



RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MORAL LEADERSHIP AND WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT: THE MODERATING ROLE OF LOYALTY TO SUPERVISOR

Igwebuike, Ikechukwu C

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Nnedum O.A.U

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Email: oua.nnedum@unizik.edu.ng; Phone: +2348033146636

Stella Obioma Nnatu

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

This current study examined the moderating role of loyalty to supervisor in the relationship between moral leadership and work family conflict among subordinates. A total of 37 subordinates in organizations/company located in Onitsha, Awka, Warri of Anambra and Delta state were sampled using the purposive sampling technique and selected with the aid of the supervisors. The gender distribution of the subordinates is 14 male (38.9%) and 22 females (61.1%). Age of the subordinates ranged from 20 to 40 years old with the mean of 28.57 and standard deviation of 4.49. Instruments used for measuring the variables include the moral leadership scale (Cheng et al., 2004), work-family conflict scale (Carlson et al., 2000), and loyalty to supervisor scale (Chen et al., 2003). The current study adopted a cross sectional survey and correlational design. Findings revealed that moral leadership has a significant negative relationship with work-family conflict ($r = -.401, r = p < .05$) and a significant positive relationship with loyalty to supervisor ($r = .541, p < .01$). However, loyalty to supervisor did not show a significant relationship with work-family conflict ($r = -.026, p > .01$). Moderation analysis indicated that loyalty to supervisor moderated the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict ($b = -.0711, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.1272, -.0150], t = -2.58, p < .05$). Based on these findings, the study recommends that the management need to first develop work conditions that should earn subordinates' trust, respect, and compliance. Under these conditions alone, can work-family conflict might be managed effectively with the aid of highly moral leaders, superiors or supervisors in the work place.

Keywords: moral leadership, moderation, work-family conflict, loyalty to supervisor



Introduction

Work-family is one of the most research focuses in contemporary industrial and organizational settings. This is attributable to the evolving nature of job roles that are aided by technological advancements (Wang & Tsai, 2014). Earliest definition of work-family conflict by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) defined it “as a special form of inter-role conflict that arises when there are incompatible demands between work and family roles”. Several jobs are becoming remote requiring that employees multitask between work and family roles while they work from home (Pien, Chen, Cheng, & Cheng, 2020). Some jobs are basically a way of exploiting the employee of their labor not included in the job description. This may consequentially put these employees in a condition where they can’t be able to organize and balance the demands of family functions. On the other hand, family-work conflict is also a problem regardless of the nature of job factors. When there is a high level of family interference with the employee job role and tasks, the employee may experience work stress, burnout, mental and physical exhaustion, and depression (Raffenaud, Unruh, Fottler, Liu & Andrews, 2020). A factor that may have an influence on employee work-family conflict is perceived moral leadership. Cheng et al. (2004) defined moral leadership as “leader’s behavior that demonstrates superior personal virtues, self-discipline, and unselfishness” (p. 91). A moral leader is characterized with being ethical, righteous, moral, and selfless. This type of leaders may positively impact the behaviours of their subordinates in their job roles (Wang, & Li, 2019). This occurs as a result of a social exchange system where positive and fair supervision is paid back with positive employee performance (Niu, Wang, & Cheng, 2009). However, this may in turn

lead to higher ability to manage work-family demands. In other words, the employee may experience less interference of work in his family roles and responsibilities when he is supervised by a moral leader. The current study will test the moderating role of loyalty to supervisor in the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict. Loyalty to a superior formally known as commitment to supervisor has been associated with several employee outcomes such as Chen, Farh, and Tsui (1998) defined loyalty to supervisor as “the relative strength of a subordinate’s identification with attachment, and dedication to a supervisor”. The concept of loyalty to supervisor is made up of components that a loyal subordinate may exhibit and they include dedication, effort, following supervisor, identification with supervisor, and internalization of supervisor’s values (Chen, Farh, & Tsui, 1998; Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002; Cheng, Jiang, & Riley, 2003). In the current study, the research wants to know if moral leadership will correlate significantly with work-family conflict across the varying levels (conditions) of subordinates’ loyalty to supervisor.

Statement of problem

Employees in Nigeria are currently faced with the problem of extreme work conditions restricting them from performing important family duties and responsibilities (Uzoigwe, Low, & Noor, 2016). Most especially among married couples, single parents, and aged subordinates. Signs of a family that is broken due to hindrances from work interference include marital crisis, divorce, children misbehaving, lack of spousal support, lack of intimacy, and family disconnection. However, research has shown that work-family have both mental and physical health consequences in an employee. These include



burnout, stress, exhaustion, sleep difficulties, eating disorder, and psychological wellbeing (Leineweber, Baltzer, Hanson, & Westerlund, 2013). Work-family demands are important in the work-family life of any employee but when one aspect is limiting the attention and dedication needed in the other; it brings incompatible dyadic relationship between job role and family role. In the current study, moral leadership is hypothesized to impact the level of work family conflict among subordinates. Secondly, there has not been any study conducted to investigate the relationship moral leadership and work family in Nigeria. Although, Yao and Li (2019) has carried out a study on the moderating role of trust in supervisor in the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict, it remains the only study published addressing the issue of work family from the lenses of moral leadership. Thus, the current seeks the bridge this gap in global and local literature by examining the moderating role of loyalty to supervisor in the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict among subordinates in private owned organizations.

Research Questions

The current study seeks to answer the following fundamental research questions:

1. Will there be a significant negative relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict?
2. Will there be a significant positive relationship between moral leadership and loyalty to supervisor?
3. Will there be a significant negative relationship between loyalty to supervisor and work-family conflict?
4. Will loyalty to supervisor moderate the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict?

Purpose of the study

The main purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between moral leadership and work-family and the moderating role of loyalty to supervisors among subordinates in private owned organizations.

1. To examine if there will be a significant negative relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict.
2. To examine if there will be a significant positive relationship between moral leadership and loyalty to supervisors.
3. To examine if there will be a significant positive relationship between loyalty to supervisors and work-family conflict.
4. To examine if loyalty to supervisor will moderate the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict.

Review of related literature

Concept of Moral Leadership: Moral leadership is defined as “a leader’s behavior that demonstrates superior virtues, self-discipline, and unselfishness” (Cheng et al., 2004). It entails “setting an example for others about the rightness or wrongness of particular actions”, and exemplifies the exercise of integrity and fulfilling obligations, never taking advantage of others, and serving as a selfless paragon (Farh et al., 2008). With business scandals due to leaders’ lack of morality emerging endlessly, scholars reflected on the previous leadership research paying too much attention to leaders’ traits and behaviors while ignoring leaders’ morality (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009). Moral leadership, which emphasizes leaders’ virtues, has received scholarly attention. Moral leadership is broadly



depicted as a leader's behavior that demonstrates superior moral character and integrity in (a) not acting selfishly (especially refraining from abusing authority for personal gain) and (b) leading by example. Moral leadership is increasingly seen as being an important component of any model of leadership for a number of reasons:

- The disproportionate influence that leaders have in creating organisational culture
- The belief that 'form should follow function', work settings should be overtly moral communities
- The need for leaders to have 'moral confidence' to inform their decision making.

Most leadership literature also assumes a commonsense understanding of key value-laden terms. Ethics is generally traced to the Greek words *ethikos*, which means pertaining to custom, and *ethos*, which refers to character (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009). Morality comes from the Latin word *mores*, which refers to character, or custom and habit. Philosophers often use ethics when discussing the study of morality and morality when discussing general principles of right and wrong (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009). However, in both popular usage and work on leadership, the terms are largely interchangeable, and that convention will be followed here. To be "moral" or "ethical," as commonly understood, is to display a commitment to right action (Cheng et al., 2004). That generally includes not only compliance with law but also with generally accepted principles involving honesty, fair dealing, social responsibility, and so forth (Cheng et al., 2004).

Concept of Work family Conflict: The term "family" has been reinvented in the past ten years and is defined in rather loose terms to account for all the disparities. Family, once defined as "a group of persons sharing common ancestry" (Merriam-Webster, 2021) has been reconceptualized. Duxbury, Lyons, and Higgins (2007) define today's family as: "a network of mutual commitment". This very broad definition of family was created to represent the new structures that are the reality of families today. Families in today's day and age include, but are not limited to the following: single parents, biracial couples, blended families, unrelated individuals living cooperatively among others (Crawford, 1999). Work family conflict is the term often used to characterize the conflict between the work and family domains. Work family conflict is defined as "...a form of inter-role conflict in which work and family demands are mutually incompatible, meeting demands of both the domains is difficult" (Duxbury, Lyons, & Higgins, 2007). In another view, Work-family conflict refers to "a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities"; and family-work conflict refers to "a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities" (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian 1996). Valcour and Batt (2003) stated that work family conflict occur contribution in work role create problems in contribution in family role. They said that work –family conflict could arise from tough time demands, stress originated in one role spillover to other role disturbing the quality of life, and behaviours that were appropriate in one domain but are considered as inappropriate in other domain. The demands of a role can be thought of as the



responsibilities, requirements, expectations, duties and commitments associated with the given role. In Greenhaus and Boutell's study (as cited in Willis, O'Conner, & Smith, 2008), work-family conflict is defined as a consequence of inconsistent demands between the roles at work and in the family. In other words, work-family conflict exists when the expectations related to a certain role do not meet the requirements of the other role, preventing the efficient performance of that role (Greenhaus, Tammy, & Spector, 2006). Therefore, it could be said that the conflict between work and family domains tends to stem from the conflict between the roles. Several studies reveal that work and family are not two separate domains as they are highly interdependent, having a dynamic relation with one another. While family life is affected by the factors at work, the reverse is also experienced (Trachtenberg, Anderson, & Sabatelli, 2009). For the past 40 years work-family conflict has been the predominant research construct in the work-family field. Work-family conflict originally began as a unidimensional construct. That is, conflict can arise from work roles interfering with family or family roles interfering with work as part of one dimension (Trachtenberg, Anderson, & Sabatelli, 2009). This is sometimes expressed as work interfering with family and family interfering with work. Research has begun to examine the different forms of work-family conflict and family-work conflict. Researchers now acknowledge that the dimensions of directionality are distinct, reciprocal constructs that have independent antecedents and outcomes. According to Greenhaus, Tammy, and Spector (2006), work-family conflict (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC) are comprised of time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based demands.

Time-based demands: Time-based demands occur when time that is set aside for one role creates difficulty in participating in another role. Time-based conflict can be present in two forms: (1) time demands associated with one role can make it physically impossible to meet expectations in another role; and (2) time demands can produce a fixation on one role while physically attempting to meet the demands required in another role. Time-based demands can occur in the number of hours worked, shift work, or absence from work to deal with a family situation.

Strain-based demands: Strain-based demands occur when strains in one role infringe upon and impede other roles. For example, an employee concerned about a child's illness may have difficulty concentrating on their job. Similarly, an employee who works long hours to meet a deadline may be ill-tempered and too exhausted to meet his/her family's needs.

Behavior-based demands: Behavior-based demands occur when patterns of behavior in one role are incompatible with the expected behavior in another role. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) found empirical support for behavior-based conflict. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) noted that behavior-based demands do not necessarily include conflicting demands. It simply means that behavior that is developed in either role can interfere with performance in another role.

Concept of Loyalty to Supervisor: Loyalty to supervisor refers to the relative strength of a subordinate's identification with, attachment and dedication to a particular supervisor (Chen et al., 1998). One of the first who developed a theory on loyalty was Hirschman (1970) and he started with referring to the concept as having a "special attachment to an organization". According to Hirschman (1970), having loyal employees is



important for organisations since it could prevent those with the highest sensitivity of quality to be the first people to leave the organisation. When a loyal employee is treated unfairly, it was found by Boroff and Lewin (1997) that rather than speaking up or resigning ones' position, the loyal employee stays and suffers "in silence". There are many different definitions of what it means by being loyal and how a loyal employee behaves. A very broad definition of loyalty given by the philosopher Ladd (1987) was as a "wholehearted devotion to an object". This object could then be everything from a specific person, group or organisation to a cause or a country. When connecting this to employees, it becomes clear that there are many different "objects" within the organisation that the employee can feel loyal towards. It is also possible that an employee can feel loyalty towards many different objects at the same time. Being loyal to an object does not have to mean that this object has certain characteristics; it is more about having a relational connection to that object (Schrag, 2001). However, Coughlan (2005) argues that loyalty is not the same thing as having a relationship and that loyalty is formed after the relationship is formed. Since the definitions of loyalty are expanding,

Theoretical Review

Theories of Loyalty to Supervisor

Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1968): This theory was propounded by Blau (1968). The theory focuses on factors of exchange between the organization and its employees. The theory implies that, "When an individual feel that there is a positive exchange between the organization and the individual, the employee will be more loyal to the organization. These positive exchanges can entail physical benefits like wages, promotion and bonuses but also exchanges

Coughlan (2005) argues that the concept of "loyalty" is getting more and more difficult to both define and measure. Going from being fully devoted to an object (Schrag, 2001) loyalty is also more recently described as employees not harming neither their colleagues nor employer (Coughlan, 2005). This shows some of the ethical dilemmas involved in loyalty, which is becoming more important in the research loyal employees (Coughlan, 2005). Some of the ways that employee loyalty is characterized is through trust, identification, commitment, participation and attachment (Guillon & Cezanne, 2014, p. 839). According to Alfes et al. (2012), it is important that employees trust their employers in order for the Human Resource Management (HRM) within the organisation to improve the performance and well-being of the employees. In their study, it was also found that when employees trust their employer, they are more likely to increase the effort they put into their work (Alfes et al., 2012) as well as staying with their employers (Alfes et al., 2012). Schrag (2001) considers identification as an important aspect of forming loyalty since when we can identify with the object; we are more likely to feel loyal towards it.

between leaders of the organization and the employee, like trust, faithfulness and loyalty" (Tyler & Blader, 2001). According to a social exchange theory by Blau (1968) as a person gains favour, the gainer is anticipated to maintain a responsibility to give a favour in return to the granter in indefinite time. Organizations are expected to sustain a good workplace and circumstances such as effective relationship and employee welfare initiatives. According to Hooi (2018), "an employee commitment in an organization is very much dependent on the degree of management commitment. As long as organizations increase their commitment



levels and dedication to employees, they will remain committed. It is important to understand that high achieving employees will be high achievers if their employers take their needs into consideration, forgive an honest mistake and care about their opinion, or, in other words-can be trusted to do the right thing”.

Social Identity Theory (Wiklund & Jansson, 2019): This theory developed by Wiklund and Jansson (2019) attempts to explain the factors affecting employee’s loyalty and focus ones upon the level of the identification the respondents feel towards different components of the organization. Wiklund and Jansson (2019) stated that the social identity theory explains that the more an individual identifies with the organization, the more motivated, committed, and there by loyal the employee will be”. According to Wiklund and Jansson (2019) there are factors which affect individual employee’s identification with an organization, and include among other, the congruency of values and norms of an organization with an individual. Therefore, universities like any other business should focus on factors that are identified with employees so as to increase their level of loyalty. The study by Wiklund and Jansson (2019) gave an example that, “If a person identifies with the people whom they work with, it could be beneficial to make sure that he group stays strong together. But, if the person identifies more strongly with the leader of the organization, it could be more important to focus on developing the leadership skills of the managers of the organization (Wiklund & Jansson, 2019).

Theories of Work Family Conflict

Role depletion theory (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999): This theory was developed by Greenhaus and Parasuraman

(1999). This theory is closely related to the conflict perspective between work and family lives and the notion of resource drain (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). It suggests that people have fixed amounts of resources (e.g. time and energy) to fulfil the demands from work and family lives.

When the demands in one domain are excessive, the person may need to make tradeoffs for re-allocating their limited resources. Under this condition, fewer resources are available for activities or responsibilities in another domain, which in turn may also negatively affect their well-being and performance in that domain (LePine, LePine & Saul, 2007). In addition, each direction of conflict is originated from the demands (e.g. work demands) in one domain that generate negative consequences (e.g. lower family satisfaction) perceived in another domain (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Role Enhancement Theory (Barnett & Hyde, 2001): This theory was proposed by Barnett and Hyde (2001). According to the role enhancement theory, “multiple roles bring rewards such as income, heightened self-esteem, opportunities for social relationships, and the experience of success.” (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). From this perspective, the combination of certain roles has a positive, rather than a negative effect on well-being, and “only beyond certain upper limits may overload and distress occur” (Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts, & Pulkkinen, 2006). This theory states that “participation in one role is made better or easier by virtue of participation in the other role” (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Moreover, this theory acknowledges the negative effect of the work-family relationship, in which, only beyond a certain upper limit may overload and distress occur, however, the central focus of this perspective is mainly on the positive



effects of work and family relationship, such as resource enhancement, work-family success or balance, positive spillover and facilitation (Kinnunen et al., 2006).

Spill Over theory (Frone, 1992): This theory developed by Frone (1992) focuses on the satisfaction and effect of one domain on the other domain. According to this theory, positive spillover (work-family enhancement) refers to situations in which the satisfaction, energy and sense of accomplishment derived from one domain transfers to another (Frone, 1992). On the contrary, negative spillover (work-family conflict) is derived from problems being carried over from one domain to another. For example, increased dissatisfaction in the work domain leads to increased dissatisfaction in other life domains (e.g. family domain) (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). This theory is of the view that work and family domains can either benefit or hamper each other. Following this explanation, interferences between work and family responsibilities might be either beneficial or detrimental to each. Considering working mothers especially teachers in relation to this theory, the ceaseless flux (interaction) between their work (teaching) and family responsibilities appears inevitable and results in either positive or negative spillover (interference). The spillover (negative or positive) they experience depends on the degree of balance (incompatibility or compatibility) between work and family responsibilities. Thus, if there is compatibility between these two domains, benefit will result leading to work-family enhancement. On the other hand, if there is incompatibility, role strain results leading to work-family conflict. This theory has suggested that although the work-family conflict bi-directions are distinct construct

yet their ceaseless interactions could have either positive or negative correlation.

Supplemental and Reactive Compensation Theories (Kando & Summers, 1971): Supplemental and reactive compensation theories are two dichotomies of compensation theory which was first proposed by Kando & Summers (1971) during the late 1980s and the early 1990s. Kando, Summers, Zedeck and Mosier are among the seminal authors who shaped these theories (Kando & Summers, 1971; Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). While compensation theory describes the behavior of employees in pursuing an alternative reward in the other sphere, supplemental and reactive compensation theories try to describe the reason behind the work-family compensation behavior of employees (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Supplemental compensation occurs when an individual finds out that his or her exogenous and endogenous rewards in one sphere (work or family) is not sufficient, and as a result the individual strives to supplement that lack of rewards in the other sphere. In contrast, the reactive compensation occurs when an individual has an undesirable experience in one sphere and seeks for contrasting experience in the other sphere (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). It is important to note that in this second view of the work-family theories, there exists a fundamental principal that work and family are two separate spheres, and that employees make the choice to excel in one sphere by lightening up in the other sphere.

Theories of Moral Leadership

Authentic-Moral Leadership Model (Hannah et al., 2011): The theory developed by Hannah et al. (2011) proposes that moral standards are primarily developed via cultural and societal influences and can be



best explained via social learning theory/processes (Bandura, 1977). Ethics are learned and part of one's culture, and thus morality is only generalizable across cultures in as much as there are universal moral truths between cultures. Further, ethics are formed not only at the societal level, but also at the organizational, group, and individual levels through social learning, social enactment, and meaning-making processes (Bartunek & Moch, 1987). The theory also proposes that the adaptability that allows the leader to develop morally and to execute moral control over the leadership influence process in large part stems from the plasticity of schemas and scripts that evolve over time through defining developmental "trigger events" (e.g., high-impact moral dilemmas) (Bandura, 2002). As leaders internalize their environment and form their self-concept over the life span, a moral component is formed as part of, and developed in parallel with, that self-concept. A given leader's moral development will differ from that of other leaders in terms of its robustness and complexity. This theory argues that such moral development depends largely upon both the quality and quantity of ethical experiences a leader faces through life-long learning and the moral meaning-making taken away from those experiences that end up shaping the leader's development (Kohlberg, 1981). Through such social learning processes, leaders not only form a global self-concept of themselves as leaders (Lord & Brown, 2004), but also form a specific dimension of the self-concept as it relates to their self-views of their own morality. In other words, a leader may consider him- or herself a "good" leader but not necessarily a "moral" leader.

Moral Foundations Theory (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010): One of the most popular approaches to understanding moral judgments is Moral Foundations Theory

proposed by Haidt and Kesebir (2010). According to Haidt and Kesebir (2010), humans evolved five distinct cognitive mechanisms, called moral foundations that form the basis of all moral decisions. However, different individuals and communities rely on the different foundations to different degrees. Haidt and Kesebir argue that the main reason that liberals and conservatives disagree about their moral judgments is their emphasis of different foundations. Liberals rely primarily on moral foundations of harm and care, whereas conservatives also emphasize foundations of purity, authority, and loyalty. In this prominent theory of moral judgments, individuals 'find' themselves with strong intuitions about certain foundations, which form the basis of their moral decisions. Yet, how these intuitions develop, become more important than others, or change over time is not emphasized. For example, according to this account, a social conservative might have a strong intuition against gay marriage based on the moral foundation of purity. Since the evolutionary foundations and the intuitions appear to be fixed, however, it is not clear, how the theory would account for the same individual's changing views on gay marriage. Individuals who come to possess a tendency to favor certain foundations and intuitions are largely stuck with them. This account of fixed moral judgments is supported by a deterministic description of the relationship between intuitions and reasoning in the social intuitionist account of moral judgments (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010). The evolutionarily determined moral foundations give rise to intuitions that dominate an individual's reactions to moral situations. Moral intuitions have primacy over moral reasoning - our intuitions determine our instantaneous reactions, and moral reasoning largely exists to justify these automatic reactions. Since the intuitions are fixed, and dominate reactions to



others' moral behavior, our reactions to the morality of others are also entirely fixed. Even though Haidt and his colleagues don't explicitly make this argument, through a combination of the Moral Foundations Theory and the social intuitionist account of morality, a very clear suggestion is made that our reactions to moral phenomena are at the mercy of our stable, fixed intuitions that cannot change (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010). The emphasis on civility as a solution is the inevitable conclusion of this approach – if we cannot change our moral intuitions and responses, the best we can do is to be civil to each other given the inevitable differences between us.

Social Neuroscience Model (Greene et al., 2008): Another theory of moral judgments is provided by social neuroscience model proposed by Greene et al. (2008). This approach emerged from a need to understand inconsistencies in how people tend to respond to moral dilemmas. In one famous example, the trolley problem, participants are presented with two different versions of an apparently very similar moral dilemma. In both versions of the dilemma, participants have to make a choice between letting a trolley run over 1 person or 5 people. The difference between the scenarios is how exactly the participants have to make this choice: they either have to pull a lever to divert the trolley towards the single person, or physically push a person in front of the trolley to stop it. Even though the consequences are the same for the two actions (1 person dies, 5 are saved), most people will not endorse pushing the person, but will endorse pulling the lever to divert the trolley (Greene et al., 2008). A variety of accounts have tried to explain why people respond differently to these two scenarios. One of the more popular neuroscientific accounts argues that we have two separate

systems to make moral judgments, and the systems often produce conflicting responses (Cushman & Greene, 2012). One is an affective system that evolved in order to stop us from doing certain actions. The authors argue that two elements in the 'push' scenario trigger this evolutionary affective response. First, when we are judging a harm that is caused by a direct transfer of a person's muscular force, we imagine ourselves doing the same action and activating parts of our brain responsible for motor planning. Furthermore, according to the authors, we evolved a system that has a negative affective reaction towards such motor actions, stops the behavior, and directs the same negative reaction toward others who are engaging in similar motor action. Thus, we have strong affective negative reactions to somebody who is pushing another person in order to harm them because we have evolved systems to stop us from doing the same. Second, we have evolved a similar system to stop us from using people as a means to an end. Thus, when the two factors combine – an individual uses muscular force to directly harm somebody to achieve another goal, the behavior is evaluated extremely negatively. In the lever version of the scenario, these affective triggers are absent: muscular force is being used to pull a lever, not to directly harm somebody (Cushman & Greene, 2012). Furthermore, the single individual is not directly being used to save the five others: he/she is harmed as a byproduct of the actions of saving the five. The researchers argue that the second system is much slower, deliberative, and involves a utilitarian calculation of minimizing harm. When the affective response is absent in the 'lever' scenario, the utilitarian system dominates and participants judge the course of action that minimizes harm as the most moral (Greene et al., 2008). In contrast, in the 'push' scenario, the affective system overwhelms the



utilitarian system, and pushing one to save five is not endorsed.

Entity theory of Morality (Merritt et al., 2010): This theory was postulated by Merritt, Effron, Fein, Savitsky, Tuller, and Monin (2010). An entity theory of morality is also implied in research that examines individuals' own moral motivation. A variety of research, ranging from moral licensing (Merritt et al., 2010) and moral cleansing (Jordan, Mullen and Murnighan, 2011) to moral hypocrisy, has focused on understanding the various situational factors that affect people's moral motivation and moral effort. In these studies, participants are often placed in situations that make them appear more or less moral, and the researchers examine the participants' reactions. Theoretically, a number of reactions to such situations may be examined, including feelings of shame or guilt that may have a long term effect on their moral self-concept and behavior. However, despite the diverse goals of these various research programs, they invariably focus on the participants' efforts to return to a status quo of appearing like moral people. By overwhelmingly focusing on how participants keep up an appearance of morality in various situations, the researchers show how participants can avoid any need to have a more lasting change in their moral character. The research does not directly address whether the underlying moral character of participants is changeable. However, by focusing on ways that participants avoid change and maintain the status quo, the research implies an entity theory of morality where character is not changeable. For example, one body of research focuses on participants' efforts to cleanse themselves when they feel that their moral self-image may have been tarnished (Jordan et al., 2011). In one study,

participants who were asked to recall a time when they were immoral (i.e., used others to get something they wanted), showed more intentions to be pro-social afterwards (i.e., donate blood, volunteer, or donate to a charity), compared to participants who were asked to recall a time when they helped somebody. The authors explained that when participants are asked to recall an immoral action, they want to cleanse their moral self-concept by doing something moral (Valdesolo & DeSteno, 2007). The implication is that once the 'cleansing' is complete, participants will return to their base level of morality, and avoid any lasting change that may result from their encounter with their prior immoral action. In studies on moral licensing and moral cleansing, the primary focus of the research is how participants maintain their moral status quo by acting more morally when their morality is challenged or less morally when their morality is confirmed. This focus has made important contributions to understanding how situational factors can affect temporary changes in individuals' moral motivation. However, since the research overwhelmingly focuses on participants' efforts to maintain a moral self-concept instead of potentially lasting change, it implies an entity theory of morality to its audience.

Theoretical framework

The current study anchors its theoretical framework on the tenets of the role depletion theory (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). According to the role enhancement theory, "multiple roles bring rewards such as income, heightened self-esteem, opportunities for social relationships, and the experience of success." (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). From this perspective, the combination of certain roles has a positive, rather than a negative effect on well-being, and "only beyond certain upper



limits may overload and distress occur” (Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts, & Pulkkinen, 2006). This theory states that “participation in one role is made better or easier by virtue of participation in the other role” (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Moreover, this theory acknowledges the negative effect of the work-family relationship, in which, only beyond a certain upper limit may overload and distress occur, however, the central focus of this perspective is mainly on the positive

effects of work and family relationship, such as resource enhancement, work-family success or balance, positive spillover and facilitation (Kinnunen et al., 2006). Also, moral leadership may be able to impact this work family relationship to reduce distress among employees. Although, employees being loyal is not antecedent variable, it may be able to explain loyalty circumstances that influence the linkage between moral leadership and work family conflict.

Empirical Review

Loyalty to supervisor and Work family conflict: Haar’s (2017) paper extends the job-related outcomes predicted by work-family and family-work conflict by exploring employee loyalty. Data were collected from a New Zealand Government department in the financial services sector. There were a total of 203 participants between the ages of 18 and 65 years, who responded to two matched surveys sent through the organisation’s Intranet. WFC was measured using the 14-item Inventory of Work-Family Conflict (Greenhaus, Callanan, & Godshalk, 2000). Employee Loyalty was measured using seven items by Rusbult et al. (1988). Positive Thinking Coping was a 4-item scale by Armstrong-Stassen (1998). Result indicated that employee loyalty was significantly and negatively correlated to both WFC and FWC (both $r = -.20$, $p < .01$). Regression analyses revealed that WFC was significantly and negatively related to employee loyalty ($\beta = -.24$, $p < .01$). Likewise, FWC was also significantly and negatively related to employee loyalty ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .001$). From Step 2, WFC accounts for 6 per cent of the variance of employee loyalty ($p < .01$), while FWC accounts for 7 per cent of the variance ($p < .01$). Roehling, Roehling, and Moen (2001) investigated the relationships among

work/life policies, informal support, and employee loyalty over the life course (defined by age and parental status and age of youngest child). The central thesis was that readers’ understanding of the impact of work/life policies on employee loyalty will be enriched by consideration of the non-work and work contexts that influence employee attitudes and behavior. Respondents for the study were drawn from the 1992 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW), a randomly selected, nationally representative survey of American workers between the ages of 18 and 64. The sample included 2,958 respondents (53.2% male), with a mean age of 38.7. Result showed that there were positive relationships between employee loyalty and work/life policies for child care ($r = .10$, $p < .01$) and flexible time ($r = .19$, $p < .01$). Abdullah, Huang, Sarfraz, and Sadiq (2021) carried out a research focused on the employee loyalty aspect of private hospitals in Pakistan during the COVID-19 pandemic, seriously impacted by strict work demand and work-family conflict. To manage this issue, social rewards and psychological rewards played a role as a mediator. The study uses a causal research design with a correlational study design in a non-contrived environment. Minimal researcher interference has been assured.



AMOS 24 has been used to deal with the mediation in study design with bootstrap methodology. The study was conducted on 250 nurses of different private hospitals across Punjab province using a proportionate stratified sampling technique. A finding of this study suggests that nurses remain loyal to their organizations despite having uncompromising work demands and facing work-family conflict when they are provided with social and psychological rewards on their job by their organizations. The result indicates that there was no direct effect of work-family conflict on employee loyalty to supervisor. Moreover, a mediation approach revealed that social rewards and psychological rewards mediated the relationship between work-family conflict and employee loyalty.

Moral Leadership and Loyalty to supervisor: Dianingrum and Kurniawan (2020) carried out a study to identify the influence of ethical and moral leadership on interactional fairness of followers, and collectivistic orientation towards loyalty to superiors. The population in the study was employees (superiors and subordinates) in 3 companies operating in Purwokerto and the sample size was 60 people. The study adopted the 9-item version scale developed by (Brown et al., 2005) to measure ethical leadership. Used the 8 item version scale developed by (Jiang & Cheng, 2008) to measure loyalty to supervisor. Used the 6 item version scale developed by (Moorman, 1991) to measure interactional justice. Used the 6 item version scale developed by (Cheng et al., 2004) to measure moral leadership. Analytical method used SEM PLS. However, result showed that there was no significant influence of moral leadership on loyalty to supervisor. Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh (2004) investigated paternalistic leadership, Western transformational

leadership, and subordinate responses to these two leadership styles. The study sample consisted of 605 low- to mid-level managers and staff from 60 Taiwanese enterprises. Paternalistic leadership was measured using the Paternalistic leadership scale by Cheng et al. (2000). Cheng et al.'s (1999) loyalty to supervisor scale was used to measure loyalty to supervisor. Result showed that moral leadership showed a significant positive relationship with compliance without dissent. Wang, Lu, and Liu (2015) examined the relation of ethical leadership with loyalty to supervisor, as well as mediating (interactional justice) and moderating (collectivistic orientation) variables of this relation by proposing a moderated mediation model. The study employed time-lagged research design to collect two waves of data from 395 supervisor-subordinate dyads in 74 teams, and used multilevel structural equation modeling to test the moderated mediation model. We measured supervisor's ethical leadership behavior with the 10-item Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS) developed by Brown et al. (2005). Loyalty to supervisor was measured with the 15-item scale of Jiang et al. (2007). Interactional justice was measured using Colquitt's (2001) nine-item scale. Results indicated that ethical leadership was positively related to loyalty to supervisor, interactional justice mediated the relationship between ethical leadership and loyalty to supervisor. Moreover, collectivistic orientation moderated the strength of the indirect effect of ethical leadership on loyalty to supervisor (through interactional justice). Tseng and Wu (2017) carried out a case study which examined the impact of ethical leadership on the financial professionals' loyalty by focusing on the mediating effects of perceived psychological contract fulfillment (PPCF) and organizational identification (OI). 373



financial professionals in Taiwan were recruited for the sample. The results revealed that the professionals' experiences of ethical leadership positively associated with their loyalty toward their companies. The results further showed that the perceived psychological contract fulfillment and organizational identification significantly mediated the relationship. Fan et al. (2021) provided a mediation-moderation model to examine how employees' perception of ethical leadership may inspire employee loyalty through psychologically related resources. A total of 234 hotel employees in Southeast China were recruited as the research respondents. Ethical leadership was assessed based on employees' perceptions using a 10-item scale from Brown et al. (2005). Identification with leader was measured with a 7-item scale adapted from Gu et al. (2015). Organizational justice was measured using a 6-item scale adapted from Poon (2012). Employee loyalty was assessed using a 4-item scale adapted from Yao et al. (2008). The results show that there is a significantly positive correlation between ethical leadership and employee loyalty ($\beta = .20, p < .01$). Psychological ownership and organizational justice are two mediating mechanisms in the linkage.

Moral leadership and work-family conflict: Öge, Çetinb, and Top (2018) carried out a study to examine the mediating role of work engagement in the links between paternalistic leadership and workplace loneliness, and paternalistic leadership and work family conflict. Employees working in the air traffic controlling division in Istanbul composed the sample of the study. A total of 106 employees were used as samples for the study. Moral Leadership was measured using moral leadership facet of the paternalistic leadership scale developed by Cheng et al. (2000, 2004). Work family conflict was

measured with the five-item scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996). Result showed that there was a significant negative correlation between moral leadership and work-family conflict among air traffic controllers ($r = -0.128, p < .05$). The results of structural equation modeling analysis supported the hypothesis that work engagement fully mediated the links between paternalistic leadership and work family conflict. Paternalistic leadership, through increasing work engagement, decreases the workplace loneliness and work family conflict levels of air traffic controllers. The findings provide valuable insights and managerial implications. Yao and Li (2019) carried out a study on the relationship between moral leadership and employee work-family conflict and hypothesized that both job clarity and workplace anxiety would mediate the relationship between moral leadership and employees' WFC, and that trust in supervisor would moderate the indirect effect of moral leadership and WFC through job clarity and workplace anxiety. The researchers collected data from 258 employees of 3 companies in China, and their spouses. The conservation of resources theory was used to propose a moderated mediation model explaining how and when moral leadership influences employees' work-family conflict. The findings indicated that job clarity and workplace anxiety mediated the relationship between moral leadership and employees' WFC, and that trust in supervisor strengthened the indirect effect through job clarity and workplace anxiety. Freire and Bettencourt (2020) also carried out a study to explore the mediating effect of the work-family conflict in the relation between ethical leadership and job satisfaction. 234 nursing professionals working at different Portuguese public hospital units were sampled in the study.



Ethical leadership was measured by using the ten-item Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS), which was developed by Brown et al. (2005). The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) by Spector (1994) was used to measure job satisfaction. Work–family conflict was assessed by using the nine-item Work–family Conflict Scale (WFCS), developed by Carlson et al. (2000). Result showed that there is a negative relationship between ethical leadership and work family conflict among the nurses ($r = 0.26, p < .05$). Furthermore, it was revealed that the work–family conflict mediated (partially) the relationship between ethical leadership and job satisfaction. He, Wang, Zheng, Guo, and Zhu (2021) also carried out a study to explore how paternalistic leadership (PL) influences Chinese expatriates' work engagement in a cross-cultural context, and examined how expatriates' cross-cultural adaptability sets a boundary condition for this relationship. Data were collected from two-wave surveys of 82 supervisors and 318 Chinese expatriate teachers from 57 Confucius Institutes in 18 countries. Structural equation modeling was used to test the hypothesized relationships. Result showed that benevolent and moral leadership as job resources are negatively related to work–family conflict (WFC), whereas the job demand of authoritarian leadership positively relates to WFC. Further, WFC mediates the effect of PL styles on Chinese expatriates' work engagement. Cross-cultural adaptability moderates the negative relationship between WFC and work engagement, and the indirect effect of PL styles on work engagement through WFC. Gull et al. (2021) did a study to investigate how paternalistic leadership (PL) and polychronicity (PC) affect the life satisfaction (LS) of nurses, specifically in public hospitals. Moreover, the mediating role of work-family conflict (WFC) and

family-work conflict (FWC) was also assessed in the relationships among PL, PC, and LS. A survey questionnaire was used to collect data from 226 nurses and the Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) technique was used. Paternalistic leadership was measured using the 10-item short version of the paternalistic leadership questionnaire (PLQ) (Aycan et al., 2013). The WFC and FWC were measured using four items for WFC and using four items for FWC with a total eight items and a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) developed by Grzywacz and Bass (2003) and Grzywacz et al. (2002). Result showed that paternalistic leadership was negatively related to family work conflict ($r = -0.212, p < .05$) and also work family conflict ($r = -0.342, p < .05$). Furthermore, WFC partially mediated the relationships among paternalistic, polychronicity, and life satisfaction.

Synthesis from related literature review:

The present study reviewed the literature that have studied the linkages between moral leadership, loyalty to supervisor, and work family conflicts. Several theories were presented which explained the nature of moral decision making and judgment and they include: Authentic-Moral Leadership Model (Hannah et al., 2011), Moral Foundations Theory (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010), Social Neuroscience Model (Greene et al., 2008), and Entity theory of Morality (Merritt et al., 2010). Loyalty to supervisor were also supported by some theories and they include Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1968), and Social Identity Theory (Wiklund & Jansson, 2019). Work family conflict were explained using several theories including Role depletion theory (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999), Role Enhancement Theory (Barnett & Hyde, 2001), Spill Over theory (Frone, 1992), and Supplemental and



Reactive Compensation Theories (Kando & Summers, 1971). A total of 13 empirical studies examining the relationships between moral leadership, loyalty to supervisor, work family conflict were selected and reviewed. However, these literatures were relevant to the formulation of the study hypotheses and supported the direction of the research questions.

Hypotheses

H1. There will be a significant negative relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict.

H2. There will be a significant positive relationship between moral leadership and loyalty to supervisor

H3. There will be a significant negative relationship between loyalty to supervisor and work-family conflict

H4. Loyalty to supervisor will significantly moderate the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict

METHOD

Participants

Participants for this study were sampled from 33 organizations/company located in Onitsha, Awka, Warri of Anambra and Delta state. A total of 37 subordinates in these organization were sampled using the purposive sampling technique and selected with the aid of the supervisors. The gender distribution of the subordinates is 14 male (38.9%) and 22 females (61.1%). Age of the subordinates ranged from 20 to 40 years old with the mean of 28.57 and standard deviation of 4.49. Among the subordinates, 3 (8.1%) are O' level certificate holders, 12

(32.4%) are first degree holders (2 years), 19 (51.4%) are first degree holders (4 years), while 10 (8.1%) are holders of a masters degree. 33 (89.2%) of the subordinates are employees, while 4 (10.8%) are first line managers. Departments with the highest subordinates were Marketing/Sales 14 (37.8%), Financing/Accounting 12 (32.4%), General Administration 4 (10.8%) and Production 2 (5.4%). However, majority of the company where the subordinates work are in the Finance/Insurance industry 31 (83.8%) and Internet 5 (5.4%). The lowest tenure of working in the organizations by a subordinate was 10 months and highest was 8 years 10 months with a mean of 1 year 8 months and standard deviation of 1 year 5 months. Majority of the subordinates have Igbo 19 (52.8%), Yoruba 2 (5.6%), Isoko 3 (8.3%), Ijaw 2 (5.6%), Itsekiri 2 (5.6%), and Edo 2 (5.6%) as their first language. Among the subordinates, 9 (25.7%) are living with their spouse while 26 (70.3%) do not live with their spouse. The inclusion criteria for selecting the participants in the current study were that they must be over the age of 18 years, be a full time staff, and work directly under a supervisor.

Instruments

Moral leadership scale: Moral leadership scale is a sub scale of the Paternalistic Leadership Scale, originally developed by Cheng et al. (2004), and comprises of 21 items on perceived Moral Leadership of the supervisors by the subordinates. The scale was designed as a 6-point Likert-type scale where the response options range between (1) I completely do not agree and (6) I completely agree. However, Cheng et al. (2004) reported the scale cronbach's alpha coefficient based on the reliability findings for the moral leadership factor was .95.



Work-Family Conflict Scale: The work-family conflict scale developed by Carlson et al. (2000) is a self-report instrument that is made up of 12 items on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). The items measure the six dimensions of the W-F-C, which arise from the integration of the 2 forms of W-F-C (time-based & strain based) and its two directions (Work Interference With Family, Family Interference With Work): time-based WIF, time-based FIW, strain-based WIF, and strain based FIW. Carlson et al. (2000) reported a cronbach alpha of .94 which indicates a strong reliability coefficient.

Loyalty to supervisor: The loyalty to supervisor scale is a 6 items scale adapted from the supervisory commitment scale developed by Chen et al. (2003). It measures subordinates level of dedication and attachment (affective and behavioural) using a likert scale of 7 points ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). Chen et al. (2003) carried out a cronbach analysis and indicated that the supervisory commitment scale obtained an adequate reliability $\alpha = .91$.

Procedure

An ethical approval letter was granted by the Research Ethical Board of the Department of Psychology and the Faculty of Social Sciences respectively at Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. In the field study, the researcher introduced himself to the supervisors in the various organizations and presented the letter of identification. The letter helped eliminate doubt about the

authenticity of the research among the supervisors. The supervisors were handed the survey equipments to be shared among subordinates and instructions were duly given. This method was utilized because the subordinates would be more willing to fill out the survey forms when it was presented by the supervisors. Although, it was a voluntary exercise and the subordinates could withdraw at any moment they felt like. Most of the completed survey forms took more than 2 days to be collected back from the supervisors. This is because the subordinates can't complete the questionnaires during work hours. Meanwhile, they had to take it home. However, out of 200 questionnaires that were distributed to the supervisors, only 111 were correctly completed and prepared for data analysis.

Design/Statistics

The current study adopted a cross sectional survey and correlational design. This design was adopted because the data collection method was based on participants' self-reported assessments and collected within a short period of time. The statistics used was the pearson product moment correlation to test for the relationship among the study variables. The simple moderation statistics was also used to test for the moderating role of loyalty to supervisor. The statistical package for the social sciences SPSS version 25 was used to carry out all the analysis in the study while PROCESS MACRO v3.4 was used to conduct the moderation analysis.

Result

Table 1: Mean, standard deviation, Intercorrelation Matrix of study variables



| | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|-----------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|---|
| Age | 28.6 | 4.5 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Gender | - | - | .015 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Tenure | 1.9 | 1.6 | -.072 | -.018 | 1 | | | | | |
| DoW | 1.2 | 0.8 | .038 | .071 | .422* | 1 | | | | |
| Education | - | - | .256 | -.034 | .409* | -.152 | 1 | | | |
| ML | 93.1 | 15.9 | -.028 | .038 | -.024 | .178 | -.339* | 1 | | |
| LS | 27.0 | 3.1 | .089 | -.098 | .172 | .043 | -.239 | .541** | 1 | |
| WFC | 48.8 | 11.8 | .221 | .273 | .071 | -.024 | -.030 | -.401* | -.026 | 1 |

Note: (**)= $p < .01$, (*)= $p < .05$, WFC= Work-Family Conflict, LS= Loyalty to supervisor, ML= Moral Leadership, DoW= Duration of working with immediate supervisor, Tenure= Company tenure, Education= Highest education.

Interpretation: Table 1 presents the inter-correlation result of the demographical and main variables in the current study. Table 1 show that the participants' age, gender, tenure in company, and duration of work showed no significant relationship with all the main study variables (moral leadership, affective organizational commitment, work-family conflict). However, only participants level of education showed a significant negative relationship moral leadership ($r = -.339$, $p < .05$). This means that subordinates with higher academic degrees had lower levels of perception of their supervisors as moral leaderships and vice versa. Among the main study variables, Moral leadership was found to have a significant negative relationship with work-family conflict ($r = -.401$, $r = p < .05$). This entails that as level of

subordinates' perceived supervisor's moral leadership increases, work-family conflict decreases. Hypothesis 1 was however confirmed and accepted. It is also indicated that moral leadership showed a significant positive relationship with loyalty to supervisor ($r = .541$, $p < .01$). This result presents that as level of subordinates' perceived supervisor's moral leadership increase, loyalty to supervisor among these subordinates increase as well. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was confirmed and accepted. However, loyalty to supervisor did not show a significant relationship with work-family conflict ($r = -.026$, $p > .01$). This result indicates that subordinates' being loyal to their supervisor will show any linear association with their degree of work-family conflict was not supported. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not accepted.

Test of Moderating role of loyalty to supervisor



Table 2: Simple moderation of loyalty to supervisor

| Model | <i>b</i> [CI] | SE | t | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|
| Constant | -100.2348 [-230.2791, 29.8094] | 63.8418 | -1.5700 | .1262 |
| Moral Leadership (centered) | 1.4245 [-.0407, 2.8898] | .7193 | 1.9804 | .0563 |
| Loyalty to Supervisor (centered) | 7.2901 [2.1312, 12.4490] | 2.5326 | 2.8785 | .0071* |
| Moral lead × Loyalty to Sup | -.0711 [-.1272, -.0150] | .0275 | -2.5818 | .0146* |

Note= $R^2 = .34$, $*p < .05$, DV= work-family conflict, CI= upper and lower limit confidence intervals.

The regression summary model as reported in the SEM moderation estimates in table 2 indicates that moral leadership ($b = .142$, 95% CI [-.0407, 2.8898], $t = 1.98$, $p < .05$) did not significantly predict work-family conflict, while loyalty to supervisor ($b = .729$, 95% CI [2.1312, 12.4490], $t = 2.88$, $p < .05$), both accounted for 34% of the total variance in work-family conflict. To

determine if there was a moderation of loyalty to supervisor, table 2 shows that there is an interaction effect, and in this case the interaction is significant, ($b = -.0711$, 95% CI [-.1272, -.0150], $t = -2.58$, $p < .05$), indicating that the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict is moderated by loyalty to supervisor. Thus, hypothesis 4 was accepted.

Table 3: Conditional Moderation Effect

| Loyalty to supervisor (M) | Effect | se | t | <i>p</i> | LLCI | ULCI |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|---------|----------|--------|-------|
| 23.000 | -.2108 | .1478 | -1.4258 | .1636 | -.5120 | .0904 |



| | | | | | | |
|--------|--------|-------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| 27.000 | -.5308 | .1370 | -3.8755 | .0005* | -.8097 | -.2518 |
| 29.000 | -.6431 | .1580 | -4.0712 | .0003* | -.9649 | -.3213 |

*= $p < .05$, LLCI=lower limit confidence interval, ULCI= lower limit confidence interval

To further explore this significant moderation, when subordinates' level of loyalty to supervisor is low (23.0), there is no significant relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict ($b = -.21$, 95% CI [-.5120, .0904], $t = -1.4$, $p > .05$). When subordinates' level of loyalty to supervisor is at median level (27.0), there is a significant negative relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict ($b = -.53$, 95% CI [-.8097, -.2518], $t = -3.9$, $p < .05$). When subordinates' level of loyalty to supervisor is high (29.0), there is also a significant negative relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict ($b = -.64$, 95% CI [-.9649, -.3213], $t = -4.07$, $p < .05$).

Discussion

The current chapter presents the discussion of the study results, implications of the study, recommendations, limitations of the study, suggestions for studies, and conclusion. The current study examined the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict, and the moderating role of loyalty to supervisor. The main study variables were analyzed using primary statistical analyses (correlation and moderation) and the result were interpreted. Hypothesis one which stated that there will be a significant negative relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict was accepted. This current result implies that subordinates who highly perceive their supervisors as moral,

selfless, and self-disciplined, have less incidents of experiencing work-family conflicts. This result is in line with the findings of Ögea, Çetinb, and Top (2018) who examined the effects of paternalistic leadership on workplace loneliness, work family conflict and work engagement. Ögea, Çetinb, and Top (2018) found that there was a significant negative correlation between moral leadership and work-family conflict among air traffic controllers. It also supported by the findings of Yao and Li (2019) who found out that moral leadership has a significant negative relationship. Hypothesis two which states that there will be a significant positive relationship between moral leadership and loyalty to supervisor was accepted. This result implies that subordinates who highly perceive their supervisors as moral, have higher levels of loyalty to these supervisors in the work environment. This result supports previous findings that have empirically reported this significant relationship. Such studies include Dianingrum and Kurniawan (2020) who found that there is a significant positive impact of moral leadership on loyalty to supervisor using the regression analysis. This result also supports the findings of Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh (2004) who reported that moral leadership showed a significant positive relationship with compliance without dissent. Hypothesis three which states that there will be a significant negative relationship between loyalty to



supervisor and work-family conflict was not accepted. This implies that it does not empirically support that subordinates' with high level of loyalty to their supervisors or superiors possess low levels of work-family conflicts or family-work conflict. Based on previous literature, it does not support the findings of Haar (2017) who revealed a significant negative relationship between employee loyalty to supervisor and work-family conflict/family-work conflict. However, the current result supports the findings of Abdullah, Huang, Sarfraz, and Sadiq (2021) who found out that there was no direct effect of work-family conflict on employee loyalty to supervisor. Moreover, a mediation approach revealed that social rewards and psychological rewards mediated the relationship between work-family conflict and employee loyalty (Abdullah, Huang, Sarfraz, & Sadiq, 2021). Hypothesis four which states that loyalty to supervisor will significantly moderate the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict was accepted. The result presented that among subordinates who are moderate or high in levels of loyalty to supervisor, their perception of supervisors as moral leaders reduces their reported degrees of work-family conflict. This is a novel discovery considering that only trust in supervisor has only been reported to moderate this relationship (Yao & Li, 2019).

Relevance of the study

The current study findings will have both theoretical and practical relevance. The study will help organizations better manage subordinates who are battling the negative consequences of work-family conflict in the work environment. Because this study utilized Nigerian employees fully employed in an organization, the study will most have an impactful relevance to the Nigerian work

culture and employee wellbeing. The current study could enlighten organizations to develop leadership training programs for supervisors in order for them to internalize the moral values of the organization and provide selfless support to the employees who may likely suffer mental and physical frustration to stabilize work roles that are interfering with family demands. The current study findings will contribute to the exploration and expansion of some existing models that were developed to explain the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict. The moderating effect of loyalty to supervisor revealed in the current study will contribute to the social exchange theory which posits that subordinates who are given psychological and social rewards for job tasks may reciprocate the gesture with loyalty. The result that will be obtained may also contribute to the moderated mediation model of work-family conflict tested by Yao and Li (2019) who revealed that trust in supervisor significantly moderated the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict.

Implications of the study

The current study findings have both theoretical and practical implications. This study found that as level of subordinates' perceived supervisor's moral leadership increases, work-family conflict decreases. This is novel in the areas of promoting employee commitment and rewards system in the workplace. The study will enlighten management to assign supervisors whom the subordinates may easily find comfortable working with to balance work-family demands. The study reveals that subordinates who this may only be applicable to are the ones who are moderately and highly loyal to their supervisors. The current study findings



will contribute to the exploration and expansion of some existing models that were developed to explain the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict. The moderating effect of loyalty to supervisor revealed in the current study will contribute to the social exchange theory which posits that subordinates who are given psychological and social rewards for job tasks may reciprocate the gesture with loyalty. This result will also contribute to the moderated mediation model of work-family conflict tested by Yao and Li (2019) who revealed that trust in supervisor significantly moderated the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the current study, it is recommended that the organization management need to first work on developing work conditions that should earn subordinates' trust, respect, and compliance. Under these conditions alone, can work-family conflict might be able to be managed effectively with the aid of highly moral leaders, superiors or supervisors in the work place. Moral leaders are characterized with selfless and virtuous personalities. Whether they are adopted as demanded by the organization's ethics or it's a dispositional trait, it remains pertinent to ensure that employees need to psychologically and affectively be committed to their job role for effective performance. One of the factors that could hinder this is the type of leadership adopted by the supervisors. However, subordinates should be provided with sustainable moral leaders who may be able to impact how these subordinates manage work-family demands effectively.

Limitations of the study

The study has some limitations that may have impacted its accuracy of statistical inference and methodology. First the sample size used in the current study is small and may have impacted the statistical outcomes obtained. Secondly, the samples were gotten from just organizations in Delta and Anambra state. Thus, creating a limitation in ethnic and job diversity of the sample data collected.

Suggestion for future studies

According to the limitations outlined in the current study, the researcher suggests that future researchers should use larger sample sizes that can help catalyze the statistical power of the data computed. Secondly, future studies should also ensure that data is representative of diverse ethnic backgrounds in order to increase the validity of generalizing the research findings. Thirdly, other possible moderators of the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict should be explored. Fourthly, future studies should not rely on explicit self-report instruments for making inference. Implicit instruments can be adopted in order to reduce the possibilities of bias reports.

Conclusion

The current study examined the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict, and the moderating role of loyalty to supervisor among 37 subordinate workers in 33 organizations/company located in Onitsha, Awka, Warri of Anambra and Delta state. Four hypotheses were formulated and tested. The first hypothesis stating that moral leadership will have a significant negative relationship with work-family conflict was confirmed. The second stating that moral leadership and loyalty to supervisor will have a significant positive relationship was also confirmed. The third hypothesis stating that loyalty to supervisor will have significant



negative relationship with work-family conflict was not accepted. The fourth hypothesis stating that loyalty to supervisor will moderate the relationship between moral leadership and work-family conflict was confirmed. A great number of Nigerian employees in private and public organizations may still be suffering the negative impacts of work-family conflicts under an unfavorable organizational leadership framework. Hence, the current provides an interventional model that could be applied for managing the conditions that could lead to inability to balance the demands of work and family.

References

- Abdullah, M. I., Huang, D., Sarfraz, M., & Sadiq, M. W. (2021). Service Innovation in Human Resource Management During COVID-19: A Study to Enhance Employee Loyalty Using Intrinsic Rewards. *Frontiers in psychology, 12*, 627659. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.627659>
- Afsar, B. (2014). Moral or Authoritative Leadership: Which One is Better for Faculty Members? *American Journal of Educational Research, 2*(9), 793-800. doi: 10.12691/education-2-9-14
- Alfes, K., Shantz, A., & Truss, C. (2012). The link between perceived HRM practices, performance and well-being: The moderating effect of trust in the employer. *Human Resource Management Journal, 22*(4), 409–427. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12005>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*(2), 269–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00092>
- Barnett, R. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family: An expansionist theory. *American Psychologist, 56*(10), 781–796. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.781>
- Bartunek, J. M., & Moch, M. K. (1987). First-order, second-order, and third-order change and organization development interventions: A cognitive approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 23*(4), 483–500. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002188638702300404>
- Blau, P. M. (1968) The Hierarchy of Authority in Organizations. *American Journal of Sociology, 73*, 453-764. <https://doi.org/10.1086/224506>
- Boroff, K.E., & Lewin, D. (1997). Loyalty, Voice, and Intent to Exit a Union Firm: A Conceptual and Empirical Analysis. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review, 51*, 50 - 63.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M. & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a Multidimensional measure of work-family conflict.



- Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249-276.
- Chen, Z. X., Farh, J. L., & Tsui, A. S. (1998). Loyalty to Supervisor, Organizational Commitment, and Employee Performance: The Chinese Case. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 98.
- Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Farh, J.-L. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75(3), 339–356. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317902320369749>
- Cheng, B. S., & Chou, L. F. (2005). Triad Model of Paternalistic Leadership: Constructs Modification and Retesting. Report prepared for Taiwan's National Science Council. Taiwan, national Taiwan University (in Chinese).
- Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7(1), 89-117
- Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., & Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7(1), 89-117
- Cheng, B.S., Jiang, D. Y., & Reily, J. (2003). Organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, and employee outcomes in the Chinese context: Proximal hypothesis or global hypothesis? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 1-24.
- Coughlan, R. (2005). Employee Loyalty as Adherence to Shared Moral Values. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17(1), 43–57. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40604474>
- Crawford, D. W. (1999). Occupational Characteristics and Marital Leisure Involvement. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 28, 52-70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077727X99281004>
- Cushman, F., & Greene, J. D. (2012). Finding faults: how moral dilemmas illuminate cognitive structure. *Social neuroscience*, 7(3), 269–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2011.614000>
- Dianingrum, M., & Kurniawan, A. A. (2020). Analysis of the Effect of Ethical and Moral Leadership on Loyalty to the Superior of Mediated Interactional Justice: Moderated Collectivistic Orientation. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Recent Innovations
- Duxbury, L., Lyons, S., & Higgins, C. (2007). Dual-income families in the new millennium: Reconceptualizing family type. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(4), 472–486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422307305488>
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms Linking Work and Family: Clarifying the Relationship between Work and Family Constructs. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 178–199. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259269>



- Erben, G. S., & Güneşer, A. B. (2007). The relationship between paternalistic leadership and organizational commitment: Investigating the role of climate regarding ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(4), 955-968.
- Fairholm, M., & Fairholm, G. (2009). *Understanding Leadership Perspectives: Theoretical and Practical Approaches*. Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-84902-7>
- Fan, X., Li, J., Mao, Z., & Lu, Z. (2021). Can ethical leadership inspire employee loyalty in hotels in China? -From the perspective of the social exchange theory. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*.
- Farh, J. L., Chen, Z., & Tsui, A. S. (1998). Loyalty to Supervisor, Organizational Commitment, and Employee Performance: The Chinese Case. Proceedings of the Annual National Meeting of Academy of Management, San Diego, California
- Freire, C., & Bettencourt, C. (2020). Impact of ethical leadership on job satisfaction: the mediating effect of work-family conflict. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41, 319-330.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(1), 65-78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.77.1.65>
- Greene, J. D., Morelli, S. A., Lowenberg, K., Nystrom, L. E., & Cohen, J. D. (2008). Cognitive load selectively interferes with utilitarian moral judgment. *Cognition*, 107(3), 1144-1154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.11.004>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources and conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258214>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 391-412). Sage Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231365.n20>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *The Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159186>
- Greenhaus, J. H., Allen, T. D., & Spector, P. E. (2006). Health Consequences of Work-Family Conflict: The Dark Side of the Work-Family Interface. In P. L. Perrewé, & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Employee Health, Coping and Methodologies* (pp. 61-98). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s1479-3555\(05\)05002-x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s1479-3555(05)05002-x)
- Guillon, O., & Cezanne, C. (2014). Employee loyalty and organizational performance: A critical survey. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(5), 839-



850. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-02-2014-0025>
- Gull, N., Song, Z., Shi, R., Asghar, M., Rafique, M. A., & Liu, Y. (2021). Paternalistic Leadership, Polychronicity, and Life Satisfaction of Nurses: The Role of Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict in Public Sector Hospitals. *Frontiers in psychology, 12*, 648332. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.648332>
- Haar, J.M. (2017). Work-family Conflict and Employee Loyalty: Exploring the Moderating Effects of Positive Thinking Coping. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations, 42*, 35-51.
- Haidt, J., & Kesebir, S. (2010). Morality. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 797–832). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470561119.socpsy002022>
- Hannah, S. T. (2011). Relationships between Authentic Leadership, Moral Courage, and Ethical and Pro-Social Behaviors. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 21*(4), 555–578. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41304450>
- He, G., Wang, Y., Zheng, X., Guo, Z., & Zhu, Y. (2021). Linking paternalistic leadership to work engagement among Chinese expatriates: a job demand-resource perspective. *Int. J. Manpow.*
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hooi, L. W. (2018). The adoption of Japanese recruitment practices in Malaysia. *International Journal of Manpower, 29*(4), 362-378. doi 10.1108/01437720810884764
- Jordan, J., Mullen, E., & Murnighan, J. K. (2011). Striving for the moral self: The effects of recalling past moral actions on future moral behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(5), 701–713. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211400208>
- Kando, T. M., & Summers, W. C. (1971). The Impact of Work on Leisure: Toward a Paradigm and Research Strategy. *The Pacific Sociological Review, 14*(3), 310–327. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1388645>
- Kinnunen, U., Feldt, T., Geurts, S., & Pulkkinen, L. (2006). Types of work-family interface: well-being correlates of negative and positive spillover between work and family. *Scandinavian journal of psychology, 47*(2), 149–162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2006.00502.x>
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development. Vol. I: The philosophy of moral development*. Harper & Row.
- Ladd, R. T. (1987). Union commitment: Replication and extension. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 640–644
- Leineweber, C., Baltzer, M., Hanson, L. L. M., & Westerlund, H. (2013). Work-family conflict and health in Swedish working women and men: a 2-year prospective analysis (the SLOSH study). *European Journal of Public*



- Health*, 23(4), 710–716. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ck_s064
- LePine, J. A., LePine, M. A., & Saul, J. R. (2007). Relationships among work and non-work challenge and hindrance stressors and non-work and work criteria: A model of cross-domain stressor effects. In P. L. Perrewé & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Exploring the work and non-work interface* (pp. 35–72). Elsevier Science/JAI Press.
- Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2004). *Leadership processes and follower self-identity*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Merritt, A.C., Effron, D.A., Fein, S., Savitsky, K., Tuller, D.M., & Monin, B. (2011). The strategic pursuit of moral credentials. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 774-777.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400–410. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400>
- Niu, C. P., Wang, A. C., & Cheng, B. S. (2009). Effectiveness of a moral and benevolent leader: Probing the interactions of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 12, 32-39.
- Öge, E., Çetin, M., & Top, S. (2018). The effects of paternalistic leadership on workplace loneliness, work family conflict and work engagement among air traffic controllers in Turkey. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 66, 25-35
- Pien, L. C., Chen, I. S., Cheng, W. J., & Cheng, Y. (2020). Work-to-Family Conflict and its Associations With Workers' Burnout, Poor Self-Rated Health, and Minor Mental Disorder: A Survey of General Employees in Taiwan. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 62(8), 588–594. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000001894>
- Raffenaud, A., Unruh, L., Fottler, M., Liu, A. X., & Andrews, D. (2020). A comparative analysis of work-family conflict among staff, managerial, and executive nurses. *Nursing outlook*, 68(2), 231–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2019.08.003>
- Roehling, P.V., Roehling, M.V., & Moen, P. (2001). The Relationship Between Work-Life Policies and Practices and Employee Loyalty: A Life Course Perspective. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22, 141-170.
- Schrag, B. (2001). The Moral Significance of Employee Loyalty. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11(1), 41–66. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3857868>
- Trachtenberg, J., Anderson, S. A., & Sabatelli, R. M. (2009). Work-Home Conflict and Domestic Violence: A Test of a Conceptual Model. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24, 471-483.
- Tseng, L., & Wu, J. (2017). How can financial organizations improve employee loyalty? The effects of ethical leadership, psychological contract fulfillment and organizational identification. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38, 679-698.



- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2001). Identity and cooperative behavior in groups: *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 4, 207–226.
- Uzoigwe, A. G., Low, W. Y., & Noor, S. N. (2016). Predictors of Work-Family Role Conflict and Its Impact on Professional Women in Medicine, Engineering, and Information Technology in Nigeria. *Asia-Pacific journal of public health*, 28(7), 629–637.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1010539516667782>
- Valcour, P.M., & Batt, R.L. (2003). Work-Life Integration: Challenges and Organizational Responses. *Faculty Publications - Human Resource Studies*, 21
- Valdesolo, P., & DeSteno, D. (2007). Moral hypocrisy: Social groups and the flexibility of virtue. *Psychological Science*, 18(8), 689–690. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01961.x>
- Wang, H. M., Lu, G., & Liu, Y. (2017). Ethical Leadership and Loyalty to Supervisor in China: The Roles of Interactional Justice and Collectivistic Orientation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 146, 529-543.
- Wang, M. L., & Tsai, L. J. (2014). Work-family conflict and job performance in nurses: the moderating effects of social support. *The journal of nursing research : JNR*, 22(3), 200–207.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/jnr.00000000000000040>
- Wang, Y., & Li, H. (2019). Moral Leadership and Unethical Pro-organizational Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 2640.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02640>
- Wiklund, F., & Jansson, S. (2019). Employee Loyalty and the Factors Affecting It : A qualitative study comparing people with different working experience on their view of employee loyalty (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-161047>
- Willis, T. A., O'Connor, D. B., & Smith, L. (2008). Investigating effort-reward imbalance and work-family conflict in relation to morningness-eveningness and shift work. *Work & Stress*, 22, 125-137.
- Yao, L., & Li, P. (2019). Moral leadership and employee work–family conflict: A moderated mediation model. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 47, 1-12.
- Yüzbaşıoğlu, N., & Doğan, O. (2018). Relationship between Paternalistic Leadership and Organizational Commitment in Hospitality Industry: Case of Antalya, Turkey. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 7(1)
- Zedeck, S., & Mosier, K. L. (1990). Work in the family and employing organization. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 240–251. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.240>



APPENDIX

1. Gender: 1. Male 2. Female.
2. Age: _____ years.
3. Highest Education: 1. High School
 2. College (2 years) 3. College (4 years) 4. Master 5. Ph. D.
4. Company Tenure: _____ years and _____ months.
5. How long have you worked with your current immediate supervisor: _____ years _____ months.
6. Your position rank: 1. Employees 2.
 First-line Manager 3. Middle-level Manager 4. Top-level Management
7. Which department in your company do you currently belong to:
 1. Research & Development 2. Marketing/Sales 3. Production 4. Quality Control 5. Finance/Accounting 6. Legal
 7. Information System 8. Human Resources 9. Public Relations 10. General Administration/Management
 11. Others: _____.
8. Which industry does your company belong to: 1. High-tech
 Manufacturing 2. Non-tech Manufacturing 3. Wholesale/Retail Business 4. Finance & Insurance 5. Real Estate
 6. Logistic 7. Internet/Communication 8. Consulting 9. Public Relations & Advertising 10. Publishing 11. Leisure Service
 12. Design 13. Construction 14. Healthcare 15. Legal Service 16. Others: _____.
9. Do you currently live with your spouse? 1. Yes 2. No.
10. How many children (< 18 years old) do you currently live with : _____ .
11. How many elder family members (> 65 years old) do you currently live with: _____ .
12. Have you ever studied abroad? If yes, please indicate time and location of your study. 1. Yes, Time:
 _____ years; Location: _____ . 2. No.
13. Have you ever worked overseas? If yes, please indicate time and location of your company. 1. Yes, Time:
 _____ years; Location: _____ . 2. No.
14. In which country were you born? _____, your nationality: _____.
15. What is your first language (mother tongue)? _____.
16. Except for No.15 (first language), please indicate whether you are fluent in (both speaking and writing) the following languages: (Multiple Options)
 1. Chinese 2. English 3. French 4. German 5. Italian 6. Japanese 7. Korean 8. Portuguese 9. Spanish
 10. Other_____.

Work-family Conflict Scale (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000)

| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3 | I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 | When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities/ responsibilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5 | I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7 | My work keeps me from my leisure/interest/friendship more than I would like. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8 | The time I must devote to my job keeps me from my leisure/interest/friendship activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9 | I have to miss leisure/interest/friendship activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10 | When I get off duty from work I am often too frazzled to participate in leisure/interest/friendship activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11 | I am often so emotionally drained when I get off duty from work that it prevents me from leisure/interest/friendship activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12 | Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes I am too stressed to do the leisure/interest/friendship activities I enjoy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Loyalty to Supervisor Scale (Chen et al., 2003)

| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| | How much do you agree with below statement? Please circle the appropriate number (1 to 6) for each statement. (From 1=strongly disagree to 6=strongly agree) | | | | | | |
| 1 | Since starting this job, my personal value and those of my supervisor have become more similar. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | My values are very much the same with my supervisor's. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3 | I praise my supervisor in front of my friends as a great person to work with. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 | To assist my supervisor, I provide information that he/she does not know. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5 | I would voluntarily take full responsibility when my supervisor makes mistakes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6 | I would help my supervisor with his/her personal business. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Perceived Moral Leadership scale (Cheng et al., 2004)



| | How much do you agree with below statement? Please circle the appropriate number (1 to 6) for each statement. (From 1=strongly disagree to 6=strongly agree) | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|----|--|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | Has the courage to report wrongdoings. | | | | | | |
| 2 | Speaks out for unfairly-treated others. | | | | | | |
| 3 | Stands out and fights against injustice. | | | | | | |
| 4 | Wouldn't mind should his/her opinion be not accepted. | | | | | | |
| 5 | Tolerant of criticism. | | | | | | |
| 6 | Open-minded and never minds when being offended. | | | | | | |
| 7 | Doesn't take advantage of company resources on personal affairs. | | | | | | |
| 8 | Doesn't ask subordinates to do personal business for him/her. | | | | | | |
| 9 | Doesn't take advantage of position power to take bribes. | | | | | | |
| 10 | Responsible on job. | | | | | | |
| 11 | Takes responsibility on job and never avoids his/her duty. | | | | | | |
| 12 | Doesn't pass the buck to others when he/she makes a mistake. | | | | | | |
| 13 | Delivers on promise. | | | | | | |
| 14 | Does what he/she says he/she will do. | | | | | | |
| 15 | There is a match between his/her words and actions. | | | | | | |
| 16 | Doesn't evaluate subordinates by personal relationship. | | | | | | |
| 17 | Doesn't give extra attention to subordinates with whom he/she has personal relationship. | | | | | | |
| 18 | Doesn't cover fault for in-group subordinates. | | | | | | |
| 19 | Sets an example to me in all aspects. | | | | | | |
| 20 | Well self-disciplined before demanding upon others. | | | | | | |
| 21 | Leads, rather than follows, subordinates to deal with difficult tasks. | | | | | | |