Previous research was conducted about parenting as a developmental antecedent of leadership and emergent leadership; however, no research exists examining the specific construct of parental psychological control and its relationship to emergent leadership. A survey method was appropriate to investigate the relationship between these two variables.

Research Questions

1. Is there a relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors as measured by the Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self-Report (PCS-YSR) (Barber, 1996), Psychological Control – Disrespect Scale...
2. Does the relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leadership exist when controlling for the Big Five personality traits as measured by the Ten Item Personality Inventory (TIPI) (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003)?

**Method**

Studies investigating the relationship between parenting and leadership commonly used quantitative methods to examine the relationship between different parenting and leadership variables (Oliver et al., 2011; Popper et al., 2000; Towler, 2005). The survey included the 8-item PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) and 8-item PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) addressing both male and female parent(s) to measure emerging adults’ perceptions of each parent’s level of psychological control. The survey included the AIMTL scale (Chan & Drasgow, 2001) to measure emerging adults’ affective identity motivation to lead. Motivation to lead was found to be predictive of leader emergence (Hong, Catano, & Liao, 2011). The researchers found that affective-identity motivation to lead, a measure that reflects individuals’ natural tendency to be leaders, predicted leader emergence in leaderless group discussions. Hendricks and Payne (2007) found affective-identity motivation to lead was positively related to leadership self-efficacy. Chan and Drasgow’s (2001) LSE scale was included to measure emerging adults’ general leadership self-efficacy. Paglis (2010) noted that LSE was related to extraversion and conscientiousness, which were also found to be related to leader emergence (Judge et al., 2002; Taggar et al.,
1999). The LSE scale was a useful measure to determine how individuals perceive their leadership abilities and their emergent leader behaviors. The TIPI (Gosling et al., 2003) was included to measure the Big Five personality traits. Extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism have all been found to consistently correlate to leader emergence (Judge et al., 2001; Tagger et al., 1999).

Surveys are used to determine correlations between the participants’ answers to the questions and to test hypotheses (Whitley & Kite, 2013). Surveys are also an ideal method because they are inexpensive and allow data to be collected relatively quickly. This cross-sectional survey method was used to gather data from a small sample of a population in order to generalize to a larger population (de Leeuw, Hox, & Dillman, 2008). The survey was administered online via Qualtrics® and emailed to students enrolled in child, youth, and family studies and agricultural leadership, education, and communication courses.

Assumptions

The underlying assumption of this study was that parenting behaviors have an impact on human development. In their review of contemporary approaches to parenting research, Collins, Maccoby, Steinberg, Hetherington, and Bornstein (2000) asserted that parenting interacted with the genetic predispositions, nonfamilial influences, and the social environment to influence the development of children. The parent and family environment is the first and principal socialization influence on children, with subsequent socialization influences acting upon this primary influence (Newcomb, 1996).

It is also assumed that human development impacts leadership development. “Adult development appears to follow along the lines described in theories of childhood
development” (Bass, 2008, p. 1053). Both leaders and children move through stages of development, influencing their abilities to make decisions and their mental capacity to view situations and adapt their behavior accordingly. According to Bass (2008), the social experiences in adolescence provided opportunities to learn how to effectively interact with others, which carried through to adulthood. The development of individuals through the lifespan also impacts those individual’s ability to lead.

The researcher assumed emerging adults were able to accurately report their perceptions of their parents’ negative behaviors on a self-report survey. It was also assumed that emerging adults were able to accurately report their perceptions of their own emergent leadership behaviors and personality traits. Self-report is the most direct way to obtain information about a person’s inner states, beliefs, interpretations, and thought processes (Whitley & Kite, 2013). Through sending the survey to students enrolled in several different courses, the results were assumed to be generalizable to populations with similar demographics.

Significance of the Study

In order to improve leadership development programs and understand the experiences of emergent leaders, scholars have explored parenting styles, genetic factors, parent attachment style, and the social environment’s impact on leadership emergence, leadership effectiveness, and specific leadership theories. Through investigating leadership during each developmental stage, researchers began to uncover what influences and experiences promote leadership role occupancy later in life (Murphy & Johnson, 2011). Studies of the antecedents to leadership focused on formal leadership positions in adulthood, but failed to investigate leader emergence during emerging
adulthood (Arvey et al., 2006; Oliver et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2009). Studies of emergent leadership focused on the attributes of the individual who emerged as a leader, failing to investigate the developmental influences that could have influenced their emergence (Ellis, 1998; Lord et al., 1986; Smith & Foti, 1998; Zaccaro et al., 1991). While these approaches contributed to the leadership literature, few researchers have investigated the developmental influences on emergent leadership with groups of adolescents or emerging adults.

Leadership development throughout the lifespan is becoming a more popular approach than the one-time leadership development program (Day, 2011b). In order to design development programs for individuals and teams, researchers and practitioners must understand the developmental antecedents of leadership. Murphy and Johnson (2011) called for a lifespan approach to the study of leadership and leadership development. The authors argued that investigating the relationship between individuals’ attributes, experiences, and leadership development over time would help practitioners and scholars understand how a leader develops. Until children and adolescents reach emerging adulthood, they spend a majority of their time with their parents and families. Identifying the specific parenting behaviors that help and hinder leader emergence allows researchers to more accurately describe the experiences and behaviors needed to shape youth into adult leaders. Murphy and Johnson (2011) noted the importance of identifying a sensitive period in leadership development to help schools and parents ensure youth received experiences or influences during that time.
**Implications for theory and literature.**

Parenting theories tend to focus on the outcomes in children and adolescents, but do not extend into emerging adulthood. Recent research has just begun to explore parenting approaches used with emerging adult children (Nelson, Padilla-Walker, Christensen, Evans & Carroll, 2011). Aquilino and Supple (2001) noted the need for research from the child’s perspective in order to understand how parenting behaviors influence adult development. Investigating the relationship between a specific parenting behavior, parental psychological control, and emergent leadership in the emerging adulthood developmental period will benefit both parenting and leadership theories and the parenting and leadership literature.

Few leadership studies have focused on specific parenting behaviors. This study furthered the scholarship of emergent leadership through the investigation of specific behaviors that may inhibit the development of attributes exemplified by emergent leaders. The uniqueness of the study and use of multiple measures of the self-perceptions and behaviors of emergent leaders also meaningfully contributed to the literature.

**Implications for practitioners.**

By describing the relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leadership, practitioners can identify potential leaders who may need specific experiences to overcome possible developmental milestones caused by this psychological control. Day (2011a) discussed the need for understanding the contextual factors that contribute to the ongoing development of leaders. Through identifying potential leaders who may have experienced parental psychological control, leader development programs
could provide different opportunities and experiences to build self-confidence, independence, decision making skills, and social skills.

This study also informs parents and can be utilized in parenting classes. Parents who are interested in improving their children’s leadership potential could be using psychologically controlling behaviors that could undermine the development of leadership skills. These parents benefit from knowing the relationship between these behaviors and emergent leadership. Parenting classes can suggest ways to handle conflicts with children that are more productive and teach self-reliance and independence, characteristics of leaders.

**Delimitations**

Several delimitations exist within this study. Students attending a large Midwestern public university were selected as the sample of this study. The small sample size limits the ability to generalize to other populations of students in other areas of the country. The sample also limits the generalizability to emerging adults who are not enrolled in post-secondary institutions.

The cross-sectional study design is an additional delimitation. Parents and individuals who may have observed emergent leader behaviors were not included in this study, limiting the study to only the participants’ self-perceptions of parent and individual behaviors and attributes. Data was not gathered from parents to analyze the relationship between the participants’ perceptions of parental psychological control and their parents’ identification of using this type of parenting behavior. This study also did not address any extraneous variables that could be related to emergent leadership behaviors in emerging
adults, such as involvement in youth leadership development programs or previous leadership experiences.

The researcher chose to use emergent leadership theory and cannot assert that leadership effectiveness is influenced by the five-factor personality model or parental psychological control, an additional delimitation. Emergent leadership theory is the process in which individuals assume leadership roles in groups and exert influence over other members of the group (Goktepe & Schneier, 1989; Schneier & Goktepe, 1983). Emergent leadership theory only addresses this process, not the effectiveness of the individual who assumed the leadership role. Lord et al. (1986) described the need to separately analyze the traits related to leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness. Judge et al. (2002) also separately analyzed the relationship between the Big Five personality traits and leader emergence and effectiveness in their meta-analysis, finding traits were related to emergence and effectiveness differently. Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) asserted that people who appear to be leaders may not have the skills required to be effective in this role.

Emergent leadership was also found to be related to narcissism (Brunell, Gentry, Campbell, Hoffman, Kuhnert, & DeMaree, 2008). Brunell and colleagues (2008) noted that narcissists routinely emerge as leaders; however, these leaders contribute to negative consequences for themselves and their organizations. Narcissists have a high sense of ego, high degree of self-esteem, are exploitative and manipulative, regulate their own behaviors to ensure a positive self-image, and lack interpersonal relationships with warmth and intimacy (Brunell et al., 2008; Paunonen, Lönnqvist, Verkasalo, Leikas, & Nissinen, 2006). The relationship between narcissism and emergent leadership is a
delimitation of this study, as those who reported emergent leader behaviors could also be damaging leaders.

Participants under 19 years of age were not invited to participate in this study and only data from participants aged 19-25 were included in the analysis. Emerging adulthood extends from ages 18 to 25 (Arnett, 2000), and this cohort of 18 year old participants was excluded from this study due to the age of consent in the state the research was conducted in.

Limitations

Several limitations were present in this study. The surveys proposed in this study, the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996), PCDS (Barber et al., 2012), MTL (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), LSE (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), and TIPI (Gosling et al., 2003) were susceptible to social desirability bias (Whitley & Kite, 2013). Schwarz, Knäuper, Oyserman, and Stich (2008) noted that participants may fail to communicate their true feelings due to social desirability and self-presentation, thus, they may edit their feelings before completing the response. Participants may have overestimated their leadership behaviors and perceptions of parental controlling behaviors or vice-versa. Fowler (2002) recommended using anonymous, self-administered surveys to produce less social desirability bias and increase the accuracy of responses. The researcher sent the surveys to participants via email to ensure confidentiality and allow respondents to administer the survey themselves, to counter social-desirability bias.

Self-report measures can also elicit acquiescence response bias, defined as the participant agreeing or disagreeing with items included in self-report measures regardless of the content of the items (Whitley & Kite, 2013). The survey included the item “This
question is to make sure you are paying attention. Please choose ‘C’.” to protect against acquiescence response bias. All the participants answered the question with ‘C’. The MTL (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), LSE (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), and TIPI (Gosling et al., 2003) also include reverse scored items to offer additional protection against this type of self-report bias. Causation cannot be inferred by a survey design, thus only the strength and direction of the relationships were reported. A causal relationship cannot be inferred between any of the Big Five personality traits and affective identity motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001) and leadership self-efficacy.

The survey was labeled as a leadership study, which may have led to selection bias based on participants’ own perceptions of their leadership abilities. Participation in the survey was not required and participants volunteered after hearing a script read by the researcher. Participants were also aware that they would be entered into a drawing for a reward after completing the survey. These factors may have influenced participants to participate in the survey limiting the research findings and conclusions. Participants who volunteer for psychological research differ from those who do not in a number of ways (Whitley & Kite, 2013). These differences may have contributed to findings of the study.

Definition of Terms

Authoritarian parenting: type of parenting style characterized by high demandingness, low responsiveness, firm behavioral control, psychological control, and rejection of children (Baumrind, 1996).

Authoritative parenting: type of parenting style characterized by high responsiveness and demandingness, autonomy support, confrontation when behavior is undesirable, power assertion over children, and affection (Baumrind, 2013).
**Demandingness**: facet of parenting styles including direct confrontations, maturity expectations, supervision, and consistent and contingent discipline (Baumrind, 1996).

**Emergent leadership**: individuals assuming leadership roles and exerting influence over other members of the group (Chaturvedi et al., 2012; Goktepe & Schneier, 1989; Schneier & Goktepe, 1983).

**Emerging adulthood**: the developmental period of ages 18-25 distinguished by identity explorations, instability, self-focus, feeling in-between, and life possibilities (Arnett, 2013).

**Leadership self-efficacy**: individual’s confidence judgment in his or her ability to effectively perform the behaviors that comprise the leadership role (Paglis, 2010).

**Motivation to lead**: construct affecting an individual’s decisions to assume leadership training, roles and responsibilities, and his or her intensity of effort at leading and persistence as a leader (Chan & Drasgow, 2001).

**Parental psychological control**: control over a child or adolescent’s psychological world (e.g., thoughts, feelings, verbal expressions, identity attachment bonds, etc.) using intrusive and manipulative behaviors (Barber, 2002; Barber & Harmon, 2002).

**Permissive parenting**: type of parenting style characterized by low demandingness, high responsiveness, providing psychological autonomy, acceptance, and relaxed behavioral control (Baumrind, 1996).

**Rejecting-neglecting parenting**: type of parenting style characterized by low demandingness and responsiveness, rejection of children, and relaxed behavioral control (Baumrind, 1996).
Responsiveness: facet of parenting including being attuned and supportive to children’s needs and demands fostering individuality and self-assertion (Baumrind, 1996).
Chapter II: Literature Review

The study begins the examination of the relationship between parental psychological control and emergent leadership with a review of the literature. The leadership and parenting literature support the general research question, is there a relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors? A secondary research question, does a relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors exist when controlling for the Big Five personality traits?, is also supported with a discussion of the traits related to emergent leadership.

The literature review begins with a chronological review of the emergent leadership literature, followed by hypotheses addressing the secondary research question. The history of the parental psychological control construct and the relationship between leadership and parenting are highlighted in the literature review. Then, a deeper review of the study of psychological control is conducted, connecting various studies of leadership with this construct. The literature review concludes with a brief review of the emerging adulthood literature to describe the population this research focused on. The hypothesized relationships between parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors are presented. A proposed conceptual model depicting the relationships between the control, independent, and dependent variables is included following the literature review to illustrate the relationship between the variables.

Emergent leadership

Emergent leadership was defined as individuals assuming leadership roles and exerting influence over other members of the group (Chaturvedi et al., 2012; Goktepe & Schneier, 1989; Schneier & Goktepe, 1983). Stogdill (1948) surmised that the demands
of a situation determined what characteristics and skills were required by the leader in his foundational literature review of leadership traits. The author’s assertion supported the theory of emergent leadership, as an individual acquired leadership status through participation in group activities and the capacity to accomplish work tasks. This theory of leadership supported that a leader emerges due to a match between the situational needs and the emergent leader’s characteristics. The leader was not in a formal position of authority, but was still able to influence other members of the group (Lord et al., 1986; Taggar et al., 1999). Hollander (1964) suggested that a group member emerged as a leader because of his/her perceived competence in helping the group achieve their goals and adhering to group norms. Through task completion and the perception of adhering to group norms, the emergent leader was viewed positively by other group members, which limited their resistance when the emergent leader attempted influence. Gleason, Seaman, and Hollander (1978) viewed the emergent leader as “part of the situation, as ‘definers of reality’ for the group, who structure and organize the group’s activities” (p. 33).

**The situation and emergent leadership.**

During the last several decades, researchers have investigated how emergent leader characteristics interacted with the situation. Hollander and Julian (1969) maintained that competence and perceived motivation to help the group achieve the task characterized a leader. The researchers viewed leadership as an influence process, involving exchange relationships between the leader and followers using ‘idiosyncrasy credits’. In Hollander’s (1964) idiosyncrasy credits theory, individuals were given credits by group members for helping the group achieve its goals and conforming to group norms. Once credits were accumulated by the individual, assertions of influence and nonconformity to
group norms were tolerated by the group members. Thus, the individual emerged as the leader in a leaderless group. This view of leadership gave credit to both the leader as an individual and also the leader as part of the larger social situation.

Gleason et al., (1978) studied the relationship between Machiavellian personality traits, task structure, situational factors, and emergent leadership. In this study, male undergraduate students completed a measure of Machiavellianism personality traits and participated in a group task, which varied from low to high structure. Gleason et al. (1978) found that individuals who scored around the median (were neither high nor low on initiating control and structure) on the Machiavellianism measure were preferred as leaders by their male peers. The researchers also determined that low structure situations provided more opportunities for emergent leadership. Gleason and colleagues findings reinforced that emergent leadership was dependent upon an ambiguous situation without a formal leader.

Goktepe and Schneier (1989) defined emergent leaders as “individuals that assume leadership responsibilities in leaderless groups or in groups where leaders are incompetent or have been deposed” (p. 165). Schneier and Goktepe (1983) also noted that once an individual was labeled a leader by group members, the individual transitioned to other leadership positions and roles seamlessly. Goktepe and Schneier (1989) studied the influence of sex, interpersonal attractiveness, and gender roles on emergent leadership. Using task groups working together for six weeks on meaningful assignments for course requirements, the authors found that sex was not a predictor of leader emergence. Interpersonal attractiveness and a masculine gender role orientation were associated with leader emergence in these groups (Goktepe & Schneier, 1989).
These findings supported that a traditional, masculine view of leadership was important to leader emergence.

**Traits of emergent leaders.**

Lord and colleagues (1986) conducted a meta-analysis to examine the relationship between personality traits and perceptions of leadership. This study found that leadership perceptions and personality traits were consistently related, likely due to group members’ internal schema of leadership. Implicit leadership perceptions were a major component in many organizations and allowed those who are perceived as leaders to exert their influence (Lord et al., 1986). Leadership perceptions and Hollander’s (1964) characteristics of emergent leaders appeared to be closely related concepts. An individual who adhered to group norms, was competent, and motivated toward the task encompassed all of the qualities the group perceived to be characteristic of a leader, thus that individual emerged in the leadership role.

Smith and Foti’s (1998) findings in their study of the relationship between intelligence, dominance, generalized self-efficacy, and leadership emergence supported Lord and colleagues (1986) finding of intelligence as an important predictor of leadership emergence. The researchers found that emergent leaders possessed higher levels of dominance, general self-efficacy, and intelligence. Smith and Foti (1998) also noted all three of these traits were critical to leader emergence, as their study found no support for leader emergence when even one of these traits was low. These researchers’ findings contributed to the assertion that the perceived traits of individuals were an important predictor of emergent leadership. Supporting Smith and Foti’s (1998) findings, Foti and Hauenstein (2007) also found high intelligence, dominance, general self-efficacy, and
self-monitoring predicted leader emergence and effectiveness in their study of a pattern approach to leader emergence.

Motivational variables have also been studied in the context of emergent leadership. Sorrentino and Field (1986) investigated emergent leadership, achievement-related motives (success oriented vs. failure threatened), and affiliation-related motives (affiliation oriented vs. rejection threatened) over time. The authors found that both achievement-related motives and affiliation-related motives predicted emergent leadership in participants. Specifically, individuals who wanted to accomplish group goals and were personable tended to emerge as the leader of the group, while individuals who were inhibited by their fear of failure and possible social rejection tended to not emerge as leaders (Sorrentino & Field, 1986). These research findings supported Hollander’s (1964) description of an emergent leader, as a competent and motivated individual. This study also provided early evidence for several personality traits that have been linked to emergent leaders.

Taggar et al. (1999) studied the relationship between cognitive ability, the five factor model of personality, and leader emergence. This study found that general cognitive ability was the most powerful predictor of leader emergence, followed by conscientiousness and extraversion. Conscientiousness represented the tendency to be organized, achievement striving, self-disciplined, and ambitious and extraversion represented the tendency to be sociable, confident, and experience positive moods and emotions (McCrae & Costa, 1992). Neuroticism, the tendency to be anxious, fearful, pessimistic, and tense (McCrae & Costa, 1992), was negatively correlated to emergent leadership (Taggar et al., 1999). Agreeableness was described by McCrae and Costa
(1992) as the extent to which a person is forgiving, friendly, warm, and soft-hearted. Tagger and colleagues (1999) found that agreeableness was not predictive of emergent leadership.

Judge and colleagues (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of published articles studying the personality traits of leader emergence and effectiveness. Using the five-factor model of personality, the authors found extraversion was the strongest and most consistent correlate of emergent leadership. Conscientiousness and openness to experience were the next strongest positive correlates of emergent leadership. Openness to experience represented the tendency to be imaginative, spontaneous, adventurous, and artistic (McCrae & Costa, 1992). The researchers also found neuroticism to be a strong, negative correlate to leadership. Judge et al. (2002) found agreeableness to be a relatively weak correlation to leadership and was the least relevant of the Big Five traits. Agreeable individuals tend to be compliant and passive, thus they would be less likely to emerge as leaders. Both Taggar et al. (1999) and Judge et al.’s (2002) research found that extraversion and conscientiousness predicted leader emergence and that neuroticism was negatively correlated to leader emergence.

Pescosolido (2002) conducted a qualitative study with jazz groups and collegiate rowing teams. The researcher observed the small groups and conducted group interviews to gather data. A grounded theory of emergent leadership was developed after analyzing the data. This theory posited that emergent leaders influenced group member behavior and group performance through their management of the group’s emotional state. This management of group emotions was especially important to the emergent leader, who had no access to rewards and punishments and was especially empathetic and responsive to
follower needs (Pescosolido, 2002). It was also posited that leaders emerged during ambiguous situations due to their knowledge, experience, and positive relationships with group members. Emergent leaders appeared to be more relationship oriented, which contributed to their emergence during times of ambiguity or low structure. This grounded theory supported the findings of Judge and colleagues (2002). Leader’s tended to be knowledgeable, experienced, and were positive and optimistic, characteristics related to conscientiousness and extraversion.

Communication skills and quality of communication were also investigated as possible predictors of emergent leaders. Riggio, Riggio, Salinas, and Cole (2003) studied the connection between extraversion, basic communication skills, and leader emergence in undergraduate students. This study found that the amount of communication and not the quality of communication was the best predictor of who emerged as the leader. Extraversion was also a significant correlate of leader emergence, although smaller and independent from communication (Riggio et al., 2003). These results confirmed the findings by Taggar et al. (1999) and Judge et al. (2002) that extraversion was an important trait of emergent leaders.

In their study of the relationship between narcissism and emergent leadership in military cadets, Paunonen et al. (2006) found similar findings to those reported by Judge et al. (2002). The authors investigated the relationship between the five factor model of personality traits and emergent leadership, in addition to the relationship between emergent leadership and narcissism. Paunonen and colleagues (2006) found that cadets who received high leadership ratings from their peers were generally extraverted,
conscientious, and low in neuroticism. These findings provided further support for the relationship between the Big Five traits and emergent leadership.

Paglis (2010) reviewed the leadership self-efficacy literature and proposed practical implications for the research of this construct. Self-efficacy was described as “the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce desired outcomes” (Bandura, 1977, p. 193) and influenced the initiation, intensity, and persistence of behavior. Smith and Foti (1998) described individuals with high general self-efficacy as possessing higher self-confidence because of previous life successes, demonstrating more effort, and persevering for a greater length of time in adverse situations (Smith & Foti, 1998). Leadership self-efficacy was conceptualized as a leader’s confidence in his or her ability to effectively perform leadership behaviors (Paglis, 2010). Chan and Drasgow (2001) found extraversion and conscientiousness were the strongest correlates of leadership self-efficacy. Extraversion and conscientiousness were also found by Judge et al. (2002) and Tagger et al. (1999) to be significant correlates of leader emergence, thus increasing the connection between leadership self-efficacy and emergent leadership.

Hong et al. (2011) examined the role of motivation to lead (MTL) in predicting leader emergence. MTL was defined as an “individual-differences construct that affects a leader’s or leader-to-be’s decisions to assume leadership training, roles, and responsibilities and that affects his or her intensity of effort at leading and persistence as a leader” (Chan & Drasgow, 2001, p. 482). Hong and colleagues (2011) found that MTL was predictive of emergent leadership. Specifically, Affective-Identity MTL was related to leader emergence in leaderless group discussions, while Social-Normative MTL was
related to leader emergence in project teams. Affective-Identity MTL reflected an individual’s natural tendency to be a leader, thus, in a leaderless group discussion the participants who showed initiative to lead generally emerged as leaders (Hong et al., 2010). Social-Normative MTL represented an individual’s sense of obligation to lead, thus, in the long-term, graded team project settings the participants who felt socially responsible emerged as leaders (Hong et al., 2010). Motivation to lead was a strong predictor of emergent leader behaviors in various situations and settings.

In a review of trait-based leadership research, Antonakis (2011) described general intelligence, the five factor model of personality and implicit motives (the need for power, affiliation, and achievement) as the traits that matter in the study of leadership. The author described the five factor personality traits using the findings of Judge et al.’s (2002) meta-analysis and offered a theoretical description of these traits within the scope of leadership. Antonakis (2011) noted that, theoretically, leaders should have low levels of neuroticism and high levels of conscientiousness. Extraversion should be the most important predictor of leadership. Openness to experience should be an important antecedent as well, because leaders should be forward thinking and visionary. Leaders should be agreeable and nice; however, they may not be able to take a stand on issues or confront others if they are characterized by agreeableness (Antonakis, 2011). The author’s theoretical description of the role these traits played in leadership supports the importance of continued research about traits and emergent leadership.

Chaturvedi and colleagues (2012) studied gender differences in heritability estimates of emergent leadership. The researchers used a behavioral genetics method to determine the influence of genes versus environmental factors in male and female leadership.
emergence. Chaturvedi et al. (2012) found that females appeared to be as genetically prone to emergent leadership as males; however, these genetic influences varied across the lifespan. These results supported the importance of genetic and environmental influences for leader emergence in both men and women. This finding supports the proposed study, as uncovering the specific environmental influences of emergent leaders is important to the development of leaders.

Past emergent leadership scholarship linked several personality traits and attributes to emergent leadership. Although studies found evidence to support several personality traits, two of the Big Five personality traits in the five-factor personality model, extraversion and conscientiousness, appeared to be the most consistent predictors of emergent leadership. Neuroticism was also consistently found to be a negative predictor of emergent leadership. Agreeableness was found to be a weak and non-relevant correlate of leadership. Based upon the previously described literature, following hypotheses were posited for the relationship between the five factor model of personality and emergent leadership:

Hypothesis 1a: Extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience will positively correlate to emergent leader behaviors.

Hypothesis 1b: Agreeableness will not correlate to emergent leader behaviors.

Hypothesis 1c: Neuroticism will negatively correlate to emergent leader behaviors.

Parental Psychological Control

The history of psychological control and leadership.

Psychological control was first investigated as a dimension for studying parenting in Schaefer’s (1965a; 1965b) studies of children’s reports of parental behavior. Schaefer
(1965a) conceptualized psychological control as “covert, psychological methods of controlling the child’s activities and behaviors that would not permit the child to develop as an individual apart from the parent” (p. 555). Psychological autonomy and psychological control were on opposite ends of this parenting dimension, according to Schaefer’s (1965b) discussion of the development of the Children’s Reports of Parenting Behavior Inventory (CRPBI). Schaefer greatly influenced Baumrind’s (1966) development of her classic parenting typology, which was initially based upon level of control and autonomy support exhibited by parents.

Baumrind (1996; 1991) developed a parenting typology to categorize parenting behaviors and the outcomes for children and adolescents. Baumrind (1966) described the permissive parent as the parent who employed few behavioral constraints, bended to the child’s impulses, and avoided any form of control. Baumrind (1966) categorized the authoritarian parent, as the parent who strictly controlled the behavior and attitudes of children according to an unconditional standard and utilized punitive, forceful measures to control children’s ideas and behavior. The author proposed that the authoritative parent was rational, encouraged verbal discussion regarding rules and behavior, and recognized a child’s individual interests. The neglecting/rejecting parent rejected and abandoned their childrearing responsibilities (Baumrind, 1991). The researcher’s theory posited that the best outcomes for children and adolescents were achieved using the authoritative parenting style and the worst outcomes for children and adolescents were manifested through the neglecting/rejecting parenting style (Baumrind, 1991).

The leadership literature also supported the positive outcomes of authoritative parenting styles. Authoritative parents encouraged independence with limits and
produced adolescents with the best chance for becoming effective leaders (Murphy & Johnson, 2011). Baumrind’s (1966; 1991) parenting styles have been used to study various aspects of leadership. Schmitt-Rodermund (2004) asserted that the characteristics of entrepreneurs mirrored some of the characteristics of leaders. Entrepreneurs appeared to have a high need for achievement, showed creativity and initiative, were risk takers, possessed high levels of self-confidence and an internal locus of control, as well as required independence and autonomy to follow their goals (Schmitt-Rodermund, 2004). Adolescents’ development of self-confidence, autonomy, leadership, and an internal locus of control was supported by authoritative parents. The author studied the relationship between participants’ personality characteristics, perceptions of parenting styles, and entrepreneurial competence, interests, and career prospects. Schmitt-Rodermund (2004) found that self-reported, early entrepreneurial competence was predicted by personality traits and parents using an authoritative parenting style.

Lee, Daniels, and Kissinger (2006) researched the effects of parenting practices on the well-being of adolescents. They found that adolescents whose parents expected obedience and often failed to meet the child’s needs (authoritarian) had a lower internal locus of control and lower positive self-concept (Lee et al., 2006). These adolescents were also less mature and psychosocially competent than their counterparts who experienced a more supportive and autonomous parenting style (Lee et al., 2006). Barbuto and Story (2010) found a positive relationship between internal locus of control and emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence was a precursor to positive organizational outcomes and a desirable attribute in a leader (Barbuto & Story, 2010), thus individuals with an internal locus of control appeared to emerge as leaders.
Emotional intelligence itself was also found to be correlated to leader emergence (Côté, Lopes, Salovey, & Miners, 2010).

In their review of the literature, Murphy and Johnson (2011) discussed how authoritarian, neglecting/rejecting, and permissive parenting styles influenced youth and later leader emergence. Authoritarian parents created firm rules and demanded control, developing adolescents who were socially incompetent with poor communication skills. These parents negated the development of leadership skills related to innovation, communication, and entrepreneurship because they constricted and controlled their children’s behavior and psychological development. Adolescents with neglectful parents tended to have low social competence and poor self-control. Permissive parents produced adolescents who were very creative, but lacked social control and competence. These three parenting styles inhibited the development of identified leadership traits and attributes that emergent leaders tended to possess (Murphy & Johnson, 2011).

Baumrind (1966) recognized the detrimental effects of guilt induction and love withdrawal, psychologically controlling behaviors, on the psychological wellbeing of children. The researcher did not specifically label these behaviors as psychologically controlling; however, the negative outcomes of dependence, social avoidance, loss of creativity, and an inability to make choices were identified as resulting from these manipulative parenting behaviors. Baumrind (1966) recommended parents use cognitive appeal and power, rather than guilt induction and love withdrawal to promote responsible, conscious decision making and prevent children from feeling helpless and unable to make decisions. A link between psychological control and Baumrind’s (1966) parenting styles was supported in Steinberg, Elmen, and Mounts (1989) research about
the relationship between authoritative parenting and academic success. They found that adolescents developed positive attitudes and beliefs about their achievement and performed better in school when their parents treated them warmly and democratically, not controlling their sense of identity and personal beliefs. Although Steinberg et al. (1989) did not define psychological control as a specific construct; the study provided early evidence for the development of this aspect of parental control as a separate construct.

A two-dimensional conceptualization to describe parenting styles was later posited by Baumrind (1996). These dimensions were responsiveness and demandingness. *Responsiveness* was used to describe the level of warmth, with parents being attuned, supportive, and accepting of children’s individual needs (Baumrind, 1996). The level of responsiveness corresponded to children’s development of self-regulation, self-assertion, and individuality. Baumrind (1996) used *demandingness* to describe the parenting behaviors of making maturity demands, supervision, discipline, and confronting children regarding their behavior. When parents and children engaged in discussions about behavior, children developed self-regulation and understood societal and parental standards. Baumrind (1996) categorized each parenting style using these dimensions as follows: authoritative parents were highly responsive and demanding, authoritarian parents were highly demanding but not responsive, permissive parents were highly responsive but not demanding, and neglecting/rejecting parents were neither responsive nor demanding.

Zhang et al. (2009) explored the moderating role of the social environment in adolescence on the genetic effects of leadership role occupancy in adulthood. This study
found that perceived parental support and parental conflict moderated the heritability of leadership role occupancy. Genetic effects were higher for participants reporting lower levels of perceived parental support and higher levels of perceived conflict with parents (Zhang et al., 2009). This study supported the importance of the social environment in the success of those individuals who were not genetically equipped with natural leadership endowments. A lack of parental support was a dimension of authoritarian parenting, supporting the negative influence authoritarian parents had on the development of leadership skills.

As the study of specific parenting styles’ effects on child development advanced, researchers deconstructed Baumrind’s (1966) authoritarian parenting style to include the concept of psychological control. Steinberg (1990) led the call to distinguish between psychological and behavioral control within the study of parenting behaviors. Barber, Olsen, and Shagle (1994) argued that the distinction between these two types of control hinged on two central assumptions about human development. These assumptions were: 1) children required psychological autonomy; to learn through effective social interactions their competence and uniqueness, and 2) children required appropriate regulation of behavior to allow them to learn how social interaction is governed by rules and structures (Barber et al., 1994). Children needed boundaries and logical consequences, in addition to opportunities to explore social interactions and their own ideas. Authoritarian parenting research has used the related concept of coercion to study psychological control, and found consistent associations with internalized and externalized problem behaviors in children (Barber & Xia, 2013). Authoritarian parents utilized firm behavioral control, psychological control, and rejection to ensure their
children’s obedience (Baumrind, 2013). High demandingness and low responsiveness characterized parental psychological control, as parents did not support their children’s individuality and demanded obedience and conformity (Sorkhabi, 2013). Barber et al. (2002) noted that the findings in studies of psychological control paralleled the findings of similar studies that used Baumrind’s definition of authoritarian parenting.

**Connecting psychological control and leadership.**

Barber (1996) described psychological control as an “insidious type of control that potentially inhibits or intrudes upon psychological development through manipulation and exploitation of the parent-child bond (e.g., love withdrawal and guilt induction), negative affect-laden expressions and criticisms (e.g., disappointment and shame), and excessive personal control (e.g., possessiveness, protectiveness)” (p. 3297). Behavioral control was defined as control over a child or adolescent’s behavior designed to teach behavior regulation and conformity to social norms (Barber, 1996; Barber, 2002). Behavioral control was also described as the reasonable implementation of regulating rules and contingent punishments (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005). The definitions of these two aspects of parental control are discussed to illustrate that psychological and behavioral control are separate constructs that produce different outcomes in children and adolescents.

Barber (1996) provided evidence of the validity of the construct of psychological control. The researcher surveyed youth transitioning to adolescence and found that psychological control was a significant predictor of depression and antisocial behavior. Psychological control was also found to be “a consistently negative and inhibiting experience for children” (Barber, 1996, p. 3314). This study supported Steinberg’s (1990)
recommendation to differentiate between psychological control and behavioral control in studies of parenting behaviors. Barber (1996) found that psychological and behavioral control were negatively related to each other and function differently with regards to manifested youth characteristics.

Parental psychological control was defined as behaviors that are intrusive and manipulative of children’s thoughts, feelings, verbal expressions, identity, and attachments to parents (Barber, 2002; Barber & Harmon, 2002). Psychologically controlling parents manipulated their children through the use of affection withdrawal and guilt induction (Baumrind, 2013). Barber’s (2002) theory of psychological control stated: “psychological control is negatively related to healthy child and adolescent development” (p. 5). Parental psychological control constrained children and adolescents development of self-efficacy through limited opportunities for self-exploration and interaction with others (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005). Parents who used these unhealthy psychological control methods prevented children from developing a sense of self and autonomy. They infringed upon children’s self-discovery, growth as individuals, social competence, self-direction, self-efficacy, worth, and development as separate individuals from their parents (Barber & Harmon, 2002).

Psychological control’s negative impact on children and adolescent development also appeared to be applicable to a variety of cultures, subcultures, and ethnicities (Barber, 2002; Barber, Bean, & Erickson, 2002; Barber et al., 2005; Barber et al., 2012). Barber et al. (2005) investigated parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control’s stability in a longitudinal study, using participants from the United States and across cultures. Barber and colleagues (2005) found that parental support was associated
with social initiative and lower levels of depression and antisocial behavior in the cross cultural samples. This finding supported the importance of parental connectedness, relatedness, and attachment for optimal child development. Perceived parental psychological control was predictive of depression and antisocial behavior and was salient in all cultures studied (Barber et al., 2005). Parental behavioral control was associated with lower levels of antisocial behavior, but was not predictive of depression and social initiative, supporting the previously noted need to separate parental control into behavioral and psychological. Barber and colleagues (2005) research supported that parental psychological control was related to internalized psychological problems, externalized behavioral problems, was relevant in many cultures, and was harmful to children and adolescents’ future development.

Gender of the parent did not appear to moderate the relationship between psychological control and negative adolescent and child functioning (Barber et al., 2002; Barber et al., 2005). In studies reviewed by Barber et al. (2002), mothers were rated higher and found to employ psychological control more than fathers. However, the authors recommended more research be conducted to confirm this finding. Barber and colleagues (2005) posited that “the experience of psychological control poses risk regardless of its source and regardless of the status of the child experiencing it” (p. 115). Parental psychological control was detrimental to child functioning, whether it was used by fathers or mothers.

In a study of secure attachment styles, parental psychological control, and charismatic leadership in emerging adulthood, Towler (2005) found a negative relationship between paternal psychological control and charismatic leadership displays.
Surprisingly, this study found no relationship between maternal psychological control and charismatic leadership displays, suggesting that children’s leadership was influenced more by their fathers and the typical masculine perception of leadership. These findings contradicted Barber and colleagues’ (2002; 2005) conclusions that parental psychological control was detrimental to children and adolescents’ development, regardless of the source.

Barber and colleagues (2012) conducted a mixed methods study to refine the measurement of and confirm the construct of psychological control. In the qualitative phase, the authors’ found that adolescents described psychologically controlling behavior as ridiculing, embarrassing in public, invalidating, a violation of privacy, guilting, excessive expectations, comparing to others, and ignoring. These categories differed slightly from previous descriptions of parental psychological control. Barber et al. (2012) developed the PCDS and found that it uniquely predicted both depression and antisocial behavior. The researchers also noted that adolescents understood what parental psychological control was and were able to describe the parenting behaviors that exemplified this control method. This recent study reinforces the importance and relevance of additional research on psychological control.

Parental psychological control specifically infringed upon children and adolescents’ development of autonomy. Parents who used psychological control did not allow children and adolescents to become their own person and develop their own identity, beliefs, and attitudes through self-initiation and having choices (Grolnick, 2003). Children and adolescents required autonomy to develop their own personalities, individual preferences, self-efficacy, and appropriate social and societal behaviors. Through psychological
control, children and adolescents were denied the opportunity to become their own person and learn to be autonomous, self-governing individuals (Grolnick, 2003). Leaders were more likely than non-leaders to be raised by parents who allowed them more independence and freedom and were less punitive and critical of them (Snell, Stokes, Sands, & McBride, 1994).

Recently, researchers have elaborated on the study of autonomy and parental psychological control through the lens of Self-Determination Theory (SDT). Soenens and Vansteenkiste (2005) found autonomy-supportive parenting was positively related to self-determining behaviors in adolescents. This study defined self-determining behaviors as self-chosen and self-endorsed behaviors based on an individual’s values and personal interests. These behaviors were in turn, related to higher academic motivation in adolescents resulting in higher perceived competence in academic abilities (Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2005). The emphasis on the role of autonomy support versus coercion and control in SDT implied that psychological control inhibited the development of intrinsic motivation. Psychological control prevented children from learning to function autonomously. Thus, as posited in SDT, the child had difficulty developing autonomous motivation as their decisions and motivation were contingent upon others demands and expectations.

Oliver et al. (2011) investigated how parents and family members influenced leadership development. Their findings that nurturing family environments related to transformational leadership qualities in adulthood prompted the authors to suggest that youth leadership programs implement a family component to teach parents to provide nurturing environments. Oliver et al. (2011) argued that parents providing autonomy and
inclusion “can create a better climate in the home [and] may also be related to the adolescent having a more positive global self-concept and to becoming an effective leader” (p. 542).

Academic intrinsic motivation in childhood and adolescence predicted motivation to lead in adulthood (Gottfried et al., 2011). Parental control and negative conditional regard were found to negatively impact autonomous sources of motivation (Roth, Assor, Niemiec, Ryan, & Deci, 2009; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2005). Motivation to lead was an attribute Hollander and Julian (1969) and Hong et al. (2011) found was related to leader emergence. Youth with higher academic intrinsic motivation reported liking to lead and did not consider the extrinsic costs of leading when pursuing leadership roles (Gottfried et al., 2011). Children and adolescents with higher academic intrinsic motivation also possessed an orientation toward mastery, curiosity, persistence, and engaged in challenging, difficult, and novel tasks (Gottfried et al., 2011). This orientation served them well in leadership roles where they enacted change and charted new directions.

Popper and Mayseless (2003) compared ‘good’ parenting and transformational leadership literature in a framework of the developmental outcomes of followers through transformational leadership. The authors asserted that the study of leadership benefitted from the study of parenting, through applying the behaviors of good parents to leaders who help develop their followers. Leaders were influenced by their past experiences and genetic predispositions and in turn influenced their followers. This cyclical influence supported the importance of exploring how experiences throughout developmental stages impact leader emergence and effectiveness.
Emerging Adulthood

Emerging adulthood was distinguished from other developmental periods by several characteristics. These characteristics were described as: the age of identity explorations, age of instability, self-focused age, age of feeling in-between adolescence and adulthood, and age of possibilities (Arnett, 2013). Emerging adulthood was described as “the time in between adolescents’ reliance on parents and adults’ long-term commitments in love and work” (Arnett, 2013, p. 11). Most American emerging adults move out of their parents’ home at age 18 or 19 (Arnett, 2000). Identity exploration was an especially important characteristic of this developmental period, as this is the time that most identity exploration takes place (Arnett, 2013; Côté & Schwartz, 2005; Schwartz et al., 2005). Emerging adults are making many decisions that will shape their future career paths, relationships, and worldviews (Schwartz et al., 2005), which could be influenced by their parents intrusive parenting style. This developmental period is the ideal period to study the relationship between parental psychological control and emergent leadership, since emerging adults have moved away from their parents, are exploring their own identities, and are likely able to reflect more thoughtfully on their experiences in childhood and adolescence and their perceptions of their leadership abilities.

Critical thinking and decision making processes continued to become more sophisticated in emerging adulthood. These practical cognitive skills are improved through experiences and learning techniques for critical thinking in colleges and universities (Arnett, 2013). Emerging adults are making decisions about the ideological orientation for the rest of their life (Arnett, 2000). In Arnett, Ramos, and Jensen’s (2001) study of the ideological worldviews adopted by emerging adults, they found autonomy
(individualistic) and community (collectivist) were balanced between the emerging adults who participated in structured interviews. Attending post-secondary institutions tended to influence which ideological worldview emerging adults adopted. Emerging adults attending college used the ethic of autonomy and non-college emerging adults used the community ethic (Arnett et al., 2001). As noted in the parental psychological control literature, autonomy development is stifled by parents who use those methods with their children. This may alter their decisions regarding ideological worldviews.

Researchers have investigated the role of many factors in identity development including agency, parents, peers, and culture (Arnett, 2013). Schwartz and colleagues (2005) studied the role of agency in identity formation in emerging adults. The researchers found emerging adults who possess and utilize agentic qualities to greater extents, explored relationships, career paths, and worldviews in a more organized manner directed toward making the most of opportunities for possible life directions. Emerging adults who did not possess or utilize agentic qualities were found to have lower self-esteem and life purpose and lacked commitment to goals, values, and beliefs to guide their exploration of life directions (Schwartz et al., 2005). Parental psychological control was related to lower self-esteem, self-worth, self-reliance, self-expression, and psychosocial maturity in numerous studies (Barber & Harmon, 2002). The authors also noted that parental psychological control interfered with children’s self-discovery, self-regulation, and development of individuality, identity, independence, and emotional autonomy. Experiencing parental psychological control may have influenced a lack of agency and self-discovery in emerging adulthood.
Adolescents who have not explored life possibilities but committed themselves to certain choices were classified in identity foreclosure (Arnett, 2013). Parents were most often the root of this lack of exploration due to their strong influence and possible psychological control. Parental psychological control could be an explanation for this identity foreclosure, as the parent coerced the child into feeling pressured to change him or herself (Barber & Xia, 2013). For example, an emerging adult may feel forced to pursue an education dictated by his/her parents, even though this is not his/her passion or choice of careers.

Emergent leaders were found to possess certain traits and exhibit certain behaviors, including three traits in the five-factor personality model (conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness to experience), general self-efficacy, motivation to achieve, and motivation to lead. Parental psychological control leads to negative developmental outcomes in children and adolescents. The use of this parenting behavior constrained the development of self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and independence in children and adolescents (Barber & Harmon, 2002; Barber et al., 2005; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2005). Depression and antisocial behavior were also associated with experiencing parental psychological control. Emergent leaders tend to communicate the most with group members, be positive, and were viewed as confident and competent individuals (Pescosolido, 2002; Riggio et al., 2003). Parental psychological control appears to develop children and adolescents who possess characteristics that are not found in emergent leaders. Due to the characteristics of adolescents who experienced parental psychological control opposing the characteristics of emergent leaders, the following hypotheses were posited:
Hypothesis 2a: After controlling for the effects of the Big Five personality traits on emergent leadership behaviors, perceived paternal psychological control will negatively correlate to emergent leader behaviors.

Hypothesis 2b: After controlling for the effects of the Big Five personality traits on emergent leadership behaviors, perceived maternal psychological control will negatively correlate to emergent leader behaviors.

A conceptual model was developed to summarize the hypothesized relationships between the five factor personality model, paternal psychological control, maternal psychological control, and emergent leader behaviors.
Figure 1. The proposed conceptual model. The five-factor personality model, psychological control, and emergent leader behavior.
Chapter III: Methods

The purpose of this descriptive study was to understand the relationship between parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors. The study also analyzed the relationship between the five factor personality model and emergent leader behaviors to control for personality in the analysis of the relationship between psychological control and emergent leadership. A survey was the method of data collection as it was the most effective means of measuring the perceptions of a large population from a sample of individuals (Babbie, 1990; Fowler, 2002). The survey was cross-sectional, as participants completed the survey at one point in time during the months of October and November, 2014.

The survey included several published measures, a report of current formal and informal leadership positions, and demographic information. The survey was administered online via Qualtrics® through a link to the survey contained in an email. Prior to distributing the survey, the researcher recruited participants in a presentation of the research purpose, incentives, and anticipated risks and time commitment to two sections of child, youth, and family studies and two agricultural leadership, education, and communication undergraduate courses at a large, public Midwestern university. Access was gained to these classes and participants through the instructors. The email containing a link to the survey was sent to the participants by the instructors following the researcher’s presentation. The instructor for a child, youth, and family studies course delivered online also sent an email that included the research purpose, incentives, anticipated risks and time commitment, and a link to the survey to students enrolled in that course.
Prior to gaining access to the survey, participants reviewed the informed consent form and indicated that they agreed to participate in the research and were at least 19 years of age. The study adhered to the University of Nebraska—Lincoln policies governing the use of human subjects for research. Institutional Review Board approval was received prior to collecting any data for the study and prior to recruiting participants from additional courses. Approval #20141014481 EX (See Appendix A).

Participants

To investigate how perceived parental psychological control influences leader emergence in the emerging adulthood developmental period, students enrolled in child, youth, and family studies and agricultural leadership, education, and communication courses at a large, Midwestern public university were recruited for participation in this study. The researcher was unable to identify specific participants who have experienced parental psychological control, thus, all students in the courses, who were 19 years of age and older, were recruited to participate in this study.

Emerging adulthood is defined as the developmental period occurring between the ages of 18 and 25 (Arnett, 2000). This period of development was defined by Arnett (2000) as the period between adolescence and adulthood. Emerging adulthood is unique as emerging adults are no longer dependent upon their parents, but do not have the responsibilities of adulthood (e.g., being a spouse, parent, and having a career). Arnett (2000; 2001) described emerging adulthood as a time of exploration and transition. Emerging adulthood is also distinguished by identity explorations, instability, self-focus, feeling in-between adolescence and adulthood, and life possibilities (Arnett, 2013). This population recently became independent from their parents, can look back on their
relationships with parents more thoughtfully, and may be inclined to share their experiences with parental psychological control; thus, this population was selected for this study. Participants who are 18 years old and younger were not be invited to participate in the study. These participants required parent permission to participate in the study. Data from participants between the ages 19 to 25 was included in the analysis.

Participants were approached to participate in the study in-person during scheduled class times and via email. The researcher read a script to recruit students and the course instructors sent an email containing a link to the survey following the in-class presentation. Participants recruited from the online course were only recruited via emails distributed by the course instructor. The data was collected using Qualtrics®. The participants were presented with the informed consent form after clicking the link to participate in the study. In order to take part in the study, participants confirmed that they read the informed consent form, agreed to participate, and were at least 19 years old and eligible to participate by selecting ‘Yes’. Following completion of the survey, participants were provided with a link to another survey to click, enter their names and email addresses, ensuring the confidentiality of the participant data.

Participants from the child, youth, and family studies courses were sent a reminder email one week after the initial email was sent. A final reminder email was sent two weeks after the initial email was sent to these participants. The participants recruited from the agricultural leadership, education, and communication courses were sent one reminder email one week after the initial email was sent to the participants. The survey was open for four full weeks to gather additional data and increase participation in the survey. As an incentive, participants who completed the entire survey were entered into a
lottery drawing for one of five $10 Amazon gift cards. Gift cards were purchased and
sent electronically to the participants whose names were drawn by an uninterested party
using a random number generator after the data collection portion of the study was
completed.

**Measures**

**Psychological control scale-youth self-report.**

The survey combined several published measures. The survey included the 8-item
Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self-Report (PCS-YSR; Barber, 1996) as a partial
measurement of emerging adults’ perceptions of each parent’s level of psychological
control. Sixteen items were included to address each parent or guardian. The scale was
adapted from a 3-point Likert scale to a 5-point Likert scale on the level of psychological
control using ratings ranging from: 1=‘Never’ to 5=‘Always’. The researcher used a 5-
point Likert scale to increase reliability, following a low alpha in the researcher’s small
pilot study. Participants were asked to identify the gender of the parent or guardian and
then rate each parent or guardian using this 5-point Likert scale. Some sample items from
the scale included: “This is a person who changes the subject when I have something to
say”, “This is a person who is always trying to change how I think about things”, “This is
a person who blames me for other family members’ problems”, and “This is a person
who often interrupts me.” Barber (1996) reported strong alphas for all interactions
between children and parents for perceived psychological control when using the 3-point
Likert scale. The specific alphas recorded for each relationship were: mother/son = .83,
mother/daughter = .83, father/son = .80, and father/daughter = .83. A higher score
indicated the participants viewed their parents as using more parental psychological
control. The PCS-YSR was included due to the measure’s reliability across studies (Soenens et al., 2007; Towler, 2005).

**Psychological control – disrespect scale.**

The 8-item Psychological Control – Disrespect Scale (PCDS; Barber et al., 2012) was combined with the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) to measure parental psychological control. Sixteen items were included to address each parent or guardian. The scale was adapted from a 3-point Likert scale to a 5-point Likert scale on the level of psychological control using ratings ranging from: 1=’Never’ to 5=‘Always’. A 5-point Likert scale was selected to keep the combined scales consistent and improve reliability. Participants were asked to identify the gender of their parent or guardian, then rate the parent or guardian using the 5-point Likert scale. Some sample items from the scale included: “This is a person who embarrasses me in public (e.g., in front of my friends),” “This is a person who expects too much of me (e.g., to do better in school, to be a better person, etc.),” “This is a person who often unfairly compares me to someone else (e.g., to my brother or sister, to himself or herself),” and “This is a person who often ignores me (e.g., walking away from me, not paying attention to me).” Barber et al. (2012) reported strong alphas for the PCDS ranging from .83 to .90 in the various ethnic groups studied. This measure was recently developed using data from qualitative interviews with adolescents. This measure uniquely predicted depression and antisocial behavior when compared to the PCS-YSR in Barber and colleagues (2012) study. A higher score indicated the participants viewed their parents as using more parental psychological control. The PCDS was combined with the PCS-YSR to provide a more complete measure of parental psychological control.
Affective-identity motivation to lead scale.

The Affective-Identity Motivation to Lead (AIMTL) Scale (Chan & Drasgow, 2001) was included to measure emergent leader behaviors. The AIMTL aimed to measure the extent that individuals like to lead others (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). The participants rated their feelings regarding nine statements using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from ‘Strongly Disagree’ to ‘Strongly Agree’. Sample statements included: “I am definitely not a leader by nature”, “Most of the time, I prefer being a leader rather than a follower when working in a group”, and “I usually want to be the leader in the groups that I work in”. Chan and Drasgow (2001) reported alphas of .84 for the Singapore military sample, .87 for the Singapore student sample, and .91 for the U.S. student sample. The AIMTL was chosen as it is a valid measure for leader behaviors and was found to predict leader emergence (Hong et al., 2011).

Leadership self-efficacy scale.

The Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) Scale (Chan & Drasgow, 2001) was designed to measure individuals’ feelings regarding their leadership abilities. This scale was used in combination with the AIMTL scale to measure emergent leader behaviors. The scale employed a 7-point Likert scale with responses ranging from ‘Strongly Disagree’ to ‘Strongly Agree’. Sample statements from the six-item scale included: “Leading others effectively is probably something I will be good at”, “I feel confident that I can be an effective leader in most of the groups that I work with” and “I am not confident that I can lead others effectively”. Chan and Drasgow (2001) reported alphas of .76 with the Singapore military sample, .83 with the Singapore student sample, and .82 with the U.S. student sample, respectively. Paglis (2010) noted that LSE was related to extraversion.
and conscientiousness, which were also found to be related to leader emergence (Judge et al., 2002; Taggar et al., 1999). The LSE scale was selected as it will be used to measure participants’ confidence in their leadership abilities, which should influence their emergent leader behaviors.

**Ten-item personality inventory.**

Gosling and colleagues (2003) Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI) was selected to measure the Big Five personality factors. The survey included ten pairs of traits such as, “extraverted, enthusiastic”, “critical, quarrelsome”, and “calm, emotionally stable”. Participants rated how they saw themselves on each pair of traits using a 7-point Likert scale with responses ranging from ‘Strongly Disagree’ to ‘Strongly Agree’. The TIPI was found to reach adequate levels in convergent and discriminant validity, test-retest reliability, and patterns of external correlates (Gosling et al., 2003). Ehrhart et al. (2009) findings supported the validity of the TIPI. Extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience were found to be positively correlated to leader emergence and neuroticism was found to negatively correlate to emergent leadership (Judge et al., 2002; Tagger et al., 1998). Thus, a measure of the Big Five personality traits will be an accurate way to measure participants’ self-perceptions of personality traits. Gosling and colleagues (2003) noted the TIPI was less reliable and correlated less strongly with other variables than longer measures of the Big Five; however, for this study the TIPI eliminated item redundancy present in more comprehensive measures. The TIPI was designed to be combined with larger surveys (Gosling et al., 2003), which made it a favorable choice to measure Big Five personality traits in this survey.
Demographic questions.

Age, gender, college, college major, and current grade level of each participant were included in the data collection. In addition to these general demographic questions, the researcher asked participants to identify their family structure. Using an adapted question from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS; Schneider, Atteberry, & Owens, 2005), the survey included a question that asked participants to select the description that best applied to the family structure he/she grew up in. The following eight descriptors of possible family structures used in the ECLS in the family structure were included in the demographic question: biological mother and biological father, biological mother and other father (step-, adoptive, foster), biological father and other mother (step-, adoptive, foster), biological mother only, biological father only, two adoptive parents, single adoptive parent or adoptive parent and stepparent, related guardian(s), and unrelated guardian(s). Participants were also asked to report any formal (e.g. supervisor, elected president of an organization) or informal (e.g. in-class small group leader, work team leader) leadership positions they are currently in. This question was used as an additional measure of emergent leadership behaviors, in addition to the AIMTL and LSE (Chan & Drasgow, 2001).

Variables

The independent variables of the study were parental psychological control, as measured by the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) and PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) and the Big Five personality traits as measured by the TIPI (Gosling et al., 2003). The dependent variable was emergent leadership. Emergent leadership included emergent leader behaviors as measured by the AIMTL (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), LSE (Chan & Drasgow,
2001), and demographic question about holding a leadership position. In addition, the previously described demographic information was collected and reported as descriptive statistics.

**Data Analysis**

The data was analyzed in R (R Core Team, 2013) using descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression modeling. Descriptive statistics were reported as the mean, reliability, and standard deviation. Multiple regression analysis is appropriate to analyze data when several independent variables simultaneously influence the dependent variable and variables are hypothetical constructs (Babbie, 1990). Multiple regression analysis is used to find correlations between each variable and parcel out the variables included in single measures (e.g. each of the Big Five personality traits in the TIPI).
Chapter IV: Results

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this survey study was to understand the relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors at a large Midwestern public university. This study analyzed the relationship between the five factor model of personality and emergent leadership. The data analysis was used to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors as measured by the Psychological Control Scale—Youth Self-Report (PCS-YSR) (Barber, 1996), Psychological Control—Disrespect Scale (PCDS) (Barber et al., 2012), the Affective-Identity Motivation to Lead Scale (AIMTL) (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), and the Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale (LSE) (Chan & Drasgow, 2001)?

2. Does the relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leadership exist when controlling for the Big Five personality traits as measured by the Ten Item Personality Inventory (TIPI) (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003)?

Demographic Data

Of the 577 participants contacted, 60 participants fully completed the survey. With regard to gender, there were more female participants (78%) than male participants (22%). The mean age of participants was 21, with participant ages ranging from 19 to 25. Seventy-five percent of participants reported they were currently in a formal or informal leadership role, while 25% of participants reported they were not in a leadership role.
Because so many students reported having both parents, this variable was dichotomized to both parents (biological mother and biological father) and other (biological mother and other father, biological father and other mother, biological mother only, biological father only, two adoptive parents, single adoptive parent or adoptive parent and stepparent, related guardian(s), and unrelated guardian(s)). Eighty-six percent of participants reported both parents as the most descriptive of the family structure they grew up in, while 14% of participants reported having another family structure. Concerning participants’ current grade level, 7% of participants were freshmen, 23% were sophomores, 29% were juniors, and 41% were seniors. The participants represented all colleges at this large, public Midwestern University and a variety of majors.

**Data Results**

Analysis was completed using R (R Core Team, 2013) to examine multiple linear regression models to analyze the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The independent variables were the Big Five personality traits and parental psychological control and the dependent variable was emergent leadership measured by affective-identity motivation to lead (AIMTL), leadership self-efficacy (LSE), and holding a formal or informal leadership position. Three separate multiple regressions were run to compare the independent variables to self-reported current leadership position, AIMTL, and LSE separately, as AIMTL and LSE were found to be separate constructs measuring separate aspects of leadership (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Hendricks & Payne, 2007).

All measures had high levels of internal consistency, as reported in Table 1. The mean and standard deviation for AIMTL (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), leadership self-
efficacy, and paternal and maternal psychological control are reported in Table 1. The items included in the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) and PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) were combined for a complete measure of parental psychological control for each parent. The researcher was unable to run Cronbach’s alpha for the TIPI (Gosling et al., 2003) as coefficient alpha is difficult to interpret in a scale measuring two items (Woods & Hampson, 2005). Cronbach’s alpha is dependent on scale length, which means that alpha values are repressed in short scales and if there is a high alpha reported the scale is likely overspecific (Kline, 2000). Gosling and colleagues (2003) developed their scale as a brief measure of the five-factor personality model. The mean, standard deviations and interfactor correlations for the TIPI are reported in Table 2 and are similar to those found by Ehrhart et al. (2009) suggesting that these variables are appropriate for use in this study. Correlations between the Big Five personality traits, paternal and maternal parental psychological control, AIMTL, and LSE are reported in Table 3. The most significant positive correlations between individual variables were extraversion and openness to experience (.544) and AIMTL and LSE (.510).

Table 1. Scale means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Identity MTL</td>
<td>31.73</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self Efficacy</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psychological Control</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psychological Control</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=60.
Table 2. Mean, standard deviations, interfactor correlations for TIPI scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* N=60. E=Extraversion, A=Agreeableness, C=Conscientiousness, N=Neuroticism, O=Openness.

Table 3. Correlations between Big Five, psychological control, AIMTL, and LSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Maternal</th>
<th>AIMTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.413</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMTL</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* E=Extraversion, A=Agreeableness, C=Conscientiousness, N=Neuroticism, O=Openness, Paternal=Paternal Psychological Control, Maternal=Maternal Psychological Control.

**Hypothesis 1.**

Hypothesis 1a: *Extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience will positively correlate to emergent leader behaviors.*

Hypothesis 1b: *Agreeableness will not correlate to emergent leader behaviors.*

Hypothesis 1c: *Neuroticism will negatively correlate to emergent leader behaviors.*

Hypothesis 1a was partially supported. Multiple regression was used to predict AIMTL, LSE, and current formal and informal leadership positions from the Big Five personality traits. Extraversion was significant (p<.05) for AIMTL but not significant for LSE or identifying oneself as currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. Conscientiousness was approaching significance for AIMTL but not significant for LSE.
or identifying oneself as currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. 
Openness to experience was not significant for AIMTL, LSE, or identifying oneself as currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. Hypothesis 1b was supported. 
Agreeableness was not significant for AIMTL, LSE, or identifying oneself as currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. Hypothesis 1c was partially supported. 
Neuroticism was approaching significance for AIMTL and not significant for LSE or identifying oneself as currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. 
Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6.

Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 2a: After controlling for the effects of the Big Five personality traits on emergent leadership behaviors, perceived paternal psychological control will negatively correlate to emergent leader behaviors.

Hypothesis 2b: After controlling for the effects of the Big Five personality traits on emergent leadership behaviors, perceived maternal psychological control will negatively correlate to emergent leader behaviors.

Multiple regression was used to predict AIMTL and LSE from paternal and maternal parental psychological control. Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Paternal psychological control was not significant for AIMTL, LSE, or identifying oneself as currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. Maternal psychological control was not significant for AIMTL, LSE, or identifying oneself as currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. Scores on the parental psychological control measures for both fathers and mothers were positively skewed. Linear regressions are robust to
partings from normality (van Belle, 2002). Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6.

**Table 4. Summary of regression analysis for full AIMTL model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE_\beta$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>22.709</td>
<td>9.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.400</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal psychological control</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal psychological control</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *$p<.05$; $B$ = unstandardized regression coefficient; $SE_\beta$ = Standard error of the coefficient; $\beta$ = standardized coefficient.

The AIMTL model indicated that only extraversion was a statistically significant predictor of leadership. Conscientiousness and neuroticism were approaching statistical significance. This model explained 13.57% ($F=2.233, p=.047$) of the variance in AIMTL.

**Table 5. Summary of regression analysis for full LSE model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE_\beta$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>26.728</td>
<td>8.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal psychological control</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal psychological control</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *$p<.1$; *$p<.05$; $B$ = unstandardized regression coefficient; $SE_\beta$ = Standard error of the coefficient; $\beta$ = standardized coefficient.

The LSE model indicated that no predictors were statistically significant. This model explained -0.04% ($F=0.689, p=.680$) of the variance in LSE.
Table 6. Summary of regression analysis for current leadership positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEβ</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.377</td>
<td>4.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal psychological control</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal psychological control</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: . p <0.1; *p<.05; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SEβ = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient.

The current leadership positions model indicated that no predictors were statistically significant.

As many of the variables were not significant for AIMTL, a stepwise reduction of the AIMTL model was performed to include only extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism in the final model. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 7. Because none of the variables were statistically significant in the LSE and current leadership position model, no further analysis was conducted.

Table 7. Final linear regression model for AIMTL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEβ</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>21.888</td>
<td>5.974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.442</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: . p<.1; **p<.01; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SEβ = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient.

Table 7 illustrates that extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism explained 19.26% ($F=5.531$, $p<.003$) of the variance in AIMTL. This is greater than the full model for AIMTL and indicates better model fit. For every one unit increase in extraversion, AIMTL increased by 0.719. For every one unit increase in conscientiousness, AIMTL
increased by 0.648. For every one unit increase in neuroticism, AIMTL decreased by 0.442.
Chapter V: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to understand the relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors, as measured as affective-identity motivation to lead (AIMTL) and leadership self-efficacy (LSE) in emerging adulthood. A survey method was used to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors?

2. Does the relationship between perceived parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors exist when controlling for the Big Five personality traits?

Summary of Results

Participants recruited from several courses at a large Midwestern public university completed online questionnaires including several published measures and demographic questions. Extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism were significant predictors for only one measure of emergent leadership, AIMTL. Agreeableness and openness to experience were not significant predictors of emergent leadership as measured by AIMTL, LSE, and currently holding a leadership position. Paternal and maternal parental psychological control was not a predictor of emergent leadership. Parental psychological control was not significantly related to AIMTL, LSE, and currently holding a leadership position. No predictors were significantly related to two measures of emergent leadership, LSE, and currently holding a leadership position.
Figure 2. Final AIMTL Model. Conceptual model depicting the supported hypotheses and relationships to affective-identity motivation to lead.
Figure 3. Final LSE and Leadership Position Model. Conceptual model depicting the unsupported hypotheses and relationships to leadership self-efficacy and currently holding a leadership position.
Parental psychological control and emergent leadership.

Paternal and maternal parental psychological control were not found to be significantly related to AIMTL, LSE, or current leadership status. The participant scores on paternal and maternal parental psychological control were both positively skewed. This is inconsistent with other studies of emerging adults that included parental psychological control as a variable and measured parental psychological control using the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) (Lucykx, Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Goosens, & Berzonsky, 2007; Nelson et al., 2011; Soenens, Vansteenkiste, & Sierens, 2009; Zimmer-Gembeck, Madsen, & Hanisch, 2011). The PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) is a recently developed measure of parental psychological control. The researcher was unable to find studies that combined the PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) and the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) with the emerging adult population, which could explain the positive skew of the results.

Schulman, Feldman, Blatt, Cohen, and Mahler (2005) found that the optimal relationship between emerging adults and their parents “represents an ability to be assertive and to insist on making personal decisions within the atmosphere of an empathic perception of parents and their needs” (p. 597) in their study of emerging adulthood. Frank, Avery, and Laman (1988) also found that the emotional autonomy that emerging adults achieve is related to a better understanding of parents, their behaviors, and motives. This mature relationship with parents may indicate that emerging adults view their parents’ psychological controlling behaviors in an empathetic lens. Emerging adults may not view their parents as using these negative behaviors all the time, but only in situations in which it was required or when it had a positive outcome in their life. The participants in this study would be considered successful emerging adults, as they are
attending a post-secondary institution and a majority recognized themselves as holding a
formal or informal leadership position, consistent with Schulman et al.’s (2005) findings.

The small sample size and specific characteristics of the sample also could have
contributed to this positive skew. Fowler (2002) asserted that with a small sample size, it
is likely that the sample will have a lower percentage of the characteristic the researcher
is looking to measure. The sample also included a high percentage (75%) of participants
who identify as leaders in formal and informal positions. Parental psychological control
was consistently related to negative outcomes in adolescents and emerging adults (Barber
& Harmon, 2002). Psychological control is negatively related to autonomy in children
and adolescents (Barber, 1996; 2002; Grolnick, 2003), positively related to depression,
and negatively related to self-esteem and social adjustment (Barber, 1996; Barber et al.,
2005; Barber et al., 2012; Soenens, Vansteenkiste, & Sierens, 2009).

Research has supported that leaders possess high self-esteem and interpersonal
competence. Bass (2008) surmised interpersonal competence was essential to leadership.
Interpersonally competent leaders communicate easily and clearly with others, foster and
maintain good relationships with others, and are socially perceptive (Bass, 2008). Self-
esteeem was also positively related to emergent leadership, and found to be higher in
leaders than in followers (Bass, 2008). These qualities of leaders and the qualities
fostered in children who experience parental psychological control appear to oppose each
other. This research sample included a high percentage of leaders, thus would also likely
have a low percentage of individuals who experienced parental psychological control.
The Big Five and emergent leadership.

In this study, conscientiousness was positively related to one measure of emergent leadership behaviors, AIMTL. Extraversion was positively related to one measure of emergent leadership, AIMTL, and neuroticism was negatively related to one measure of emergent leadership, AIMTL. Agreeableness was not related to any measures of emergent leadership. Openness to experience was also not related to any measures of emergent leadership. The findings concerning the relationship between extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism to emergent leadership were consistent with published research (Judge et al., 2002; Paunonen et al., 2006; Tagger et al., 1999). Inconsistent with previous research, openness to experience was not found, in this study, to be a correlate of leadership emergence (Judge et al., 2002). The results of this study also replicated Chan and Drasgow’s (2001) findings that extraversion and conscientiousness were related to AIMTL, and openness to experience was not significantly related to AIMTL. The researcher did not find a significant relationship between agreeableness and AIMTL and found a negative, significant relationship between neuroticism and AIMTL, contrary to Chan and Drasgow’s (2001) findings.

Inconsistent with the literature, conscientiousness and extraversion were not related to LSE (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Hendricks & Payne, 2007; Ng, Ang, & Chan, 2008). Openness to experience and agreeableness were not found to be significantly related to LSE, consistent with the literature (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Ng et al., 2008). In the current study, neuroticism was not significantly related to LSE, consistent with Chan and Drasgow’s (2001) and Hendricks and Payne’s (2007) findings, but inconsistent with Ng and colleagues (2008) research. None of the Big Five personality traits were significantly
related to participants identifying that they currently hold a formal or informal leadership position.

**Implications**

**Contributions to theory.**

The research findings have implications for leadership theories. The relationship between extraversion and neuroticism and AIMTL supports the importance of the Big Five personality traits in leadership theory. The trait theory of leadership benefits from continued investigations analyzing the relationship between personality traits and leadership (Antonakis, 2011). This study also further validated the measures used in the study: the AIMTL (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), LSE (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996), and PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) as evidenced by the high alphas reported in the results. This study is significant because it was one of the first studies to research parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors while controlling for the Big Five personality traits.

The majority of participants in this study were female and the majority of the participants in this study also identified themselves as leaders. According to Carli and Eagly (2011) neither gender has an advantage when it comes to the Big Five personality traits that are correlated to emergent leadership. The participants also scored relatively high on the LSE, as the mean score was 34, indicating that the participants were generally confident in their leadership abilities. These findings are consistent with Bardou, Byrne, Pasternak, Perez, and Rainey (2003)’s findings in their study of the effects of gender, previous leadership experience, and institutional support on leadership self-efficacy. In their study, the authors found that female student leaders reported equal or higher levels
of self-efficacy when compared to male student leaders. In an earlier study, Mayo and Christnfeld (1999) found that women tended to have lower performance expectations for themselves in their study of the effects of gender and race on the performance expectations of college students. Goktepe and Schneier (1989) found that a masculine gender role was associated with leader emergence in small groups. The findings of the present study appear to support that females are gaining more access to leadership roles during college and have confidence in their leadership abilities.

Although the relationships between paternal and maternal psychological control and AIMTL, LSE, and currently holding a leadership position were not significant, the research meaningfully contributed to the field of parenting. This study is one of the first to combine the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) and PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) as a singular measure of parental psychological control. The combined scales reported high alphas for both paternal (.96) and maternal (.93) psychological control, providing limited evidence that these two measures can be successfully combined. Further research should replicate this finding using a factor analysis with larger samples and diverse populations.

**Contributions to practice.**

The most significant finding of this study revealed that extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism were the only personality variables that predicted AIMTL. No other personality traits were significantly related to LSE or currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. Personality was linked to the participants’ natural tendency to be motivated to lead, but not linked to the participants’ confidence in their leadership abilities or currently holding a formal or informal leadership position. This study also found a relationship between AIMTL and LSE, supported by a positive
correlation of .510. The participants were confidence in their leadership abilities, supported by the mean scores of the LSE; however, personality did not predict this confidence. The participants’ confidence in their leadership abilities could be supported by their positions in formal and informal leadership positions. These findings support the importance of providing many opportunities for emerging adults to lead. Zarrett and Eccles (2006) called for more programs that allow youth transitioning from adolescence to emerging adulthood to participate in decision making and leadership. Dugan and Komives (2007) recommended student involvement in organization and leadership programs, and increasing the number of leadership positions in organizations for students in their national study to identify how to develop leadership capacity in college students. The researcher’s findings support these additional leadership opportunities as being important for emerging adults, to give participants the ability to reinforce their leadership identity and confidence in their leadership abilities.

Access to formal and informal leadership positions also supports Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, and Osteen’s (2006) leadership identity development model. The authors posit that students develop a leadership identity through stages as they overcome challenges and transitions in thinking about leadership. The findings support leadership identity theory and the LID model’s assertion that the group a student is part of can provide an environment to develop a leadership identity (Komives et al., 2006). Instructors, advisors, and faculty sponsors should be aware of the need to encourage group processes that support leadership (expectation setting, shared responsibilities, establishing group norms, etc.), as well as allowing and encouraging all students to participate in the leadership process (Komives et al., 2006). The results of this
study support the importance of access to formal and informal leadership roles to encourage development of a leadership identity and confidence in leadership abilities.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Future research should analyze the relationships between various parenting behaviors and leadership constructs. This study was limited by the focus on parental psychological control and emergent leader behaviors and small sample size. Future studies with larger samples should be conducted to replicate the researcher’s findings. Developmental theories of leadership would benefit from a study using a comprehensive measure of parenting behaviors, such as the Parenting Styles and Dimension Questionnaire (PSDQ; Robinson, Mandelco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995) or the Child Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) originally developed by Schaefer (1965a; 1965b). Analyzing the relationship between various parenting behaviors and the entire MTL measure (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), leadership self-efficacy, and measures of leadership effectiveness would also contribute to the investigation of the developmental antecedents of leadership. The use of only the AIMTL measure from Chan and Drasgow’s (2001) entire MTL measure limited this study. The MTL measure includes measures to address different aspects of MTL, social-normative MTL and noncalculative MTL (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). Addressing these additional components of motivation to lead would have addressed those who lead because of a sense of responsibility (social-normative MTL) or those who lead because they do not calculate the costs relative to the benefits of leading (noncalculative MTL). The findings from future studies would be able to explain the relationship between parental psychological control and MTL, as a construct.
PsyCap is defined as a positive psychological state characterized by the confidence to take on and succeed at challenging tasks, optimism about success now and in the future, persevering toward goals, and having resiliency in the face of challenges to attain success (Luthans, 2002; Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). The four facets of PsyCap are self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency (Luthans et al., 2006; Luthans et al., 2007). This study investigated the perception of parental psychological control, which could be influenced by this positive psychological state. Future studies should use measures of PsyCap to determine if this psychological state influences emerging adults’ perceptions of parental psychological control and their own appraisals of currently occupying formal or informal leadership positions.

Drawing from multiple methods to assess parenting and leadership would improve the validity of future studies and the conclusions drawn between parenting and leadership in emerging adulthood. This study was also limited by its cross-sectional design and only using self-reported data. Obtaining data from parents to develop a full assessment of parenting behaviors used in child rearing and observational data related to leadership effectiveness would also reduce the limitations of future studies.

Longitudinal studies that examine parenting from early childhood through emerging adulthood and assesses leadership throughout this period would improve the practice of leadership. Researchers could determine specific parenting behaviors that encouraged children and adolescents to pursue leadership opportunities or develop leadership skills, and encourage parents to use these behaviors. Leadership development would also be analyzed to support the experiences and influences needed to develop leaders.
Longitudinal studies would further the findings in this study and assist in clarifying the relationship between affective-identity motivation to lead, leadership self-efficacy, and current leadership positions.

Research examining a range of parenting behaviors and leadership constructs will answer the call to investigate leadership development through the lifespan (Day, 2011b; Murphy & Johnson, 2011). Drawing from multiple methods, using multiple survey designs, and examining the dearth of leadership constructs and measures of leadership effectiveness will meaningfully influence the study of the developmental antecedents of leadership. Researchers should continue to study various leadership constructs, parenting behaviors, and other influences throughout the lifespan to develop a lifespan theory of leadership (Murphy & Johnson, 2011). This study has contributed to the field of leadership development. Future studies replicating this study design with larger samples may also contribute to the theories of the influence parenting behaviors have on future leader emergence.

**Conclusion**

Leadership scholars have identified the need for research investigating the developmental antecedents of leadership (Avolio, 2007; Day 2011b; Murphy & Johnson, 2011). Although leadership scholars investigated the relationship between parenting and leadership, there was a gap in the leadership literature analyzing the impact of parental psychological control. This descriptive study explored the relationship between the five factor personality model, parental psychological control, and emergent leadership behaviors in emerging adults. Participants were emailed a survey including measures of the Big Five personality traits, affective-identity motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow,
2001), leadership self-efficacy, parental psychological control, and self-reported formal and informal leadership positions. Parental psychological control was not significantly related to affective-identity motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), leadership self-efficacy, or leadership position. Extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism were related to affective-identity motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), but were not related to leadership self-efficacy or leadership position. Agreeableness and openness to experience were not significantly related to any of the measures of emergent leadership.

This study is significant as it is one of the first studies to successfully test the combination of the PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) and PCDS (Barber et al., 2012) to measure parental psychological control and investigate the relationship between parental psychological control and emergent leadership. This study replicated findings from previous studies (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Hendricks & Payne, 2007; Ng, Ang, & Chan, 2008) and further validated the measures used to measure emergent leader behaviors, parental psychological control, and the five-factor model of personality. The findings support the importance of access to leadership positions in emerging adulthood and contribute to the parenting and leadership literature.
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APPENDIX B: Email to Students Receiving In Person Presentation

Hello! My name is Melissa Fenton and I am a graduate student at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. I read a short script to your class today, asking you to participate in my Thesis study. Below is the information required to participate and a link to the survey:

This semester, I am conducting research for my Master’s Thesis that investigates the relationship between negative parenting behaviors and leader emergence. Please understand the following:

- Only individuals who are at least 19 years of age are invited to participate in this study.
- To participate, you will take a 10-15 minute survey.
- The individuals who complete the entire survey can choose to be entered into a drawing for one of five $10 Amazon gift cards.
- All data will be kept confidential and all results will be recorded in aggregate form with no identifying information.
- Your instructor will not know who completed the survey and it will not affect your grade in this class.

If you are willing to participate in this study,

Follow this link to the Survey:

https://alec.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6mzSB4qVAGrBVHv or copy and paste it into your browser.

Thank-you for your time!

Best,

Melissa Fenton, Graduate Student
Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
402-472-9184
mfenton2@unl.edu

Dr. Gina Matkin, Associate Professor
Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
402-472-4454
gmatkin1@unl.edu
APPENDIX C: Recruitment Script Read to Students

“The study of leadership benefits from research investigating the early influences of leaders. In order to further the practice and study of leadership development, it is necessary to investigate the relationship between negative parenting behaviors and leadership emergence. This study is also important for parenting researchers and practitioners.

This semester, I am conducting research for my Master’s Thesis that investigates the relationship between negative parenting behaviors and leader emergence. Only individuals who are at least 19 years of age are invited to participate in this study. To take part in this study, you will take a 10-15 minute survey. A link to the online survey will be emailed to you by your instructor following this class. The individuals who complete the entire survey will be entered into a drawing for one of five $10 Amazon gift cards. Your odds of winning one of these gift cards is 1 in 40. All data will be kept confidential and all results will be recorded in aggregate form with no identifying information. Your instructors will not know who completed the survey and it will not affect your grade in this class.

Please contact me at mfenton2@unl.edu if you have any questions regarding this study. Thank-you for your time and considering participation in my research!”
APPENDIX D: Email to Students in Online Course

Hello! My name is Melissa Fenton and I am a graduate student at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. I am currently working on my Thesis and am asking you to participate in my research. The information below explains the importance of my Thesis study and the requirements to participate.

The study of leadership benefits from research investigating the early influences of leaders. As a future leader, it is important for you to reflect upon your past experiences and your leadership abilities in small groups. In order to further the practice and study of leadership development, it is necessary to investigate the relationship between negative parenting behaviors and leadership emergence. This study is important to furthering both the study of parenting and leadership. Practitioners in leadership development and parenting will also benefit from the results of this study.

This semester, I am conducting research for my Master’s Thesis that investigates the relationship between negative parenting behaviors and leader emergence. Please understand the following:

- Only individuals who are at least 19 years of age are invited to participate in this study.
- To participate, you will take a 10-15 minute survey.
- The individuals who complete the entire survey can choose to be entered into a drawing for one of five $10 Amazon gift cards.
- All data will be kept confidential and all results will be recorded in aggregate form with no identifying information.
- Your instructor will not know who completed the survey and it will not affect your grade in this class.

If you are willing to participate in this study,

Follow this link to the Survey:

https://alec.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6mzSB4qVAGrBVHv or copy and paste it into your browser.

Please contact me at mfenton2@unl.edu if you have any questions regarding this study. Thank-you for your time!

Best,

Melissa Fenton, Graduate Student
Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
402-472-9184
mfenton2@unl.edu

Dr. Gina Matkin, Associate Professor
Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
402-472-4454
gmatkin1@unl.edu
Appendix D: Questionnaire

The Relationship between Parenting and Emergent Leadership
IRB Approval Number: IRB#20141014481 EX November 2014

Dear Student:

The study of leadership benefits from research investigating the early influences of leaders. As a future leader, it is important for you to reflect upon your past experiences and your leadership abilities in small groups. In order to further the practice and study of leadership development, it is necessary to investigate the relationship between various types of parenting behaviors and leadership emergence.

In order to study the relationship between negative parenting behaviors and emergent leadership, we are inviting you to participate in a brief survey. You will take the survey once and thoughtfully respond to the survey questions. The survey will take between 10-15 minutes to complete. The survey will be completed online, thus you will be able to complete it at a time that is convenient for you.

If you complete the entire survey, you will be sent to another survey in order to enter your name and email address into a drawing to receive one of five $10 Amazon gift cards. You are not required to enter the drawing. The drawing will take place one week after the final data is collected. The odds of winning the drawing are 1 in 40. Winners will be drawn by an unrelated party using a random number generator. You will be notified via the email you provide if you win one of the gift cards. The Amazon gift card will also be electronically delivered to your email address for you to redeem.

There are no anticipated risks to participants. All findings used in any written reports or publications from this project will be reported in aggregate form with no identifying information.

You must be 19 years of age or older to participate in this study. You are free to decide not to participate in this study. Your instructors will not know if you choose to participate or not. Your grade will not be affected by the outcome of this study. You can also withdraw at any time without harming your relationship with the researchers, your instructors, or the University of Nebraska—Lincoln.

If you have any questions about this study or if you want to voice any concerns, please feel free to contact, Melissa Fenton, 4-H Graduate Assistant at (402)472-9184 or mfenon2@unl.edu or Dr. Gina Matkin at (402)472-4454 or gmatkin@unl.edu. Please contact the University of Nebraska—Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402)472-6965 for the following reasons: you wish to talk to someone other than the research staff to obtain answers to questions about your rights as a research participant; to voice concerns or complaints about the research; to provide input concerning the research process; or in the event the study staff could not be reached.
You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Selecting 'Yes' below certifies that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information presented. Selecting 'Yes' also certifies that you are 19 years of age or older and are eligible to participate.

☑ Yes
☑ No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Instructions: How well do the following statements describe how you feel? Imagine a typical work or school situation where you are working in a group or team, and the question is raised if someone should be appointed as a group leader. Assume for now that everyone in the group has roughly the same level of training, knowledge, and experience on the job. Please read each statement carefully and choose the one answer that best describes your agreement or disagreement. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer honestly and frankly.
Q1 I am definitely not a leader by nature.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q2 Most of the time, I prefer being a leader rather than a follower when working in a group.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q3 I have a tendency to take charge in most groups or teams that I work in.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q4 I am the type of person who is not interested in leading others.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Q5 I believe I can contribute more to a group if I am a follower rather than a leader.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q6 I am the type of person who likes to be in charge of others.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q7 I usually want to be the leader in the groups that I work in.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q8 I am the type of person who would actively support a leader, but prefers not to be appointed as the leader.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q9 I am seldom reluctant to be the leader of the group.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Instructions: The following statements deal with how you feel about your abilities. Please select the answer that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.
Please answer in an honest fashion.

Q10 I am not confident that I can lead others effectively.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q11 Leading others effectively is probably something I will be good at.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q12 I believe that leading others effectively is a skill that I can master.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q13 I do not expect to become very effective at leading.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Q14 I feel confident that I can be an effective leader in most of the groups that I work with.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q15 It probably will not be possible for me to lead others as effectively as I would like.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Slightly Agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Instructions: Please rate the following statements about your parent(s) or guardian(s). When selecting your response, think about the two parent(s) or guardian(s) that primarily raised you through childhood and adolescence. You will rate the statements for each parent or guardian separately. Please read each item carefully and answer honestly and truthfully.
Q16 Parent or guardian 1 is a:

- Male
- Female

Q17 This is a person who........

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most of the Time</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is always trying to change how I think about things. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes the subject whenever I have something to say. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often interrupts me. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blames me for other family members' problems. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brings up past mistakes when he/she criticizes me. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is less friendly with me if I do not see things his/her way. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will avoid looking at me when I have disappointed him/her. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I have hurt his/her feelings, stops talking to me until I please him/her again. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ridicules me or puts me down (e.g., saying I am stupid, useless, etc.). (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embarrasses me in public (e.g., in front of my friends). (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doesn't respect me as a person (e.g., not letting me talk, favoring others over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>violates my privacy (e.g., entering my room, going through my things, etc.)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>tries to make me feel guilty for something I've done or something he/she thinks I should do.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>expects too much of me (e.g., to do better in school, to be a better person, etc.)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>often unfairly compares me to someone else (e.g., to my brother or sister, to himself/herself)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>often ignores me (e.g., walking away from me, not paying attention to me)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q18 This question is to make sure you are paying attention. Please choose 'C'.

- A
- B
- C
- D

Q19 Parent or guardian 2 is a........

- Male
- Female

Q20 This is a person who.......

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most of the Time</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is always trying to change how I think about things. (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes the subject whenever I have something to say. (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often interrupts me. (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blames me for other family members' problems. (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brings up past mistakes when he/she criticizes me. (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is less friendly with me if I do not see things his/her way. (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will avoid looking at me when I have disappointed him/her. (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I have hurt his/her feelings, stops talking to me until I please him/her again. (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
<td>Column 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ridicules me or puts me down (e.g., saying I am stupid, useless, etc.).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embarrasses me in public (e.g., in front of my friends).</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doesn't respect me as a person (e.g., not letting me talk, favoring others over me, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violates my privacy (e.g., entering my room, going through my things, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tries to make me feel guilty for something I've done or something he/she thinks I should do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expects too much of me (e.g., to do better in school, to be a better person, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often unfairly compares me to someone else (e.g., to my brother or sister, to himself/herself).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often ignores me (e.g., walking away from me, not paying attention to me).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: Below are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please select the response next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

Q21 I see myself as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Moderately</th>
<th>Disagree a Little</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree a Little</th>
<th>Agree Moderately</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted, enthusiastic.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical, quarrelsome.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable, self-disciplined.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious, easily upset.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to new experiences, complex.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved, quiet.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic, warm.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized, careless.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm, emotionally stable.</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional, uncreative</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q22 Instructions: Please select or enter a response to the following questions.

Q23 What is your current age?

______ Use the sliding bar to select your age.

Q24 Which of the following descriptions best describes the family structure you grew up in?

- Biological mother and biological father
- Biological mother and other father (step-, adoptive, foster)
- Biological father and other mother (step-, adoptive, foster)
- Biological mother only
- Biological father only
- Two adoptive parents
- Single adoptive parent or adoptive parent and stepparent
- Related guardian(s)
- Unrelated guardian(s)

Q25 Are you currently in any formal (e.g. supervisor, elected official in an organization) or informal (e.g. in-class small group leader, work team leader) leadership positions?

- Yes
- No

Q26 Which of the following best describes your gender?

- Male
- Female

Q27 Which college are you currently enrolled in?

- College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
- College of Architecture
- College of Arts and Sciences
- College of Business Administration
- College of Education and Human Sciences
- College of Engineering
- College of Fine and Performing Arts
- College of Journalism and Mass Communications
- College of Public Affairs and Community Service
- Undecided
Q28 What is your major?

________________________________________________________________________

Q29 What is your current grade level?

☐ Freshman
☐ Sophomore
☐ Junior
☐ Senior