

# **DIFFERENCES IN PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AS PREDICTORS OF ENGAGEMENT IN WOMEN AND MEN LEADERS.**

**EXTENDED SUMMARY - Alba Gamir Pinazo**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, many women continue to face barriers and obstacles throughout their personal and professional lives. For this reason, the United Nations General Assembly included this issue in two of the seventeen goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, UN, 2016a; United Nations, UN, 2016b).

Many are the barriers and impediments that women leaders have been forced to overcome in order to achieve the same work as a male leader, such as horizontal segregation, gender stereotypes, the glass ceiling, the attribution of domestic chores to women, etc. when overcoming these barriers, women leaders develop a wider range of interpersonal tools and strategies in comparison to their male counterparts (Cifre, et al., 2019; Machín-Rincón, Cifre, Domínguez-Castillo & Segovia-Pérez, 2020; Montalvo-Romero, 2020). It will lead to the fact that men and women do not exercise leadership on equal terms, as women perform more usually transformational leadership (Cifre, Domínguez & Machín, 2019), which can be seen as a personal resource.

According to the demands-resources (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), the fact that these women leaders develop different personal resources, not only will buffer the job demands, but also will generate an increase in the motivation and engagement of the leaders.

One of these personal resources that acts as a antecedent of engagement is Psychological Capital (PsyCap). It is a psychological state of positive development of an individual and is characterised by 4 dimensions: self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience (Luthans, Youssef & Avolio, 2007, p. 3). It has beneficial effects for both, the individual (contributes to its well-being and facilitates the development of skills) and the organisation (psychosocial capital shared among group members) (Salanova, 2008).

As said before, the second type of personal resource that women leaders might develop is transformational leadership, due to the expected patterns developed by women (less hierarchical, more cooperative, more compassionate, etc...) (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & Van Engen, 2003; Ayman & Korabik, 2010).

This leadership style comprised of four dimensions: charisma, inspirational motivation, individual consideration and intellectual stimulation. It not only emphasises change and inspiration by motivating those being led through visions and values, but also provides a way to overcome role incongruence and may act as a personal resource for women leaders, as transformational leadership can be a potential preventive factor in the health dimensions associated with engagement (Cifre, et al., 2019; Eagly et al., 2003).

## **OBJECTIVE AND HYPOTHESIS**

The main objective of the research is to find out the predictive value of PsyCap and transformational leadership on the engagement of women leaders.

**Hypothesis 1 (H1).** PsyCap (efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism) is positively related to engagement (vigour, dedication and absorption).

**Hypothesis 2 (H2).** Transformational leadership (charisma, inspirational motivation, individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation) is positively related to engagement.

**Hypothesis 3 (H3).** Higher scores on Psycap, Transformational Leadership and engagement are expected to be found in women than in men.

**Hypothesis 4 (H4).** PsyCap and transformational leadership contribute to explain more variance in engagement in women than in men.

**Hypothesis 5 (H5).** The PsyCap dimensions contribute to explain more variance in engagement in women than in men.

**Hypothesis 6 (H6).** The transformational leadership dimensions contribute to explain more variance in engagement in women than in men.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The sample for the present study was obtained in a research by the research group GeST (Gender, Health and Work) of the Universitat Jaume I, mainly through professional online networks (LinkedIn) and professional associations. The final sample consists of a total of 342 participants of which 69% are women and 31% are men.

Instruments: the Psycap was assessed through, items from three different scales:, the scale extracted from Machín-Rincón et al. (2020) for self-efficacy; the scale used in Rodríguez-Sánchez et al. (2020) for resilience; and the Psychological Capital

Questionnaire 12 (Luthans et al. 2007) for hope and optimism. For engagement, the Spanish version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli et al. 2002) was used. Finally, transformational leadership was measured using the Spanish version of the MLQ - Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire (Morelo and Morales 1993).

Data analysis: a descriptive analysis and normality analysis was carried out for the sample, followed by a Mann-Whitney U ANOVA, due to the non-normality of the sample, to observe the differences between men and women. A correlation analysis was also performed to confirm the relationships between each of the variables, and finally the hierarchical linear regression analysis to check the interaction, the variance explained, by the transformational leadership and psychological capital variables.

## **RESULTS**

Results of the correlation analysis show that there is a positive relationship between the levels of Psycap and transformational leadership with the levels of engagement, so our first two hypotheses are fulfilled. Mann-Witney U test show that there are differences between both sexes, although the effect size of these is smaller, so we could say that the third hypothesis is partially fulfilled. Finally, results of hierarchical linear regressions analyses show that both the fourth and sixth hypotheses are partially fulfilled, unlike the fifth, which is not fulfilled and is therefore rejected.

Results of the correlation analysis show that there is a positive relationship between the levels of Psycap and transformational leadership with the levels of engagement, so our first two hypotheses are fulfilled. Mann-Witney U test shows that our third hypothesis is not fulfilled, as there are differences between the sexes, but they are not in line with expectations, the high scores are those of men. But, it should be noted that the the effect size of these differences is smaller, so the difference is not very relevant. Finally, results of the hierarchical linear regression analyses show that both the fourth and sixth hypotheses are partially fulfilled, unlike the fifth, which is not fulfilled and is therefore rejected. This shows us that it is not always true that in the case of women the variance is more explained by our variables than in the case of men, and that when this is true, the difference is not excessive.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION**

The results obtained from the correlation analysis are consistent with the trend explained by Cifre et al. (2019) and Machín-Rincón et al. (2020), that Psycap and transformational leadership are positively related to engagement. Then, a good way to

improve the engagement of leaders is to achieve an improvement in their Psycap, and also to encourage them to use transformational leadership.

Regarding the sex differences in the scores of our variables, we expected, that women would score higher than men in all variables. This is due to the barriers they have to overcome, as they generate a higher level of psycap, and their behavioural patterns, which make them more likely to opt for transformational leadership. We have found differences, but these are not in line with expectations, as the scores are higher in men than in women, this may be due to the possible limitation that the study consists of an unequal gender sample, but also the  $r$ , the effect size, is smaller, so we know that these differences are not very relevant.

Finally, the linear regression analyses show that there is not a very high increase in the variance explained (26% and 27%), which confirms the existence of other variables that affect these leaders to vary their engagement. At the same time, it should be noted that the difference in variance explained between men and women by these two variables is not excessive. The same is true for the transformational leadership dimensions (23% and 24%). Even in the Psycap dimensions, the variance explained in men (35%) is greater than that explained in women (30%). What should be noted from this analysis that both variables are significant predictors of work engagement only in the case of women. Also, women have more significant dimensions of both variables than their male counterparts. This might an advantage for women, that organizations should profit, working to achieve gender equality in leadership positions, not only because it is necessary, but also because it will lead to a better well-being for women in this stereotypical men positions (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt y Van Engen, 2003).

# DIFERENCIAS EN EL CAPITAL PSICOLÓGICO Y EL LIDERAZGO TRANSFORMACIONAL COMO PREDICTORES DEL WORK ENGAGEMENT EN MUJERES Y HOMBRES LÍDERES

## INTRODUCCIÓN

Mayor abanico de herramientas y estrategias interpersonales en las mujeres líderes para superar barreras e impedimentos que sus homólogos masculinos.

El modelo de demandas-recursos como marco teórico para comprender el bienestar de las mujeres líderes. Según este, demandas elevadas generan un impacto en los recursos, pudiendo actuar estos como predictores de variables de motivación y/o engagement.

Work engagement (WE) como indicador de bienestar.

El capital psicológico (Psychcap) como recurso personal.

El liderazgo transformacional (LT) como recurso personal.

### OBJETIVO:

Analizar el valor "predictivo" del PsychCap y del liderazgo transformacional sobre el work engagement, así como si existen diferencias entre hombres y mujeres líderes

### HIPÓTESIS:

- H1.** PsychCap está relacionado positivamente con WE.
- H2.** El LT está relacionado positivamente con WE.
- H3.** Se esperan encontrar puntuaciones más elevadas en los niveles de Psychcap, LT y WE en mujeres que en hombres líderes.
- H4.** El PsychCap y el LT contribuyen a explicar más varianza del WE en mujeres que en hombres.
- H5.** Las dimensiones del PsychCap contribuyen a explicar más varianza del WE en mujeres que en hombres.
- H6.** Las dimensiones del LT contribuyen a explicar más varianza del WE en mujeres que en hombres.

## METODOLOGÍA

**Participantes:** Muestra obtenida por el grupo de investigación GeST (Género, Salud y Trabajo), a través de redes online y asociaciones profesionales. Con un total de 342 participantes las cuales 96% mujeres.

### Instrumentos:

- Psychcap: Autoeficacia (Machín-Rincón et al., 2020), resiliencia (Rodríguez-Sánchez et al., 2020), esperanza y optimismo (Cuestionario Capital psicológico 12 (Luthans et al., 2007)).

- Engagement: Escala de Compromiso Laboral de Utrecht (Schaufeli et al. 2002).

- Liderazgo transformacional: Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire (Morelo y Morales 1993).

**Análisis de datos:** Se realizó el análisis descriptivo y de normalidad de la muestra, seguido de un ANOVA de U Mann-Whitney. A continuación una correlación de Rho Spearman y para finalizar el análisis de regresiones lineales jerárquicas.

## RESULTADOS

Tabla 1: Análisis de normalidad

Variables	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Estadístico	gl	Sig.	Estadístico	gl	Sig.
PsychCap	,079	342	,000	,961	342	,000
Lid. Transformacional	,087	338	,000	,956	338	,000
Engagement	,121	338	,000	,886	338	,000
Años puesto actual	,164	341	,000	,860	341	,000
Años en organización	,126	328	,000	,929	328	,000
Edad	,066	331	,002	,985	331	,002

Tabla 2: Correlaciones Rho Spearman

	PsychCap	PC_Esp	PC_Opt	PC_Auto	PC_Res	Lid.Trans.	LT_Caris	LT_Insp	LT_Consi	LT_Esti	Eng.	Eng_Vig	Eng_Ded	Eng_Abs
PsychCap	1,000													
Esp.	,720**	1,000												
Opt.	,635**	,471**	1,000											
Auto.	,867**	,433**	,370**	1,000										
Res.	,645**	,484**	,439**	,383**	1,000									
Lid. Trans.	,689**	,479**	,403**	,631**	,476**	1,000								
Carisma	,612**	,473**	,358**	,534**	,496**	,801**	1,000							
Mot. Insp.	,576**	,409**	,342**	,519**	,309**	,856**	,588**	1,000						
Cons. Ind.	,601**	,376**	,350**	,566**	,469**	,840**	,594**	,577**	1,000					
Esti. Int.	,405**	,281**	,209**	,403**	,277**	,654**	,447**	,432**	,496**	1,000				
Eng.	,473**	,461**	,427**	,296**	,401**	,429**	,376**	,351**	,320**	,383**	1,000			
Vigor	,478**	,471**	,403**	,311**	,391**	,382**	,362**	,323**	,277**	,307**	,888**	1,000		
Dedica.	,499**	,491**	,434**	,320**	,378**	,431**	,389**	,374**	,310**	,347**	,874**	,764**	1,000	
Absorción	,266**	,243**	,261**	,185**	,292**	,286**	,246**	,192**	,236**	,331**	,782**	,521**	,527**	1,000

\*\* La correlación es significativa en el nivel 0,01 (unilateral). \* La correlación es significativa en el nivel 0,05 (unilateral).

PsychCap: Capital psicológico, Esp.: Esperanza, Opt.: Optimismo, Auto.: Autoeficacia, Res.: Resiliencia, Lid. Trans.: Liderazgo transformacional, Mot. Insp.: Motivación inspiracional, Cons. Ind.: Consideración individual, Esti. Int.: Estimulación intelectual, Eng.: Engagement, Dedica.: Dedicación.

Tabla 3: Prueba U de Mann-Whitney (Dif. H y M)

Variables	Hombres		Mujeres		Valor z	p	r
	Rango promedio	Rango promedio	Rango promedio	Rango promedio			
PsychCap	192,77	161,18	-2,740	,006**	0,15		
Lid. Transformacional	186,12	161,36	-2,156	,031*	0,12		
Engagement	172,80	167,30	-4,479	,632	0,03		

\* = p < 0,05; \*\* = p < 0,01; r -> 0,3 efecto pequeño; r -> 0,5 efecto medio; r < 0,5 efecto grande.

Tabla 4: Regresión lineal jerárquica

Predictores	Hombres (n = 106)				Mujeres (n = 236)			
	B	t	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	B	t	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>
Paso 1: Control			.04				0	
Edad	.036	1.33			-.017	-.89		
Años en el puesto	-.022	-1.72			-.001	-.09		
Años en la organización	.009	.78			.005	.43		
Paso 2: Escalas totales			.30**	.26**			.27**	.27**
Lid. Transformacional	.27	1.77*			.26	2.53*		
PsychCap	.50	2.41*			.52	4.27**		

\*\* Valor estadísticamente significativo p ≤ .01 \* Valor estadísticamente significativo p ≤ .05

† Valor estadísticamente significativo p ≤ .10

Tabla 5: Regresión lineal jerárquica

Predictores	Hombres (n = 106)				Mujeres (n = 236)			
	B	t	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	B	t	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>
Paso 1: Control			.04				.01	
Edad	.036	1.33			-.018	-.93		
Años en el puesto	-.022	-1.72			-.003	-.28		
Años en la organización	.009	.78			.006	.60		
Paso 2: Dimensiones PsychCap			.39**	.35**			.31**	.30**
Esperanza	.445	3.99**			.235	2.98**		
Optimismo	.068	.92			.198	3.45**		
Autoeficacia	.006	.05			.069	.83		
Resiliencia	.289	2.26*			.233	2.36**		

\*\* Valor estadísticamente significativo p ≤ .01 \* Valor estadísticamente significativo p ≤ .05

Tabla 6: Regresión lineal jerárquica

Predictores	Hombres (n = 106)				Mujeres (n = 236)			
	B	t	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	B	t	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>
Paso 1: Control			.04				0	
Edad	.036	1.33			-.017	-.89		
Años en el puesto	-.022	-1.72			-.001	-.09		
Años en la organización	.009	.78			.005	.43		
Paso 2: Dimensiones Lid. Tra.			.27**	.23**			.24**	.24**
Motivación Inspiracional	.093	.90			.091	1.11		
Carisma	.256	2.03*			.213	2.51*		
Consideración Individual	.083	.55			.019	.23		
Estimulación Intelectual	.126	1.33			.253	3.76**		

\*\* Valor estadísticamente significativo p ≤ .01 \* Valor estadísticamente significativo p ≤ .05

## CONCLUSIÓN Y DISCUSIÓN

- Psychcap y LT se relacionan positivamente con WE. Una buena forma de mejorar el WE es conseguir una mejora del Psychcap e incitar a utilizar el LT.
- Las diferencias entre hombres y mujeres no son las esperadas. Puede deberse a la limitación de que el estudio consta de una muestra desigual de género.
- No hay un aumento elevado de la varianza explicada entre el Psychcap y LT con el WE (26% y 27%): posibilidad de otras variables que afectan a estos líderes para variar su WE, además la diferencia de varianza explicada entre géneros por estas no es excesiva. Lo mismo ocurre con las dimensiones.
- En el caso de las mujeres, PsychCap y LT son predictoras significativas, mientras que en el caso de los hombres no. Más dimensiones significativas de ambas variables que sus homólogos masculinos.
- Lograr la igualdad de género por parte de las organizaciones, no solo porque es necesario, sino también porque conducirá a un mayor bienestar tanto para las mujeres como para la organización.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Ayman, Roya., y Korabik, Karen (2010). Leadership: Why Gender and Culture Matter. *American Psychologist*, 65(3), 157–170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018806>
- Bakker, Arnold B., y Demerouti, Evangelia. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Cifre, Eva.; Dominguez, M Pilar., y Machin, Laritza M., (2019). *Liderazgo transformacional y capital psicológico como fuentes de bienestar ocupacional psicosocial de mujeres líderes: ¿también en los hombres?* XIV edición 2019 premio de psicología “lafourcade”. Fundación Lafourcade-11 para el bienestar psicológico.
- Cifre, Eva; Garitza, Leire; Domínguez, M. Pilar; Marchín, Laritza; Laguna, M. Pilar., y Segovia, Monica. (2019, julio). *Mujer, líder y cuidadora también en el trabajo. ¿Y yo?: Liderazgo transformacional y salud psicosocial de mujeres líderes*. Comunicación presentada en el XIII Congreso Español de Sociología, Valencia, España.
- Demerouti, Evangelia; Bakker, Arnold B.; Nachreiner, Friedhelm., y Schaufeli, Wilmar B. (2001a), “The job demands-resources model of burnout”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 499-512.
- Eagly, Alice H.; Johannesen-Schmidt, Mary. C., y Van Engen, Merloes. L. (2003). Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men. In *Psychological Bulletin* (Vol. 129, Issue 4, pp. 569–591). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569>
- Luthans, Fred; Avolio, Bruce J.; Avey, James B., y Norman, Steven M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. In *Personnel Psychology* (Vol. 60, Issue 3, pp. 541–572). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>
- Luthans, Fred; Youssef, Carolyn M., y Avolio, Bruce J. (2007). Psychological Capital: Developing the Human Competitive Edge. In *Psychological Capital: Developing the Human Competitive Edge*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195187526.001.0001>

Machín-Rincón, Laritza; Cifre, Eva; Domínguez-Castillo, Pilar., y Segovia-Pérez, Monica. (2020). I am a leader, i am a mother, i can do this! the moderated mediation of psychological capital, work-family conflict, and having children on well-being of women leaders. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(5), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12052100>

Montalvo Romero, Josefa. (2020). El trabajo desde la perspectiva de género. *Revista de La Facultad de Derecho*, 49, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.22187/rfd2020n49a6>

Organización de las Naciones Unidas. (2016a). *Crecimiento económico - Desarrollo Sostenible. Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible.* <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/es/economic-growth/>

Organización de las Naciones Unidas. (2016b). *Igualdad de género y empoderamiento de la mujer - Desarrollo Sostenible. Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible.* <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/es/gender-equality/>

Salanova, Marisa (2008). Organizaciones Saludables Y Desarrollo Desarrollo de Recursos Humanos. *Revista de Trabajo y Seguridad Social*, 47(303), 179–214.