

IMPACT OF PARENTING ON LEADERS' BEHAVIOR IN WORKPLACES IN BANGLADESH

*Samuel Mursalin, Ridwanul Monir, Ayaz Mohammad Abrar
Tamim, Ashiful Hoque Chowdhury*

ABSTRACT

Parenting style may play a significant role in the development of the personality and behavior of individuals. Individuals are likely to showcase in their adulthood the outcome of the individual parenting styles that they have experienced during their childhood. Leadership behavior is likely to be a crucial outcome of the parenting structure that an individual has grown up in. Eventually, this leadership behavior may be exercised in multiple group contexts (e.g., workplaces). The aim of this study is to understand whether the different parenting styles that leaders have received during their childhood impact their leadership behavior in their workplaces. Five leaders from different companies and industries were chosen for in-depth research. The leaders were asked to fill out a short version (32 questions) of the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ). The survey captures information on the parenting styles that the leaders have experienced based on seven constructs: support and affection; regulation; autonomy; physical coercion; verbal hostility; punishment; and indulgence. Next, we conducted in-depth interviews of at least three team members of each leader to understand the leaders' leadership behavior in the workplace. The questions of the in-depth interviews were inspired by Scott's research on leaders' power and control in the workplace (Scott, 2018). The results indicate that parenting style has an impact on leadership behavior. Leaders who have received support and affection tend to become emotionally intelligent and promote inclusive work culture. And leaders who were brought up in regulation displayed strict professionalism or power distance. In addition, leaders who were physically or verbally abused displayed signs of coercion, threat, emotional abuse, and blaming. Furthermore, leaders who were physically or verbally adored could show signs of emotional intelligence and inclusivity if they have also received support & affection.

Keywords : leadership, management, parenting, behavior, leaders.

INTRODUCTION

Evidence suggests that parenting styles influence and shape the development of competence and achievement strategies in children, and the authoritative parenting style among the other parenting styles has been the most successful in developing appropriate achievement strategies (Magomaeva, 2013). The process of parenting or grooming is aimed at transforming an individual from ignorance to enlightenment. An individual moves from the acquisition of information to having intelligence, from having the intelligence to gaining knowledge, and from gaining knowledge to achieving wisdom which is further shaped by the values, beliefs, culture and philosophy of life absorbed for the purpose of leading. Good parenting or grooming is therefore an important factor in empowering and preparing individuals on their journey towards gaining higher consciousness and self-actualization (Bhandarker & Singh, 1999).

In a child's future career choice, one of the vital sources of influence is parents. Though genetics is considered one of the ways through which parents influence their children's career choices, data from longitudinal adaption suggest biology, i.e. genetics, only reveals part of the whole story.

One-third of the intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurship can be attributed to genetics (i.e., biological parents) but the remaining two-thirds have been attributed to the upbringing and the environment the children grow up in (i.e., adoptive parents). The non-genetic factor such as imprinting, which happens as a result of role-modeling make strong impact on career choices and skill development of children (Shanine et al., 2022).

Parents who are the first leaders for their children most of the time serve as prototypes for leadership models for the children. Essentially, family is the first environment for a child to gain exposure to a leader, experience with a leader, and learn about obedience which eventually helps in the formation of impressions about authority. The nature of the attachment style between a parent and a child that is formed early during the phases of childhood translates into adulthood and influences the relationships that the individuals build with others in later phases of their lives. The idea concerning children taking their parents' behavior and beliefs as a role model is based on social learning theory, according to which human beings tend to mold their behavior, thoughts, and feelings based on a person they perceive as an ideal or model (Magomaeva, 2013).

There is substantial evidence that suggests that an individual's early childhood socialization experiences with their parents mold their interpersonal relationships in their adulthood (Bhandarker & Singh, 1999). Furthermore, good parental support impacts career development in a positive way whereas neglectful and non-participative parenting impacts career development in negative ways (Shanine et al., 2022).

The primary objective of this research is to understand if parenting has an impact on the behavior of individuals when they attain leadership positions in workplaces. The research identifies a possible linkage between negative parenthood and the development of abusive leadership traits. Furthermore, the research will try to identify and find out a link if there are possible overlaps between transformational leaders and good parents since both of these are achievement-oriented and foster self-esteem, self confidence, and trust in others.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Parenting and Leadership

Around 60 years ago, it was speculated that family factors such as parental encouragement and acceptance might promote leadership attributes. On asking notable leaders (e.g., General Electric's former CEO Jack Welch) about what significantly influenced their own development as leaders, most of these leaders were frequently found to mention one common factor which was the supportive role of their parents (Liu et al., 2019).

To a large extent, the precise literature and extensive research that has been carried out on parenting has offered new possibilities for future exploration in the study of developmental psychological aspects of leadership. A large number of specific behaviors or strategies can be identified which are engrained or imparted by parents that promote developmental processes in their children (Popper & Mayselless, 2003).

Leadership Development from a Young Age

On the other hand, in the early leadership literature, influences that transformational leaders usually have were identified, measured, analyzed, and discussed in relation to separate domains and variables. Although there are possibilities for the impact and influence of transformational leaders (and parents) to be more holistic. Also, the division into different domains and variables are mostly artificial. Leadership development can be rooted in an individual well before adulthood, which emphasizes that leadership development is an ongoing process, and is continuous throughout the life of an individual. In early literature, theory and research regarding leader development has mostly focused on adults. However, there are other characteristics that are needed to be considered at different developmental stages of one's life. The existing models focusing on adult leadership might be deficient for proper understanding of earlier developmental stages such as adolescence (Liu et al., 2019).

Given that, parents maintain an environment that enables children to establish their own identity and individuality, the environment in the long run helps these children to be non-dependent on parents. Authoritative parenting which generally is inclusive of acceptance and involvement of parents regarding children's decision-making was also observed to be beneficial and positively related to emotional autonomy. Parents who are particularly careful and responsive to their child's needs to grow an independent mindset, provide the basis for adolescents to learn independence. These adolescents get the opportunity to act and think autonomously while knowing that they do have their parents' support through love and involvement from the parents. Authoritative parenting was observed to affect emotional autonomy in a positive way. Alongside, mastery orientation was also found to have a positive relationship with authoritative parenting (Kudo et al., 2012).

Additionally, a scale has been designed, developed and validated to assess the inclination of parents to provide a secure base for their children. The scale can be further used with proper modifications to assess this aspect of the relationship between leader-follower. Moreover, the literature so far has also identified various methods through which different concepts can be measured through proper data collection and documentation. Some of such concepts are scaffolding and identifying positive and negative ways by which parents affect their children's motivation, self-efficacy, and performance (Popper & Mayselless, 2003).

Additionally, they are concerned about a lack of leaders to fill the ranks of baby-boom era (years followed by WWII) managers or leaders who will be retiring. If individuals can be prepared in the early stages of

their lives to take up leadership responsibilities and tasks, a robust life span pipeline of leaders across all walks of life could be made available for societies and generations. According to developmental psychology, youth when compared to adults are more sensitive to learning stimuli and have more flexibility and agility to change. Therefore, individuals can be considered more receptive to leadership interventions in their early stages of life (Liu et al., 2019).

Leadership and Cultures

The characteristic of leadership and parenthood can be culturally contingent. It was observed that attributes of leaders did vary across eight countries and no single trait could have been identified in the top five as being typical.

One of reference model of cultural dimensions known as “power distance” (i.e., respect for authority), has been found relevant to leadership in terms of cultural analysis. According to Hofstede (1980), in cultures that are characterized by low-power distances, subordinates expect their superiors to discuss with them and include their suggestions while making business decisions. On the other hand, in cultures that are characterized by high-power distance superiors are expected by subordinates to act autocratically.

Paternalism was used to rate a number of countries (for example-Japan, Taiwan, Mexico, United States) and came to the observation that Japan (which is highly collectivist in Hofstede’s terms) is the most strongly paternalistic as revealed by policies. Similar studies on employees in Taiwan and Mexico (which are also two collectivistic cultures) and in the United States (which has an individualistic culture), revealed more paternalism in the collectivistic cultures. When paternalism was strong, employees expected more job security and to be treated as people not just workers by their company and superiors. Therefore, the analogy between parenthood and leadership can be more powerful in cultures that are collectivistic (Popper & Maysel, 2003).

Leadership in a Workplace

According to scholars, leaders in a workplace can be symbolically equated with parents, and the relationship between a leader and a follower can be considered similar to the relationship between a parent and his/her child. Furthermore, according to implicit leadership theory, parents play a vital role in shaping leadership expectations in the mind of an individual, since leader images are mirrored in the individual’s descriptions of perceived parental behaviors and traits (Liu et al., 2019).

More importantly, further research could be ways for researchers to come up with solutions for organizations to identify employees with the necessary skills and psychological dispositions that will help them to succeed in the roles and positions of a leader. According to a few employers, young people joining the workforce are not adequately prepared for taking the responsibilities of leadership (Kudo et al., 2012).

Parenting and Ethical Leadership

Ethical leadership is considered to be a moral phenomenon; moral development, on the other hand, is usually influenced by the initial exposure that a leader has his/her childhood. Besides, apart from the relationship with parenting, other environmental factors are also present that mediate moral development. Ethical leadership development is a concept that requires longitudinal studies so that clear causation can be established. If leaders can be tracked from their childhood to demonstrate how parenting influenced factors such as behavioral control and how nurturing influenced future ethical or unethical decisions and if those relations of these decisions can be traced back, causation can be established where unethical leaders were developed because of a parenting background that appears not to be supportive of moral development and where ethical leaders were developed because of parenting that appears to be supportive of appropriate moral development (Maina, 2022).

Parallelism was observed between the stages of ethical leadership and moral development and the stages of ethical leadership. It appeared from most observations that ethical leadership could be considered a spectrum starting at a point where a leader from his or her childhood is inward-looking and self-centered, and gradually they develop and grow their external orientation and others-centeredness which on whole can be viewed as a transition from a moral orientation to a justice orientation. Parenting can be considered as an antecedent of ethical leadership which works as a mediating variable through morality development. While the development of ethical leadership might also have other antecedents, parenting is more significant than most of them since all leaders who were once children while growing up were influenced in their formative stages by early life role models most of which were derived from their experiences of being parented (Maina, 2022).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses a mixed-method approach to collect data from the leaders and their team members. The leaders in this study filled out the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) questionnaire that captures their parents' parenting styles. In-depth interviews of a minimum of three team members of each leader were conducted to analyze each leader's leadership behavior in the workplace critically.

Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) was used to study the parenting style of the leaders in the study (Robinson et al. 2001). The questionnaire has 32 questions under three broad parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting style. The three parenting styles are further broken down into seven constructs. The authoritative parenting style has three elements: support and affection, regulation, and autonomy. The authoritarian parenting style has three dimensions: physical coercion, verbal hostility, and punishment. The permissive parenting style has one dimension: indulgence. Each of the 32 questions is measured on a 5-point Likert Scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The score of each construct is the mean of the items under each construct. The score of each parenting style is the arithmetic mean of the constructs under each style (e.g., the authoritarian score is determined by the average scores in support and affection, regulation, and autonomy).

A high mean score in the authoritative style means that the parenting demonstrated a balance of control and affection. A high mean score in the authoritarian style means that the parenting demonstrated high degrees of control and less affection. A high mean score in the permissive style indicates a low focus on control and a high degree of affection.

In-depth interviews of at least three team members of each leader were conducted. This allowed a deep understanding of the leader's behavior in diverse contexts. The questions that the team members were asked were inspired by Hannah Scott's 'Workplace Bullying and Power Control Wheel' (2018).

The scores generated from the PSDQ questionnaire of the leaders were critically compared to the interview responses of the team members to find out whether there is any relationship between the parenting styles that the leaders had received and their leadership behavior in the workplace.

Five leaders from different backgrounds and seniority levels were chosen from different industries and company sizes. The basic characteristics of the leaders are given in table 1

Table 1: Characteristics Of Leaders And Their Companies

	Position	Age	No. of years of experience	Company Type	No. of years in Operations	Number of employees in the company (approx.)	Team size of the leader
L1	Director	40	15	Education	3	20	20
L2	Director	35	10	Marketing Agency	5	250	3
L3	Assistant Manager	28	4	Marketplace Platform	10	12,000	5
L4	Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	36	12	HR and Recruitment	3	15	15
L5	Assistant General	30	3	Government Audit	50	300	5

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

In this section, a detailed investigation is carried out to understand the parenting styles that the leaders had experienced and their leadership behavior in the workplace from the responses of their team members. An in-depth case-by-case analysis is conducted to reveal critical insights from each.

Leader1

Table 2: PSDQ means scores of Leader1

Support And Affection	Regulation	Autonomy	Physical Coercion	Verbal Hostility	Punishment	Indulgence
2.6	5	2.4	1.25	4	3.75	3
Authoritative: 3.33			Authoritarian: 3			Permissive: 3

Table 3: Interview Responses Of The Team Members of L1

	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5
Coercion and threats	Never happened	Yes. Happened multiple times. Most of the time, the coercion is unfair and does not have anything to do with workplace performance.	Yes. Occasionally does this even if I am not at fault.	Yes. Happened multiple times. Does not have the knowledge to apprehend the meaning of unfairness. Does not care what his team members are doing and passes unfair comments.	Yes. Happened multiple times.
Physical or Verbal Intimidation	Never happened	Never happened	Yes. Has been verbally aggressive multiple times and accused me wrongly. Does not do the same with his favorite people	Never happened	Never happened
Emotional Abuse	Yes. Not only disrespects me but also everyone on the team. Introduces some team members to external parties highly but others as "staff members" even though the others have their own designations.	Yes. Disrespect is probably not the right word. Makes me feel awkward sarcastically in front of others.	Yes. Pokes me sarcastically. I feel humiliated.	Yes. I felt humiliated multiple times when he poked me in front of other people.	Never happened because of my seniority in the company.
Isolation	Never happened	Never happened	Never happened	Never happened	Never happened
Minimizing, Denying, and Blaming	Never happened	Never happened	Never happened to me but could do with my colleagues	Never happened	Never happened
Using Coworkers To Create Conflict	Never happened. Rather sits down with the team to solve the issues.	Never happened. Tries actively to solve the problems.	Never happened	Occasionally happened when he has a personal motivation and probable individual reward	Never happened
Employer Privilege	Never happened	Sometimes treats me as an inferior team member	Treats me as an inferior team member	Thinks very highly of self and does not treat others as potentially quality team members who can add value to work	Never happened because of my senior level in the company

From table 2, we can see that L1 scores the highest on the authoritative parenting style (3.33). This demonstrates that the parents of L1 had a moderate balance of control and affection. A deeper dive into the seven constructs show high scores on regulation, verbal hostility, and punishment. Average scores on support and affection and autonomy and a low score on physical coercion.

From the responses of the team members of L1 in table 3, a high level of coercion and threat, emotional abuse, and employer privilege to demean others were observed. L1 exerts all these using regulation and verbal hostility which can be traced back to the high scores of L1 on regulation and verbal hostility.

Leader2

Table 4: PSDQ means scores of Leader2

Support And Affection	Regulation	Autonomy	Physical Coercion	Verbal Hostility	Punishment	Indulgence
2.8	3.2	2.6	1	2.75	2.25	2.6
Authoritative: 2.87			Authoritarian: 2			Permissive: 2.6

Table 5: Interview Responses Of The Team Members of Leader2

	T6	T7	T8
Coercion and threats	No, there was not an instance like this. Provided suggestions to improve work. Observations always came with explanations that were always justified.	No. Had differences of opinion. Always gave us a safe space to speak. Criticizes but in a very supportive and constructive manner	Hasn't happened so far
Physical or Verbal Intimidation	Never happened. Gets silent when angry. Does not show anger. Very calm person but I can sense silence as a disappointment. Explains all the issues in detail.	Happened only once but that was a result of me constantly nagging for suggestions. Snapped when I kept on talking after a bad meeting. Apologized to me later.	Never happened
Emotional Abuse	Never happened. Very straightforward with instructions and communicates directly if a project is planned beforehand. Very helpful with the mental health issues of team members.	Never happened. Never even tried to establish self as a boss figure. Always gave us the liberty to take authority and understand the emotions of team members well.	Can often say something sarcastic but never humiliates
Isolation	Can exclude only when the conversation is not necessary for me, but always encourages me to interact when needed. Whenever it is a discussion where senior figures of the company participate, we are suggested not to be a part of it and that's completely alright	No. Rather encourages and pushes us to make and build conversations with others. But takes off pressure by recommending not to join gatherings that are not very valuable or insightful.	Not in terms of social gathering
Minimizing, Denying, and Blaming	No. Intervenes on heated arguments and protects me. Very supportive leader	No	No

	T6	T7	T8
Using Coworkers To Create Conflict	Never happened. Can do occasional leg pulling in a light-hearted manner	Never. Jokes and makes fun. Never encourages if someone outside the team makes fun of us.	No
Employer Privilege	Never happened. Very supportive even when we fail to deliver.	No, even if we come up with irrational ideas. Support us in putting up ideas even if they don't make sense. Gave neutral evaluation and suggestions but never threatened to demote or dismiss me.	Not really. Always pushes me to give my opinions even if that opinion doesn't make any sense. Always pushes me to join conversations and be vocal about my points in a very supportive way. Suggested that I could improve in some fields but never threatened me regarding anything.

From table 4, we can see that L2 scores slightly more on the authoritative parenting style (2.87) than the permissive parenting style (2.6) while authoritarian is the lowest (2). This demonstrates that the parents of L1 had a moderate balance of control and affection.

From the responses of the team members of L2 in table 5, it can be concluded that L2 encourages participation, provides guidance to the team members to become better, and is emotionally intelligent. L2 also never abused the team members physically or verbally, isolated team members, used coworkers to create conflict, and misused employer privilege. Despite a noteworthy score on the parents' verbal hostility dimension (2.75), higher scores on support and affection (2.8) and regulation (3.2) reflected more on L2's leadership behavior.

Leader3

Table 6: PSDQ means scores of Leader3

Support And Affection	Regulation	Autonomy	Physical Coercion	Verbal Hostility	Punishment	Indulgence
3.2	4.2	3	1.25	4.25	2.5	3
Authoritative: 3.47			Authoritarian: 2.67		Permissive: 3	

Table 7: Interview Responses Of The Team Members of Leader3

	T9	T10	T11
Coercion and threats	Never happened	Never happened	No
Physical or Verbal Intimidation	Never happened	Never happened. Very calm person, Maintains extremely high levels of professionalism.	Happened only once because of a misunderstanding. Sorted it with a single conversation. Very professional.
Emotional Abuse	Never happened. Calm and professional individual.	Never happened.	Never happened. Maintains professionalism during and outside office hours.
Isolation	No. Highly encourages social participation to network with people who can contribute to professional and self-development	Never happened. Pushes team members to participate in networking events.	Never happened. Maintains inclusivity and makes everyone participate in decision-making. Challenges us to go out of our comfort zone to network.
Minimizing, Denying, and Blaming	Never happened	Never happened	Never happened. Extremely professional.
Using Coworkers To Create Conflict	Never happened. A very straightforward individual who makes his point directly to concerned individuals.	Never happened. Only communicates for professional reasons and articulates with every team member while praising and constructively criticizing.	Never happened.
Employer Privilege	Never happened. As mentioned before. Very professional individual. Never misused any office resource for personal use.	Never happened. Treats team members with respect and empowers them to make decisions.	Never happened. Could be emotionally disconnected at times but always treats everyone with respect and takes our input in major decisions.

From table 6, we can see that L3 scores high in the authoritative parenting style (3.47) and moderately high in the permissive parenting style (3). This shows a high balance of control and affection from the parents of L3.

From the responses of the team members of L3 in table 7, it can be concluded that L3 maintains professionalism in the workplace which can be attributed to a high score in the parents’ regulation dimension (4.2). Surprisingly, a high score on parents’ verbal hostility dimension (4.25) did not make L3 verbally intimidate, emotionally abuse, isolate, and blame team members. A plausible explanation is a high score on parents’ support and affection (3.2) that may have reduced L3’s verbal hostility in the workplace.

Leader4

Table 8: PSDQ means scores of Leader4

Support And Affection	Regulation	Autonomy	Physical Coercion	Verbal Hostility	Punishment	Indulgence
4.8	4	3.6	2.25	2.25	3.5	2.8
Authoritative: 4.13			Authoritarian: 2.67			Permissive: 2.8

Table 9: Interview Responses Of The Team Members of Leader4

	T12	T13	T14
Coercion and threats	No. A very unbiased person. Makes me understand and guides me in a polite manner if I make mistakes.	Never happened	No. Explains in a polite manner if I miss deadlines or make mistakes and also tells me to be careful not to make the same mistakes again.
Physical or Verbal Intimidation	Never happened. Always provides clear action plans. The team automatically functions without intimidation.	Never happened	Never happened. Soft-spoken individual who explains every task in detail. Provides support to team members so that they can complete tasks conveniently.
Emotional Abuse	Never happened	Never happened. An emotional person who talks heart out when team members don't perform.	Never happened. Impossible for an individual like this. A very emotional individual who gets sad very often but never lashes out on the team members.
Isolation	Never happened. The individual is all about inclusion. Keeps three departments working together and organizes quarterly gatherings of the whole company to boost team morale.	Never happened. Always tries to include everyone. Asks about the whereabouts of team members when they can't attend team meetings. Emotionally connected with every team member.	Never happened. Includes everyone in group discussions. Organizes quarterly hangouts for the whole company.
Minimizing, Denying, and Blaming	Never happened	Never happened	Never happened. Occasional leg pulling during group meetings to keep discussions lively. Nothing negative or serious.
Using Coworkers To Create Conflict	Never happened. As mentioned before, the individual strives to keep everyone in the same boat.	Never happened. Empowers me and maintains an environment where everyone is treated fairly.	Never happened. Such activities are impossible for such an individual.
Employer Privilege	Never happened. Always empowered me and promoted me to senior ranks even when I probably did not deserve them.	Happened only once. My department was not doing well and the individual threatened to fire the whole team purely out of emotion. Otherwise, the individual is extremely positive. Empowers me to an extent that I feel positively motivated to pursue greater responsibilities.	Never happened. Always valued my input which actually made me feel superior.

From table 8, we can see that L4 scores extremely high in the authoritative parenting style (4.13) and similar in authoritarian (2.67) and permissive parenting styles (2.8). This shows an extremely high balance of control and affection from the parents to L4.

From the responses of the team members of L4 in table 9, it can be observed L4 is an emotional individual and promotes inclusivity and empowers employees which can be attributed to the extremely high score on parents' support and affection dimension (4.8). L4 also scores high on the parents' autonomy dimension (3.6) which is reflected in how L4 empowers his employees. Despite a high score on the parents' punishment dimension (3.5), L4 is not physically or verbally abusive because of a high score on the parents' support and affection dimension.

Leader5

Table 10: PSDQ means scores of Leader5

Support And Affection	Regulation	Autonomy	Physical Coercion	Verbal Hostility	Punishment	Indulgence
4	5	3	4	4	2.5	4
Authoritative: 4			Authoritarian: 3.5			Permissive: 4

Table 11: Interview Responses of The Team Members of Leader5

	T15	T16	T17
Coercion and threats	Never happened	Has happened when he thought I could do better but could not deliver accordingly. The tone was not rude.	Never happened. Evaluates fairly.
Physical or Verbal Intimidation	Never happened	Occasionally. CXO-level professionals' blame often gets on us indirectly. However, it is understandable.	Never happened. Friendly but maintains a power distance to show that the team members must follow.
Emotional Abuse	Has happened multiple times and I was genuinely hurt during these interactions. I am always reminded of how far I am from the expected level.	Has happened. Needs to show superiority and leadership but often comes out wrongly and negatively. Employees feel demoralized. Maintains a high power distance and reminds team members of their positions very often.	Occasionally happened. Not comfortable with sharing.
Isolation	Has happened. I was introduced in a meeting with the seniors but was then asked to leave the room as the meeting was not relevant to me. I think that's alright.	Has happened, sometimes we have a tendency to become free in social gatherings. I can be asked to leave a certain gathering if I don't maintain the power distance.	Has happened. I felt disrespected in front of the others, though the individual was not rude.
Minimizing, Denying, and Blaming	Has happened on some occasions. After saying something hurtful, the individual will not take the issue seriously and often enforces team members to act normal as if nothing happened.	Never happened to me but I wouldn't be surprised if other team members were made to feel inferior.	Never happened to me but highly possible somewhere down the line.
Using Coworkers To Create Conflict	Never happened	Never happened. Does not need others to demean team members	Never happened
Employer Privilege	Never happened	Never happened	Never happened

From table 10, we can see that L5 scores equally high on authoritative parenting style and permissive parenting style (4).

From the responses of the team members of L5 in table 11, it can be understood that L5 maintains a high power distance with team members, which can be attributed to the perfect score on the parents' regulation dimension (5). Despite a high score on the parents' support and affection (4), L5 can be emotionally abusive, isolate team members, and blame others which can be attributed to the high scores on the parents' physical coercion (4) and verbal hostility (4).

DISCUSSIONS

Leadership was observed to coerce, threaten, emotionally abuse, and use employer privilege to demean team members. It is highly likely that L1 experienced verbal hostility and punishment from his or her parents. Leadership is an emotionally intelligent leader who empowers team members and pushes them to develop professionally. Just like L1, L2 also faced verbal hostility from the parents. However, L2 scored higher in support & affection, and regulation. As a result, L2 does not coerce, threaten, emotionally abuse, or use employer privilege like L1. Leadership is an extremely professional leader and does not engage with employees for issues other than work. This can be attributed to the fact that L3's parents maintained high regulation. Surprisingly, L3's parents were verbally hostile, but L3 does not demonstrate this in his workplace because L3 has also received support & affection, and regulation from the parents. Leadership is an emotionally-driven leader who promotes inclusivity and fosters a tightly-knit culture. It is highly likely that L4 received extreme support & affection from the parents. L4 also grew up in a good blend of regulation and autonomy which is reflected on L4's preferences to set the ground rules and then let the team have autonomy. L4 did receive physical punishment from the parents but never demonstrated similar behavior in the workplace because of the high support & affection. Leadership maintains power distance and makes his team members follow the hierarchy strictly. It is highly likely that the parents of L5 prioritized regulation the most. L5's parents were both physically and verbally hostile which made L5 emotionally abuse, isolate, and blame team members.

Despite high support & affection, L5 displays negative traits because L5's parents were both physically and verbally abusive.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

A limitation of this research is that the genders of the leaders and the participants could not be studied because of the anonymity requested by the participants of the study. That is why the role of leaders' gender cannot be studied. In addition, leaders outside Dhaka (capital of Bangladesh) could not be studied.

Future research can be conducted on how parents and influential mentors that the leaders have encountered during their childhood shaped leaders' behavior in the workplace. Additional constructs, such as demographic characteristics (age, income level, sex) and personality traits (big five personality traits and dark triad) can be added as proximal characteristics to predict leaders' behavior. Endocrinology (study of hormones) can be studied to understand whether levels of certain hormones (dopamine, testosterone, and estrogen) influence leaders' behavior.

The research can also be expanded to other countries, and a more holistic study or a country-by-country comparative study can be conducted.

CONCLUSIONS

The field of study of how biological and environmental factors affect leaders' behavior has gained popularity over the last few decades. One stream of research focuses on biological factors, such as genes,

sex, physical structure, and hormones that impact leaders' behavior while another focuses on psychological factors, such as personality, intelligence, and self-regulation (Tuncdogan et. al., 2017).

This research paper focuses on the parenting styles that the leaders grew up in as an environmental factor that determines the leaders' behavior during adulthood in the workplace.

From this study, it can be observed that parenting dimensions are likely to have a significant impact on leaders' behavior in workplaces. Leaders whose parents showed support & affection tend to be associated with becoming emotionally intelligent and inclusive. Leaders who were raised in regulation is expected to display strict professionalism. Leaders who were physically and verbally abused are likely to demonstrate coercion, threats, emotional abuse, and demean team members in the workplace.

An insightful finding of this study is that leaders who were verbally abused by parents can be not verbally abusive if they had received support & affection. However, the parents were physically and verbally abusive, the leaders are likely to be abusive as well.

Through this research, we aim to shed some light regarding how parenting influence leadership behavior and encourage researchers to conduct further research in this field.

REFERENCES

- Bhandarker, A.; Singh, P. (1999). *Parenting Transformational Leaders. Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 3(1), 1–13. doi:10.1177or097226299900300102
- Kudo, F. T.; Longhofer, J. L.; Floersch, J. E. (2012). *On the origins of early leadership: The role of authoritative parenting practices and mastery orientation. Leadership*, 8(4), 345–375. doi:10.1177or1742715012439431
- Liu, Z., Riggio, R. E., Day, D. V., Zheng, C., Dai, S., & Bian, Y. (2019). Leader development begins at home: Overparenting harms adolescent leader emergence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(10), 1226.
- Magomaeva, A. (2013). " who Taught Us How To Lead?" Parental Influence On Leadership Styles.
- Maina, J. (2022). Parenting as an Antecedent to Ethical Leadership: A Review of Literature. *Journal Of Human Resource & Leadership*, 6(1), 80-97. doi: 10.53819or81018102t2051
- Popper, M., & Maysel, O. (2003). Back to basics: Applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1), 41-65.
- Robinson, C. C., Mandlco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (2001). The Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ). In B. F. Perlmutter, J. Touliatos, & G. W. Holden (Eds.),
- Handbook of family measurement techniques: Vol. 3. Instruments & index (pp. 319 - 321). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Shanine, K., Madison, K., Combs, J., & Eddleston, K. (2022). Parenting the Successor: It Starts at Home and Leaves an Enduring Impact on the Family Business. *Entrepreneurship Theory And Practice*, 104225872210887. doi: 10.1177or10422587221088772
- Scott, H.S. (2018). Extending the Duluth model to workplace bullying: A modification and adaptation of the workplace power-control wheel. *Workplace Health & Safety*, 66(9), 444-452. doi:10.1177or2165079917750934.
- Tuncdogan, A., Acar, O. A., & Stam, D. (2017). Individual differences as antecedents of leader behavior: Towards an understanding of multi-level outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 40-64.

SHORT BIO OF AUTHORS

Samuel Mursalin is a Lecturer of Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management at North South University. He is also a Coordinator at NSU Startups Next, a startup incubator at North South University. His research interests are new venture creation, student entrepreneurship, startup incubators and accelerators, and venture studios.

Ridwanul Monir completed his Master's in Management from the University of Glasgow. He worked on humanitarian logistics and relief supply chain in Bangladesh. His research interests include success factors of supply chain management, leadership management and startup incubators.

Ayaz Mohammad Abrar Tamim has completed his Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing and Finance from North South University. His research interest includes leadership in organizations, innovation management and, startup incubators.

Ashiful Hoque Chowdhury has completed his Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing and Finance from North South University. His research interests include in-depth study on the fundamentals of management and human psychology.

