

Leadership and Transference of Work Role Gains to Family Domain: Moderating Role of Family Structure

Sunil Kumar*, Gitanjali Upadhaya**

ABSTRACT

Leadership and work roles are two traversed process in organizational framework. This study aimed to explore the relationship between servant leadership and work role gains transfer of university teachers into their family domain. The information was collected from 223 teachers of 6 Central universities of North-India. The information was analyzed by using partial least square-structure equation modeling (PLS-SEM). The results of the study highlighted that servant leadership is acting as a source to the resources accumulated during work roles. The dimensions of servant leadership are showing significant role in the transference of instrumental and affective skills and abilities gained in work roles to family domain. The respondents' family structure in the form of marital status, spouse working status and living status with parents showed significant moderation in the relationship between leadership and work role gains transference to family domain. The future researchers can identify the classroom role transference effects of students on family roles in relation to servant teacher leadership.

Keywords: *Servant Leadership, Work Roles, Family Domain, Family Structure, Transference, Moderators*

* Senior Research Fellow, Department of Human Resource Management & Organizational Behavior, School of Business & Management Studies, Central University of Himachal Pradesh, India. Email: sunil23121984@gmail.com

** Assistant Professor, Department of Human Resource Management & Organizational Behavior, School of Business & Management Studies, Central University of Himachal Pradesh, India.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership rooted itself deeper in our organizations. It is a social process and a force which is constructive, dynamic and playing a crucial role in success and survival of any organization (Jain & Bhargav, 2010). In contemporary scenario the emphasis in leadership is changing from self-centric to people centric and toward more relational styles of leadership (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). Accordingly, organizational behavior literature is focusing on the relationship between ethics and leadership (Hollander, 1995; Rost, 1995; Fulmer, 2004). The need of values and ethics based leadership is pointing toward the application of servant leadership in modern organizations. Yukl (2009) incorporated the servant leadership in ethical leadership. Servant leadership is aligning itself with more liberal and flexible forms of leadership styles and representing servant leadership as a futuristic leadership style for handling organizations (Kumar, 2018b).

This change is evident in leadership scholars' conceptual and empirical investigation of servant leadership (Greenleaf, 2002; Hale & Fields, 2007; Kumar, 2018b; Neubert, Kacmar, Carlson, Chonko, & Roberts, 2008; Spears, 2004; Van Dierendonck, 2011; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010; Yukl, 2009).

The servant leadership is about serving others, prioritizing other's needs, and finding satisfaction and motivation in serving others (Spears, 2004). The values like altruistic love, care, and compassion to hold the relations in the right direction and to mobilize the group toward the desired goal are characteristic features of servant leadership (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leadership is a way to show individual presence and creating positive changes in the society. It is a transformational approach to work and life (Spears, 2004).

In organizational context servant leadership reverses the organizational pyramid; here top leaders occupy the lowest part of pyramid which increases their empathetic powers and understanding in all situations (Kumar, 2018b). In servant leadership leaders understand the organizational structures that facilitate them to address and solve complex problems. Servant leaders demonstrate to the follower's that their concerns are on priority. At interpersonal level servant leader act as mentor and provide support to the followers to do right things in right ways and make followers self-sufficient (Rowe & Guerrero, 2010). Robbins, Judge and Vohra (2013) classified the behavior of servant leader into listening, persuading, actively developing follower's potential, empathizing and

accepting stewardship.

In this proposed theory the teacher as a leader is serving the organizations, students and society with 'self-less' desires. The servant leadership traits in teachers ensure more sensitivity and compassion towards colleagues and students thereby enabling open healthy work environment (Iyer, 2013). Servant teachers develop share sense of purpose among students and help them to grasp opportunities according to the purpose (Bowman, 2005). Servant teaching does not focus on attitudinal learning, instead focus on the outcomes (Nolands & Richards, 2015). Teacher as a social and personal entity seems to fulfill all characteristics of servant leader. Working over and above the limitations, acceptance of challenges at physical and mental levels separate teachers and signifies them as leaders in educational institutions (Kumar, 2018a).

On the other hand organizational literature talked evidently about work-life balance of individuals'. This talk majorly resulted in two major aspects of work-life balance: (a) roles conflict and (b) roles facilitation. The second aspect roles facilitation includes positive side of work-family interface in term of positive spillover from work roles to life roles and life roles to work roles. This was evidently marked in the work of Greenhaus and Powell (2006); Chen & Powell (2012); Wayne, Randel and Stevens (2006); and Wayne, Grzywacz, Carlson and Kacmar (2007).

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) divided the positive side of work-family interface in two paths: instrumental path and affective path. The instrumental path deals with direct impact on the performance of individuals in their life roles while affective pathway as indirect transference of positive affect from one life role to another life role. This transference results in more engagement in individual's life roles (Rothboard's 2001). In this dual path model five types of resources generated in the form of skills and perspectives, psychological and physical resources, social capital resources, flexibility and material resources (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

The educational system revolves around the roles and duties performed by teachers (Kumar, 2018a). In case of higher education the main aim is to promote human knowledge and development of expertise in different walks of life. To undertake and fulfill this aim, the faculty members in higher education are performing roles of teacher, researcher and mentor for larger cause of serving the society and for dissemination of knowledge.

The behavioral theories clearly mentioned that leadership and work roles are significant concepts in organizations. These concepts are deeply embedded at individual and organizational level. This study will result in

the generation of theory through empirical inquiry at individual teacher behavioral level, to represent the organizational processes of leadership and work roles transference into family domain.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The 'ecological system theory' says people have desires and natural capability for growth and development. These desires and capabilities lead them to resources accumulation, conservation and deployment of conserved resources during life roles (Hobfoll, 1989). Kumar (2018c) justified the perceived and transference of behavioral traits in term of judgments and values from one life role to another life role in classroom settings. The transference of these resources between life roles take pace in instrumental and psychological forms (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Dewe and Cooper (2012) argued that these resources are designed in organizational work context and leads to better functioning and well-being of people. So in this context it is important to understand about the processes in organization which act as source of work roles gains. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) argued that work family roles enrichment should be discussed in contextual framework or in entirety to explore the psychological phenomenon of work to family development. In this proposed theory Kwan, Mao and Zhang (2010) discussed the role of mentoring in organizational setup to increase the work role gains through personal and relational skills. Likewise in modern organizations servant leadership as a people centric approach put forth direct impact of supervisors on subordinates through behavioral values of listening, persuading, actively developing follower's potential, empathizing and accepting stewardship (Robbins, Judge & Vohra, 2013). Zang et al., (2012) integrated the concepts of servant leadership with work family enrichment and found a significant relationship between servant leadership and work family enrichment.

The work to family gains facilitates the positive outcomes at individual and organizational level in the form of organizational commitment, satisfaction and mental and physical well-being. There are work related (affective commitment, job satisfaction) and non-work related (well-being, health) consequences of work role gains (McNall, Nicklin & Masuda, 2010). While, CHchan and Mak (2014) stated that servant leaders in the organization generate trust in the environment which is leads employees' toward higher job satisfaction. Jaiswal and Dhar (2017) advocated the

generation of trust through servant leadership at interpersonal and group level to increase individual's creativity and leading to achieve extraordinary results in work roles. Servant leadership impact employees job consequences like trust, creativity (Jaiswal & Dhar, 2017), job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior (Donia et al., 2016) and employee engagement (Carter & Baghurst, 2014) in work roles and at workplace.

Panaccio et al., (2014) stated that the people who lack on extraversion, collectivism and pro-activeness can work better under a servant leader. Rastogi, Rangnekar and Rastogi (2016) found that flexibility provided by servant leader at workplace create a positive influence between work and family domains and help to manage talent in the organization. Sousa and Van Dierendonck (2017) provided an interpretation about under-estimation of own abilities by servant leader to help and to recognize the followers' intrinsic value in organizational setting.

The role of family structure can be absorbed in this relationship. Perry-Jenkins, Repetti and Crouter (2000) stressed on the application of models in work family research which includes samples in term of race, ethnicity and family structure. In literature a strong relationship was found between family structure and work role gains transference to family domain. Grzywacz and Marks (2000) specified that working parents and adults with children exhibit more work-family facilitation. The working married couples with children have unique experience of life roles leads them toward higher work-family facilitation (Marks, 1996). Dumas and Stanko (2017) examined the parental side, life partner and children role in light of work-family enrichment. Researchers found that leaders with family generate family role identification as compare to non-family leaders. Servant leadership as a flexible and people centric approach can help to balance the organizational and family domain through trust, creativity, empowerment, interpersonal acceptance, autonomy and stewardship in life roles. In the present study marital status, spouse job status and living status with parents were used to define structural aspects of family. Siu et al., (2010) in their research indicated that family friendly organizational policies and job autonomy are directly related with work role gains.

In the changed human resource management paradigm the life roles are impacting each other deeply. The university system is facing these changes internally and externally in term of attracting and retaining quality manpower. Leadership style in these organizations is playing a vital role in human resource management practices. The objectives of the present study are: (a) to examine relationships between perceived servant leadership and work to family enrichment; (b) to study the moderating

role of family structural aspects in perceived servant leadership and work to family enrichment.

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Servant Leadership as a Source of Work to Family Enrichment

Two studies were identified in the literature who studied the relationship between servant leadership and work family enrichment. The first conducted by Zang et al., (2012) and the second study was conducted by Tang, Kwan, Zhang, and Zhu (2016). Both studies empirically verified servant leadership as source of work gains and their transfer to family domain. The servant leadership leads to resource gain by decreasing the work to family role conflicts (Tang, Kwan, Zhang, and Zhu, 2016). Taken together the resource conservation theory (Hobfoll, 1989), work family enrichment theory (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) and servant leadership theory will result in work resources accumulation under the influence of servant leadership. The employees who perceive servant leadership in organization derive higher meaning in their work and life role (Zang et al., 2012). The above theory is clearly mentioning servant leadership as a significant source of work roles to family enrichment.

***H1:** Servant leadership is significantly related to work roles to family enrichment.*

Effect of Family Structure on the Relationship of Servant Leadership and Work to Family Enrichment

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) exemplified that the conflict and problem-solving skills developed in work role can help individual to handle and solve the conflicts with their children, spouse, parents and other family members. In the same way the nurturing behavior developed in family increase the individual performance at work by transferring this nurturing behavior to nurture the sub-ordinates and watching, helping them to grow, achieving their full potential. The impact of employee's family structure is evident on organization processes. Super (1980) identified that technological advancements, dual career marriages, changing gender role in family care increased multiple role performances, in a particular life theater. The servant leader approach toward followers is providing more flexibility for handling these changes in life roles (Zang et al., 2012). The

distribution of power in joint and nuclear family structure is a matter of investigation. Servant leadership develops policies in the organization which leads to more autonomy and empowerment to employees (Van Dierendonck, 2011). The instrumental and psychological transference of these gains to family is affected by the structure of family (Dumas & Stanko, 2017). Moreover the family structure is providing context (Greenhaus & Powell) and application (Perry-Jenkins, Repetti and Crouter, 2000) to servant leadership and work family interaction model. In light of this theory following hypotheses are formulated.

H2: The marital status of respondents is significantly moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work roles to family enrichment.

H3: The respondents living status with parent is significantly moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work roles to family enrichment.

H4: The respondents spouse job status is significantly moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work roles to family enrichment.

METHOD

Measurement (Research Tool)

To conduct the study servant leadership measurement scale developed by Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) and work to family enrichment scale developed by Carlson et al., (2006) were used. In Servant Leadership Measurement Scale eight different dimensions include 30 different variables. The Inter-correlation among factors is between 0.08 and 0.81 with a mean of 0.46 (rater-report). The scale on work to family enrichment included 3 factors with 9 variables. The scale was already cross-validated and validity of the scale was formulated and inter-correlation among factors ranges between 0.61 and 0.86 with a mean of 0.775.

Pilot Study

Initially, pilot study was conducted on 46 respondents to check the validity and reliability of scales in Indian context. The contributing items were rated on 5-point scale (1- strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree). The results of pilot study showed Inter-item consistency of measurement scales for collecting information. The Guttman's Split-Half value for servant leadership scale was 0.923 with cronbach's alpha value of 0.946. While in

case of work to family enrichment scale the Guttman's Split-Half value is 0.811 with cronbach's alpha value of 0.911. The Cronbach's alpha values showed high internal consistency between items (Field, 2009).

In the final stage, the valid data was collected from 223 teachers of 6 Central University situated in 6 different States of North India. In the sample 121 were male and 102 were female respondents. The 77 percent of respondents were married. Designation wise majority of respondents were assistant professors (81 percent). Out of the married respondents the spouses of 70 percent respondents were in job. In case of living status with parents majority of the respondents don't live with parents (56 percent).

RESULTS

The Partial least squares structure equation modeling (PLS-SEM) was used for assessment of structural model. A comprehensive and elaborative procedure was used to validate and cross-validate the structural model. The assessment of coefficient of determination and predictive relevance were evaluated for model. The formative constructs were assessed as suggested by Hair et al., (2013). The collinearity diagnosis, convergent validity and statistical significance of constructs were determined through smartPLS-SEM 2.0. Regarding partial least squares structure equation modeling Monecke & Leisch (2012) suggested that the assumptions in PLS-SEM show leniency regarding sample size, measurement scales and residual distributions. The collinearity among factors affects the estimation of weights and statistical significance (Bollen & Bauldry, 2011). Regarding collinearity in present study variance inflation factor (VIF) values are less than 5 and represented no issue regarding multicollinearity among factors.

Table 1: Assessment of Measurement Model (N = 223)

Constructs	Multicollinearity Assessment	Convergent Validity	Discriminant Validity	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
	VIF	AVE	FLC	CR	α
Empowerment	1.612	0.558	0.747	0.883	0.837
Accountability	1.395	0.715	0.846	0.909	0.866
Humility	1.076	0.741	0.861	0.919	0.913
Courage	1.549	0.801	0.895	0.923	0.873
Interpersonal Acceptance	1.073	0.613	0.783	0.861	0.801
Standing Back	1.317	0.705	0.651	0.905	0.821

Constructs	Multicollinearity Assessment	Convergent Validity	Discriminant Validity	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
	VIF	AVE	FLC	CR	α
Stewardship	1.168	0.789	0.888	0.882	0.732
Development	1.005	0.829	0.910	0.936	0.893
Capital	1.006	0.531	0.729	0.755	0.878
Affect	1.002	0.605	0.778	0.751	0.746

Source: smartPLS-SEM 2.0

Convergent validity reflects the variable loadings on the construct. Factor loadings are the first step to observe the convergent validity. In the study average variance extracted (AVE) values were checked to determine the convergent validity, and all the values are greater than 0.50 representing convergent validity in measurement model. While discriminant validity is degree of difference among constructs. To assess the discriminant validity 'Fornell-Lacker Criterion' was used in the study. In the Table 1 the values of squared AVE are given. All squared AVE values are higher than inter-construct correlations. Thus, all constructs have discriminant validity. In SEM the unobserved latent factor are predicted by the observed variables, so this is the necessary condition that the variables should be reliable and have high composite reliability ($\geq .70$). In measurement model all the constructs showed composite reliability and cronbach's alpha value ≥ 0.70

Assessment of Coefficient of Determination (R^2) and Predictive Relevance (Q^2)

Coefficient of determination is the mostly used measure to check the predictability of structural models. It indicates the amount of variance explained by the predictor variable in dependent variable. The value of R^2 ranges from 0 to 1 (Hair et al., 2013). For work family enrichment as dependent construct and servant leadership as predictor construct the value of R^2 is 0.178 (t- statistics = 3.166, $p < .002$). Despite these values the predictive relevance (Q^2) is important in PLS-SEM models. To calculate the Q^2 values a procedure named as blindfolding is used. Blindfolding calculate Stone-Geisser's Q^2 value by using sample re-use technique. The Q^2 value for work to family enrichment as dependent construct and servant leadership as predictor construct is 0.168 with sum of squared observation value of 223 and sum of squared estimates value is 185.508. The model represents predictability and predictive relevance.

Path Analysis and Hypotheses Testing in PLS-SEM

Path analysis is used to determine the consistency of data as per model (Streiner, 2005). Path analysis specifies the relative change in dependent variable due to independent variable(s) in an adequate manner. In SEM introduction of moderator in a relationship either changes the direction or magnitude of the relationship. In the present study marital status, staying with parents and spouse job status were used as moderator in the relationship between servant leadership and Work Family Enrichment.

The hypotheses were checked by analyzing path coefficients, t-statistics and p-value for the respective causal relationship between independent and dependent variables. The results are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Path Analysis and Moderation Assessment for Hypotheses Testing (N = 223)

Hypotheses	Path Coefficients (β)	T-Statistics	P-Value	Results
H1: Servant leadership is significantly related to work roles to family enrichment.	0.422**	2.367	0.001	Not Rejected
H2: The marital status of respondents is significantly moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work roles to family enrichment.	0.285 (Unmarried)	11.038	0.001	Not Rejected
	0.454** (Married)			
H3: The respondents living status with parent is significantly moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work roles to family enrichment.	0.404** (Living with parents)	2.075	0.039	Not Rejected
	0.431** (Not living with parents)			
H4: The respondents spouse job status is significantly moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work roles to family enrichment.	0.400** (In Job)	13.067	0.001	Not Rejected
	0.631** (Not in Job)			

Source: smartPLS-SEM 2.0.

Hypothesis H1 proposed that servant leadership is significantly related to the work role to family enrichment of teachers. The empirical evidence ($\beta = 0.422$, t -statistics = 2.367, $p < .001$) clearly showing positive impact of servant leadership on work to family enrichment. The hypothesis is not rejected. Thus, if the servant leadership is showing increase of one unit the relative change in work to family enrichment is of 0.442 units. As hypothesis H2 predicted the influence of respondent marital status on servant leadership and work roles to family enrichment. The empirical evidence for respondents is (Unmarried: $\beta = 0.285$, Married: $\beta = 0.454$, t - statistics = 11.038, $p < .001$) clearly showing marital status of the respondents is moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work family enrichment. The hypothesis is 'not rejected'. The results are signifying the moderation of marital status between servant leadership and work family enrichment. The third hypothesis (H3) proposed that respondent living status with parents (stay with parents, not stay with parents) is moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work family enrichment. The empirical evidence for respondents is (Stay with parents: $\beta = 0.404$, Not stay with parents: $\beta = 0.431$, t -statistics = 2.075, $p < .039$) clearly showing living status of the respondents is moderating the relationship between perceived servant leadership and work roles to family enrichment. The fourth hypothesis H4 proposed that respondent spouse job status (spouse in job, spouse not in job) is moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work family enrichment. The empirical evidence for respondents is (Spouse in job: $\beta = 0.400$, Spouse not in job: $\beta = 0.631$, t -statistics = 13.067, $p < .001$) clearly showing spouse job status of the respondents is moderating the relationship between servant leadership and work family enrichment. The hypothesis is 'not rejected'. Thus, the respondent whose spouse is in job is showing lower degree of relationship between perceived servant leadership and work family enrichment than respondent whose spouse is in job.

Managerial Implications and Future Scope of the Study

The positive impact of servant leadership on work family enrichment showed that the servant leadership is contributing toward the work-life balance of human resource i.e. the values perceived from servant leader reflected in work role gains which are also transferred to family domain. The research highlighted the management of role transference effect depends upon family structure; so the employee oriented policies like

holidays, child care leave and academic visits of faculty should be framed in light of structural aspects of family to facilitate the instrumental and psychological role gains. The leadership directly impact culture in the organization for generation of role expectations in culture. The research can be on the mediation role of organizational culture in the relationship between servant leadership and work family enrichment. The future researchers can identify the classroom role transference effects of students on family roles in relation to servant teacher leadership.

DISCUSSION

The present study is indeed validating the relationship between servant leadership and work to family enrichment. Zang et al., (2012) and Tang, Kwan, Zhang, and Zhu (2016) found a similar significant relationship between servant leadership and work-family enrichment. The servant leadership in organizations is acting as antecedent to the positive philosophy of WFE. This positive affect is transferred to family domain in the form of high performance (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). The servant leadership dimensions in higher educational institutions are working as a source of resources during work to family transference of role gains. The characteristic values of empowerment, accountability, standing back, humility, authenticity, courage, stewardship and interpersonal acceptance in servant leadership are impacting the work to family transference in terms of development, capital and affect. All characteristics mentioned above are not exhaustive but act as promise and power for those who have the intention to adopt the concepts of servant leadership for improving performance in work roles.

The servant leadership is managing organizational context as suggested by Dewe and Cooper (2012) for resources accumulation during work roles. The role of leadership seems to be significant by providing empowerment to teachers in their work roles.

The family structural aspects in term of marriage, living status of respondents with their parents and power distribution in family domain through spouse working status is significantly affecting the relationship. Dumas and Stanko (2017) found that leaders with family generate family role identification as compare to non-family leaders. The power distribution between partners in family structure, the respondent's control in family affairs is impacting the transference impact of work role gains into family domain relative to servant leadership practices in organizations.

CONCLUSION

The study provided empirical evidence about the relationship of servant leadership and work-family enrichment. The married respondents exhibited higher relationship between servant leadership and work family enrichment. The respondents whose spouse is in job attributed low work role to family transference, this signifies that mechanism of transference of roles effect is significantly controlled by life partner job status, and this can be associated with roles distribution and change in traditional role of spouse in family life. Similarly the people who live with parents showed less significant impact of servant leadership on work to family transference, this can be attributed to the control of family affairs in term of decision making in family system. The study linked the organizational and family aspects of teacher's life in term of positive organizational processes of leadership and work to family transference of material and behavioral gains.

REFERENCES

- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 421-449. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621.
- Bollen, K. A., & Bauldry, S. (2011). Three Cs in measurement models: Causal indicators, composite indicators, and covariates. *Psychological Methods*, *16*(3), 265. doi:10.1037/a0024448
- Bowman, R. F. (2005). Teacher as servant leader. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *78*(6), 257-260. doi: 10.3200/TCHS.78.6.257-260
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*(1), 131-164. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002
- Carter, D., & Baghurst, T. (2014). The influence of servant leadership on restaurant employee engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *124*(3), 453-464. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1882-0
- CH Chan, S., & Mak, W. M. (2014). The impact of servant leadership and subordinates' organizational tenure on trust in leader and

- attitudes. *Personnel Review*, 43(2), 272-287. doi:10.1108/PR-08-2011-0125
- Chen, Z., & Powell, G. N. (2012). No pain, no gain? A resource-based model of work-to-family enrichment and conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 89-98. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2012.05.003
- Dewe, P., & Cooper, C. (2012). Resource Accumulation. In *Well-Being and Work* (pp. 99-133). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Donia, M. B., Raja, U., Panaccio, A., & Wang, Z. (2016). Servant leadership and employee outcomes: The moderating role of subordinates' motives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(5), 722-734. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2016.1149471
- Dumas, T. L., & Stanko, T. L. (2017). Married with children: How family role identification shapes leadership behaviors at work. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(3), 597-633. doi:10.1111/peps.12182
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Sage publications.
- Fulmer, R. M. (2004). The challenge of ethical leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(3), 307-317. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.06.007
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of management review*, 31(1), 72-92. doi:10.5465/amr.2006.19379625
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 111.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2013). *Multivariate data analysis* (Vol. 7). New Delhi: Pearson.
- Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, 3(4), 397-417. doi:10.1177/1742715007082964
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
- Hollander, E. P. (1995). Ethical challenges in the leader-follower relationship. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5(1), 55-65. doi:10.2307/3857272
- Iyer, R. D. (2013). Servant leadership in teaching. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 3(1), 100. doi:10.5296/ijhrs.v3i1.3035

- Jain, S., & Bhargav, S. (2010). *Human resource management*. New Delhi. Knowledge Book Distributors.
- Jaiswal, N. K., & Dhar, R. L. (2017). The influence of servant leadership, trust in leader and thriving on employee creativity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(1), 2-21. doi:10.1108/LODJ-02-2015-0017
- Kumar, S. (2018a). A study of perceived workplace spirituality of school teachers. *Psychological Thought*, 11(2), 212-223. doi:10.5964/psyc.v11i2.298
- Kumar, S. (2018b). Servant leadership: A review of literature. *Pacific Business Review International*, 11(1), 43-50.
- Kumar, S. (2018c). Individual personal values as mediators during behavioral perception and transference. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, 12(1), 122-132. doi:10.5964/ijpr.v11i2.221
- Kwan, H. K., Mao, Y., & Zhang, H. (2010). The impact of role modeling on protégés' personal learning and work-to-family enrichment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 313-322. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.009
- Marks, N. F. (1996). Caregiving across the lifespan: National prevalence and predictors. *Family relations*, 27-36.
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 381-396. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1
- Monecke, A., & Leisch, F. (2012). semPLS: Structural equation modeling using partial least squares. *Journal of Statistical Softwares*, 48(3), 1-32. doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i03
- Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1220. doi: 10.1037/a0012695
- Noland, A., & Richards, K. (2015). Servant teaching: An exploration of teacher servant leadership on student outcomes. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 15(6), 16-38. doi: 10.14434/josotl.v15i6.13928
- Panaccio, A., Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Cao, X. (2015). Toward an understanding of when and why servant leadership accounts for employee extra-role behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(4), 657-675. doi:10.1007/s10869-014-9388-z

- Perry-Jenkins, M., Repetti, R. L., & Crouter, A. C. (2000). Work and family in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(4), 981-998. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00981.x
- Rastogi, M., Rangnekar, S., & Rastogi, R. (2016). Flexibility as a predictor of work–family enrichment. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 17(1), 5-14. doi:10.1007/s40171-015-0108-y
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Vohra, N. (2013). *Organizational behaviour* (15th ed.) Pearson India.
- Rost, J. C. (1995). Leadership: A discussion about ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 129-142. doi:10.2307/3857276
- Rothbard, N. P. (2001). Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(4), 655-684. doi:10.2307/3094827
- Rowe, W. G., & Guerrero, L. (2010). *Cases in leadership* (2nd ed.). New Delhi. Sage Publication India Pvt. Ltd.
- Siu, O. L., Lu, J. F., Brough, P., Lu, C. Q., Bakker, A. B., Kalliath, T., & Sit, C. (2010). Role resources and work–family enrichment: The role of work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 470-480. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.06.007
- Sousa, M., & Van Dierendonck, D. (2017). Servant leaders as underestimators: Theoretical and practical implications. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(2), 270-283. doi:10.1108/LODJ-10-2015-0236
- Spears, L. C. (2004). Practicing servant-leadership. *Leader to leader*, 2004(34), 7-11. doi:10.1002/ltl.94
- Streiner, D. L. (2005). Finding our way: An introduction to path analysis. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 50(2), 115-122. doi:10.1177/070674370505000207
- Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 16(3), 282-298. doi:10.1016/0001-8791(80)90056-1
- Tang, G., Kwan, H. K., Zhang, D., & Zhu, Z. (2016). Work–family effects of servant leadership: The roles of emotional exhaustion and personal learning. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(2), 285-297. doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2559-7
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261. doi:10.1177/0149206310380462

- Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(3), 249-267. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 517. doi:10.1037/a0018867
- Wayne, J. H., Randel, A. E., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work–family support in work–family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(3), 445-461. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.002
- Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). Work–family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(1), 63-76. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.01.002
- Yukl, G. A. (2009). *Leadership in organizations*. Pearson Education India.
- Zhang, H., Kwong Kwan, H., Everett, A. M., & Jian, Z. (2012). Servant leadership, organizational identification, and work-to-family enrichment: The moderating role of work climate for sharing family concerns. *Human Resource Management, 51*(5), 747-767. doi:10.1002/hrm.21498