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ABSTRACT

The fluid and dynamic nature of leadership processes lends itself to a type of self-concept that is variable and subject to ongoing regulation at the level of events. Multiple theories of leadership infer an evolving self-concept, but this study represents the first attempt to measure it, explore its nature, and assess its adaptability in terms of important developmental and perceptual outcomes. A pilot study with 97 undergraduates was used to develop multidimensional measures of leadership identity and variability. These measures were further scrutinized in a study of 113 MBA students who wrote about and rated their leadership in 4-6 distinct events that unfolded over the course of three weeks. Across both studies, results confirmed the existence of significant event-level variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness, and importance. The utilization of two distinct regulation strategies, reappraisal and suppression, was also found to vary. Leaders differed from one another in the extent to which their identification and regulation remained stable or varied across events. Both implicit person theories and variability in event characteristics were found to predict variability in the four focal variability constructs. Overall, these results provide evidence for the importance of studying leadership identity dynamics at the level of events instead of limiting exploration to the person-level. Significant opportunities to expand upon these findings are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It is widely presumed that self-concepts exhibit dynamic variability over time. A common label for this phenomenon is *identity work*, defined as the process of “forming, repairing, maintaining, strengthening, or revising” relevant identities (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003, p. 1165). Self-concepts are constructed and developed in the context of environmental and social feedback, which prompt the ongoing modification of self-conceptualizations (e.g., Day & Harrison, 2007; Fiske & Dyer, 1985; Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2010). In particular, external validation or invalidation of identity claims can either serve to strengthen, weaken, or re-direct subsequent identity development efforts (DeRue & Asford, 2010; Farmer & Van Dyne, 2010). A key implication of these constructs is that the experience of identity change over time is likely to differ substantially from one person to the next. Nevertheless, attempts to quantify the manner in which individual identities vary are notably lacking. The primary purpose of the present research is to further explore the construct of identity variability, its measurement, and its relationship to leadership development and perceptions.

This project focuses on identity variability within the domain-specific context of a leadership self-concept. Dynamic change in leadership identity has largely been studied in terms of broad career (e.g., Mumford, Zacarro, Johnson, Diana, Gilbert, & Threlfall, 2000) and skill-based (e.g., Lord & Hall, 2005) trajectories, whereby the identities of
leaders at different stages of career progression (e.g., novice, intermediate, or expert levels of skill; Lord & Hall, 2005) are compared and contrasted. Other treatments of leader self-concept fluctuation have acknowledged dynamics such as shared leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2003), which necessitate variability in terms of the discrete (e.g., follower, leader) or skill-related (e.g., conflict manager, coordinator of resources) identities leaders choose between in a given situation (e.g., Hannah, Lord, & Pearce, 2012). Notably absent from these treatments is theory and research that specifies the manner and extent to which individuals vary in their identification with a leadership self-concept across events, and how this variability impacts important outcomes ranging from developmental readiness (Hannah & Avolio, 2010) to other-source ratings of performance effectiveness (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008).

Accordingly, the purpose of the present research was threefold. First, by synthesizing previous work that alludes to variability in leadership identity, this study sought to identify multiple dimensions along which individuals vary with regard to their leadership self-concept. Based upon these findings, a second goal of this study was to develop psychometrically sound measures of within-leader variability in identity. Third, in order to establish identity variability as an important individual difference, this construct was studied in terms of its relationship with a variety of relevant antecedents as well as performance-related outcomes.

Variability in leadership identity is inherently longitudinal. It also represents an aggregate construct, in that multiple measurements of event-level leadership identity perceptions are needed to model the extent to which variability occurs across events. Accordingly, the primary study employed a three-wave longitudinal design in order to
assess variability in event-level perceptions of leadership identity across a series of work-related leadership events. Furthermore, the absence of an established within-person, event-level measure of leadership identity required the development of a valid and reliable measure. To accomplish this objective, a laboratory experiment was conducted in the pilot phase in order to validate a measure of dimensional event-level leadership identity. The following chapter includes a broad overview of the research problem and a brief description of the meta-hypotheses guiding this research project, the research conducted, and its potential contributions.

**Overview of the Problem**

An identity is often referred to as a “self-concept” because a concept represents a set of features that are linked together by their ability to adequately represent a discrete mental category (Kihlstrom, Beer, & Klein, 2003). Some of these linkages are relatively stable over time and situation, while other aspects appear to be malleable and contextually-driven (Markus & Kunda, 1986). Core and stable features of identity are referred to as the *self-concept* and defined as “a system of affective-cognitive structures about the self that lends structure and coherence to the individual’s self-relevant experiences” (Markus & Nurius, 1986, p. 955). The self-concept serves as an interpretive framework that informs the manner in which both *intrapersonal* and *interpersonal* information is processed and responded to (Markus & Wurf, 1987).

A second relevant aspect of identity is the *working self-concept* (WSC), the limited portion of our overall self-concept that is activated in a particular situation (Farmer & Van Dyne, 2010; Lord & Brown, 2001). Markus and Kunda (1986, p. 859) define the WSC as “a temporary structure consisting of elements from the collection of
self-conceptions, organized in a configuration determined by ongoing social events.” Self-concepts are “situated” in the sense that different configurations of personal attributes, or self-representations, are activated by the role demands of a particular situation (Markus & Wurf, 1987). This enables individuals to possess more than one self-concept (e.g., leader, follower, mentor), which enables an efficient adaptation and response to events that would not be possible if self-conceptualizations were constructed from the ground up for every situation a person encounters.

Individuals can be thought of as complex configurations of multiple identities that vary in terms of contextual activation and associated traits, goals, and cognitive-affective states (McConnell, 2010). Some of these identities (e.g., daughter, female) are innate and inherent, while other identities (e.g., work-related identities) are optional and subject to evaluation over time. One such identity is a leadership self-concept, which people have the option of claiming for themselves or granting to other individuals (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Research has identified a number of factors that can either promote or inhibit the development of optional self-concepts such as leadership identity. Critical obstacles include a lack of formal leader identity status (Day & Harrison, 2007), social feedback that challenges or fails to confer a leadership identity (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Giessner & Van Knippenberg, 2008), failure to identify or associate with individuals possessing a similar work identity (Elsbach, 1999; Walsh & Gordon, 2007), and possessing qualities that are non-prototypical of identity exemplars (Banaji & Prentice, 1994; Hogg, 2001). Factors promoting identity development include identity-development resources (Luhrmann & Eberl, 2007), salient identity-consistent attributes (McConnell, 2010), and group memberships that assist in a) the development of desired selves and b) the
avoidance of feared selves (Cameron, 1999). These factors and others like them have been shown to facilitate or impede ensuing identity development and performance efforts. However, it remains to be understood what these dynamics look like as they unfold within a particular activated identity (e.g., leadership identity) at the level of events.

**The Dimensional Nature of Identity**

An important prerequisite for studying the dynamic nature of leadership identity is a fundamental understanding of what self-concepts are and how they are experienced. Three distinct dimensions of leadership identity can be ascertained from previous work in the broader realm of self-concept research. The first is *activation*, defined as the extent to which a leadership identity is being used as a frame of reference at any given time (Bargh, 1982; McConnell, 2010; Smith & Semin, 2004). Dynamic systems theories (e.g., Freeman & Ambady, 2011) imply that person construal and in particular, self-construal is not ubiquitous and devoid of context. That is, leaders do not view themselves primarily as leaders in all situations (e.g., work, non-work). Rather, leadership identities are activated, or used as the basis for making performance judgments, in specific contexts that warrant assuming the role of leader. Inasmuch as leaders differ in terms of their assessments of when it is necessary to assume a leadership identity, this source of variability (e.g., leader identity activation) may function as an informative source of between-leader differences.

Two additional dimensions of identity were proposed by Cross and Markus (1994) and used to classify individuals as “schematic” or “aschematic” with regard to a problem-solving identity. One dimension pertained to how individuals perceived a potential dimension such as “problem-solvers” as *self-descriptive*, or representative of
their skills, while the second dimension gauged the self-perceived importance, or relevance of being an effective problem-solver. A leadership identity is similar to a problem-solving identity in that it is skill-based (Lord & Hall, 2005), making it reasonable to infer that similar self-descriptiveness and importance judgments are made as individuals assess their identity as leaders. Prior research supports the notion that self-perceptions of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance are likely to vary to a different extent depending on the leader. For instance, leaders with an expert level of skill-related experience are likely to exhibit more stability in terms of identity self-descriptiveness, relative to novice leaders (Lord & Hall, 2005). Nevertheless, the extent to which individuals vary in self-assessments of identity descriptiveness and importance has yet to be studied. Cross and Markus (1994) relied upon single-item, one-time measurements of identity-related skill and importance as a means of studying problem-solving identity at the person level rather than the within-person event level.

As stated previously, identity activation, descriptiveness, and relevance judgments are likely to be more variable for some people than others. Activation can vary as a function of context, which provides exposure to environmental cues and feedback that elicit and validate a leadership identity (Day & Harrison, 2007; DeRue, Ashford, & Cotton, 2009). Importantly, leaders are also exposed to contextual cues and social feedback processes that activate other viable work (e.g., follower) and non work-related (e.g., parent) self-concepts (Cheung & Halpern, 2010; Kark & Van Dijk, 2007). Variability in identity self-descriptiveness judgments can be influenced by internal factors such as self-esteem (Atwater, Dionne, Avolio, Camobreco, & Lau, 1999), failure to identify with others exhibiting a similar identity (Elsbach, 1999), and associating the
identity with feared selves (Markus, 1977). External factors can also contribute to variable judgments of a particular identity’s descriptiveness, and might include failed attempts at claiming an identity (DeRue & Ashford, 2010), the presence or absence of leaders with similar demographic features (Hogg, 2001), and positive/negative identity exemplars (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007).

Identity importance judgments can fluctuate as situations make particular identities more or less relevant (Day & Harrison, 2007; Mendoza-Denton, Ayduk, Mischel, Shoda, & Testa, 2001). For instance, diminishing job security and/or employment durability could render a work-related identity (e.g., leader identity) more or less important as a function of whether the employee intends to continue in his/her current role or experiment with provisional identities (Alvesson & Wilmott, 2002; Lane & Scott, 2007). Finally, the activation of other relevant self-aspects can render an identity momentarily less important. For instance, a manager receiving a call from her child’s school about a disciplinary issue is likely to temporarily disengage from her manager self-concept in order to address a parenting issue through the lens of her parent or mother self-concept.

In summary, the self-concept literature suggests that leadership identity is a multidimensional construct. Leaders are likely to vary meaningfully in the extent to which their levels of leadership identity activation, self-descriptiveness, and importance fluctuate over time. These differences in fluctuation are likely to be caused by a variety of factors, just as they are likely to influence a range of developmental and performance-related outcomes. Better understanding the specific nature of leadership self-concept can
assist in the development of guiding propositions for the exploration of identity variability constructs, which are briefly discussed in the following section.

**Guiding Propositions**

A key proposition of this research is that the influence of identity-related obstacles and assets on leader success might be better understood in terms of the extent to which individuals vary in their identification with a leadership self-concept. Specifically, the detriment of obstacles and the benefit of assets could be more pronounced for leaders who possess either too little or too much sensitivity to the self-relevant cues and feedback emanating from leadership episodes. For instance, negative performance feedback could be an obstacle to leader success amongst those interpreting such feedback as a threat to the self-descriptiveness of a leadership self-concept. The same feedback episode, however, could serve as a constructive development tool for a second person whose leadership self-conceptualization is adaptable to external cues.

A second and related meta-hypothesis of this study is that leaders vary in the extent to which they are prompted by events to dynamically re-evaluate their dimensional leadership identity. That is, variability in leadership identity can be thought of as existing along a continuum. Highly stable leaders, at one extreme, maintain consistent perceptions of themselves as leaders across events, showing minimal to no variability in terms of how important or self-descriptive a leadership self-concept is. At the other extreme, highly variable leaders frequently vacillate between perceiving a leadership role as highly important and self-descriptive of themselves and the opposite, questioning their fit as leaders along with the significance of their leadership. Thus, events that pose obstacles and opportunities for leadership identity-development have a strong influence
on these individuals. A useful analogue for this type of continuum is the notion of core affect variability (e.g., Kuppens, Oravecz, & Tuerlinckx, 2010), which suggests that people can be distinguished in terms of whether their core experience of affect across events is highly stable, highly unstable, or somewhere in-between.

Self-concept stability has long been identified by scholars as a preferred-state (Greenwald, 1980; Markus, 1977; Swann & Read, 1981), regardless of the tendency many have to experience at least some degree of dynamic variability (see Markus & Kunda, 1986 for a demonstration of this). Accordingly, a third meta-hypothesis of the present research is that leaders attempt to mitigate the impact of leadership self-concept variability on outcomes by engaging in identity regulation, or efforts designed to restore one’s view of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance to acceptable levels (i.e., to the perceiver). One notable implication of this view is that highly variable leaders will engage in a greater degree of identity regulation than highly stable leaders.

Attempts to self-regulate have commonly been described in terms of two mechanisms; reappraisal and suppression (Gross & John, 2003). Reappraisal efforts consist of attempts to cognitively frame a situation to make its impact less negative. Suppression efforts enable an individual to display an external image (e.g., confidence) that is inconsistent with one’s true thoughts and feelings, yet more socially acceptable.

Studying all the ways that variability in leadership identity could be modeled as an individual difference is beyond the scope of this research. Numerous possibilities emerge when previous insights from the identity-based literature are synthesized, and many of these will be identified and discussed in the literature review. However, given practical constraints, this study focused on two specific types of variability that a) have
been prominently discussed in the identity literature, b) have direct relevance for studying leadership identity, and c) have been successfully modeled in other literatures (e.g., affect, goal-setting). These are variability in multidimensional leadership identity (i.e., activation, self-descriptiveness, importance) and efforts to regulate leadership self-concept (i.e., reappraisal, suppression).

**Measuring Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation**

Traditional approaches to measuring identity consist of one-time observations of an individual’s subjective assessments of identity fit and importance (Cross & Markus, 1994). These assessments are then compared at the between-persons level of analysis as a means of determining how schematic or aschematic individuals are with regard to a particular identity. In other words, a single measurement is used to study inter-individual variability with regard to a specific type of identity, such as problem-solving (Cross & Markus, 1994). Meanwhile, the emergence and growing sophistication of multilevel research methodologies makes it possible to assess and analyze multiple event-level measurements of self-perceived identity activation, descriptiveness, and relevance within a single leader. Accordingly, a multiple-measurement paradigm seems better suited to capture the dynamic features that characterize a working self-concept (Markus & Wurf, 1987).

For this study, multiple event level measurements of leadership identity variability and regulation were collected and analyzed for each individual. Participants were asked to recall in specific detail a series of distinct events when they were called upon to engage in leadership behavior(s). For each of these events, subjects then completed the measures of leadership identity variability and regulation developed in the
Identifying Relevant Antecedents and Outcomes

A number of factors are likely to influence the likelihood that a leadership identity is activated and regulated. They also influence the impact of events on one’s self-assessments of a leadership identity’s self-descriptiveness and importance. The present research focused on two individual antecedents, core self-evaluations (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997) and implicit person theories (Dweck, 1986), as well as on a third contextual antecedent, event characteristics (Hoffman & Lord, 2013). Core self-evaluations (CSEs) are described by Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) as “bottom-line evaluations that individuals hold about themselves” (p. 80) and reflect aggregate assessments of one’s self-esteem, ability to be successful, situational control, and emotional stability. Low CSEs are indicative of higher uncertainty, which could increase the frequency with which someone questions their identity as a leader, as well as their ability as a leader to influence outcomes (i.e., the importance dimension of identity). Implicit person theories (IPTs: Dweck, 1986) are defined as individual beliefs regarding the flexibility of personal characteristics. Leaders possessing incrementalist IPTs, which reflect the belief that personal features are malleable, might demonstrate subsequent malleability in self-assessments of leadership identity and regulation, relative to leaders possessing entitist IPTs, or the belief that self-aspects are stable and rigid.
Theory specifying event characteristics (Hoffman & Lord, 2013) contends that leader behavior varies as a function of different types of events, which makes it prudent to study leadership development and perceptions at the event level. For instance, events that are novel and extraordinary could engender higher degrees of variability in leadership identity and regulation, relative to other events that are familiar and ordinary.

Variability in leadership identity and regulation is also hypothesized to contribute in meaningful ways to relevant outcomes. The nature of these relationships is likely to reflect an inverted-U, such that moderate amounts of self-concept variability and regulation efforts will be preferable to low or high amounts. The present research focused on two such outcomes; developmental readiness and other-source ratings of leadership performance. Developmental readiness (Hannah & Avolio, 2010) refers to the extent that leaders are motivated to and capable of developing the knowledge, skills, and abilities they have as leaders. Identity instability could interfere with one’s ability and motivation to develop, while too much stability could also hinder readiness by reducing motivation to engage in development-related programs. Other-source ratings of leadership performance reflect external perceptions of leaders with regard to critical leadership functions. This research proposes that external raters are capable of subtly detecting low, moderate, and high amounts of variability in leadership identity and regulation. High levels of variability could be indicative of low confidence, while low levels of variability might be indicative of overconfidence. Accordingly, a primary purpose of this study was to identify optimal levels of identity variability and regulation in terms of their capacity to affect developmental readiness and other-source ratings of performance effectiveness.
A conceptual map of these relationships is presented in Figure 2.2. In order to model and test these relationships, two studies were conducted as described below.

**Description of Pilot Study**

An important first step to establishing the significance of leadership identity variability and regulation was constructing and validating measures that are capable of assessing these dynamics across events. In order to achieve this aim, a pilot study was conducted amongst 100 undergraduate students from The University of Akron with work-related leadership experience. Study participants were prompted to visualize and briefly reflect upon three events that required them to engage in leadership behavior. Thus, a leadership self-concept was primed. After separately reflecting on each experience, participants were presented with a series of 12 items assessing leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance (i.e., 6 items for each dimension) as well as 20 items assessing identity regulation. Identity activation was assessed by having subjects recall and reflect upon three additional events that were neither self-concept based nor leadership-related and also pertained to someone they knew. Following each set of events, participants completed a lexical decision task consisting of leadership-related words and non-words. The operating assumption of this task was that participant reaction times to leader words would be quicker following reflection upon personal episodes of leadership behavior as opposed to impersonal episodes of another person’s behavior, providing support for leadership identity activation. Responses to the identity variability and regulation measures were factor analyzed to assess dimensionality, and items failing to load on a single dimension were discarded to create leaner scales with better psychometric qualities.
Description of Primary Study

Once measures of variability in leadership identity and regulation were developed and modified in accordance with the pilot study results, a primary study was undertaken to link these sources of variability to the antecedents and outcomes discussed above. One hundred and thirteen graduate students (i.e., students enrolled in a Masters of Business Administration program) were enlisted to participate in an online-based, three-wave longitudinal study, which unfolded in three phases.

In phase one, participants were briefed on the nature of the study and asked to complete a series of dispositional measures gauging core self-evaluations, implicit person theories, and developmental readiness (i.e., motivation and ability to develop). Subjects were also asked to reflect and write about two events where they engaged in leadership behavior. For each of these events, subjects completed the variability in leadership identity and regulation scales, as well as a measure of event characteristics.

In phase two, participants were contacted via e-mail one week following the completion of phase one to reflect on and write about two new events (i.e., events they did not use for phase one) that required them to engage in leadership behavior. For each of these events, subjects once again completed the variability in leadership identity and regulation scales, as well as a measure of event characteristics. Having subjects complete these measures at multiple time points assisted in reducing possible fatigue effects, while providing a sample with multiple measurement points (i.e., 6 leadership events) as a basis for calculating variability indices.

For phase three, participants were contacted via e-mail one week following the completion of phase two to reflect on and write about two additional events (i.e., events
they did not use for phase one or phase two) that required them to engage in leadership behavior.

Subjects were asked to provide the e-mail address and/or name of three of their supervisors or instructors at the end of phase one. The first supervisor or instructor they listed was sent an e-mail two weeks later (i.e., once participants had completed phase two) with a link to a scale where they were asked to rate their leadership perceptions of the participant. Contact information for three instructors was collected to increase the probability of obtaining other-source data from at least one source for each participant.

**Potential Contributions of the Proposed Research**

Studying variability in leadership identity and regulation was found to contribute to existing theory in two primary ways (see Chapter VI for a more complete discussion). First, the present research added a new micro level to self-concept research by considering variability within self-concepts at the level of events. A similar contribution was made with regard to identity regulation, which is currently studied at the person level (e.g., identity work; Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2010) but not at the event level. Efforts to model related person-level dynamics (e.g., affect; Kuppens, Van Mechelen, Nezlek, Dossche, & Timmermans, 2007; Kuppens et al., 2010: goals; Ilies & Judge, 2005; Richard & Diefendorff, 2011) at the level of events have resulted in notable gains, which suggests that the application of a similar lens to identity-related dynamics could provide a substantial benefit.

Confirming the existence of discernible differences in leadership self-concept variability would naturally lead to a second question of theoretical significance; how much variability is optimal? High stability in self-perceived identity importance and
descriptiveness could be indicative of confidence or expert levels of leadership skill development, but it could also suggest narcissism. Research, for instance, suggests that narcissists attribute performance and feedback to external (e.g., others) rather than internal (e.g., self-concept related) sources (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Stucke, 2003). Indeed, it could be that an optimal level of self-concept variability is neither high nor low, but moderate, suggesting a curvilinear relationship (see Pierce & Aguinis, 2013, for a review of individual differences that exhibit curvilinear relationships with important workplace outcomes). Efforts to regulate self-concept at the level of events might follow a similar or different pattern from that established by self-concept variability. The data provided by this study enabled a single and limited test of these questions, but future theory can specify the basis for determining optimal levels of variability and regulation for leadership self-concepts as well as other work-related self-concepts.

Leadership development practices could also benefit from this research in at least three ways. First, the present research encourages practitioners to develop identity-based and event-level performance assessment tools that are capable of capturing dynamic fluctuation, or a lack thereof, amongst leaders. Second, the results of this study provide a valuable impetus for leadership development programs that are based in identity rather than more traditional foci such as skill development. Such programs could focus on promoting factors that facilitate identity development and/or inhibiting factors that inhibit identity development, as discussed previously. Finally, valid measures of leader self-concept variability and regulation could provide a means of initially assessing and subsequently tracking leaders as they develop over time. In doing so, progression towards an optimal level of variability or regulation could be monitored.
The following chapters provide a theoretical and empirical rationale for acknowledging the influence of self-concept variability and regulation efforts in leadership research in particular and self-concept research in general. Chapter II reviews the existing literature in order to identify variability in leadership identity and regulation as identified, yet untested theoretical assumptions. Chapter III provides the methodology and results for a pilot study designed to develop valid measures of variability in leadership identity and regulation. In Chapters IV and V, the relationships hypothesized in Chapter II are measured and tested by means of a primary study involving MBA students. Specifically, leadership identity variability and regulation are studied within a broader nomological network of relevant antecedents as well as developmental and perception-based outcomes. The results of these hypothesis tests are then described in terms of implications for leadership and self-concept research in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview of the Literature

Leadership identity constitutes a single, domain-specific manifestation of an individual’s self-concept. Contextual features play an integral role in activating leadership identity, and can also influence the extent to which such an identity is perceived to be self-descriptive and important. Individual differences such as core self-evaluations and implicit person theories are likely to interact with contextual features of events to produce situational variability in leadership identity as well as efforts to regulate it. Accordingly, some individuals experience a high amount of cross-situational stability in their identification with a leadership self-concept, while others may experience significant instability. Variability in self-concept identification and regulation, in turn, is likely to impact developmental and performance-related outcomes in a curvilinear fashion. High amounts of stability or instability could have adverse effects on development and other-source perceptions, while a moderate amount may be optimal in terms of facilitating these outcomes.

The present chapter builds a conceptual argument that variability in leadership identity and regulation are substantive constructs capable of making an important contribution to the leadership and self-concept literatures. In order to accomplish this objective, existing theory and research are first brought to bear in developing the notions
of variability in leadership identity and regulation from their most basic elements. Additional literature pertaining to core self evaluations, implicit person theories, and event characteristics is then reviewed as a means of positioning these constructs as noteworthy person- and event-level antecedents. Extant research will also be reviewed implying that important organizational outcomes are directly affected by the stability (or instability) of an individual’s ongoing assessment and regulation of a leadership self-concept. In particular, other-source perceptions of leadership and developmental readiness will be examined as outcomes of interest. Finally, variability in leadership identity and regulation will be described as explanatory mechanisms, or mediating variables, of the antecedent-to-outcome relationships previously described.

**Developing a Multidimensional Definition of Leadership Self-Concept**

Any definition of leadership self-concept must proceed from a broader understanding of the identity literature and the various ways in which it has contributed to existing understandings of what it means to be a leader. The following section moves from the self-concept literature to the leadership literature and synthesizes the two to arrive at a multidimensional definition of leadership self-concept.

**Self-Concepts Defined**

Identities, or self-concepts, are traditionally defined as a type of cognitive *schema*, or structure for organizing information. According to Markus (1977), “Self-schemata are cognitive generalizations about the self, derived from past experience, that organize and guide the processing of self-related information contained in the individual’s social experiences” (p. 64). Fiske and Dyer (1985) further define self-schemata as cognitive structures that consist of informational nodes connected together by associative links.
The evolution of these organizing frameworks is believed to begin when an individual adopts a provisional self, or an idea of what they a) might become, b) would like to become, or c) fear becoming (Markus & Nurius, 1986). Provisional selves are subjected to social experimentation, and a combination of internal standards and external (social) feedback are used to assess perceived fit (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Ibarra, 1999). Ultimately, a decision is made in terms of whether the provisional self is “schematic,” or consistent with one’s sense of self, as opposed to “aschematic” (Cross & Markus, 1994). Schematic identities are incorporated into one’s self network and subjected to continual modification, or identity work. Svenningson and Alvesson (2003) define the process of identity work as any effort consistent with “forming, repairing, maintaining, strengthening, or revising” (p. 1165) a particular identity and its mental representation.

Above and beyond assisting with the organization of information, self-concepts serve a social function. Among the social motives believed to drive self-assessments are self knowledge, self-enhancement, and self-improvement (Banaji & Prentice, 1994). In a basic sense, identities are inherently social (e.g., leader, student, sister), requiring other people (Gergen & Davis, 1985; Markus & Wurf, 1987) or groups (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1985) to serve as points of reference that give an identity meaning. For instance, Social Comparison Theory (e.g., Dunning, 2003) suggests that individuals determine the suitability of an identity for their self by comparison to salient and prototypical members, or exemplars, of a given identity category. The process of constructing and maintaining an identity is also social in that it requires an individual to negotiate a desired or claimed identity with those around them, who in turn can choose to
either a) accept and validate the identity, b) reject and invalidate it, or c) accept a modified version (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; DeRue et al., 2009).

Scholars are fairly consistent in terms of identifying fundamental characteristics of self-concepts. For instance, a predominant view is that individuals define their identity at three distinct levels; an individual level, where self is defined in comparison to others, a relational level, where self is defined in terms of social roles, and a collective level, where self is defined in terms of group membership (e.g., Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Lord & Brown, 2003; Lord, Brown, & Freiberg, 1999). Other research has suggested that self-concept distinctions can be finer-grained, reflecting intra-individual and skill-based distinctions such as “problem solver” (Cross & Markus, 1994) rather than inter-individual distinctions based on social comparisons (e.g., leader). Nevertheless, most would concur with Cross and Markus (1994) in acknowledging both the independent (e.g., cognitive structure) and interdependent (e.g., social nature) functions of self-concept. Indeed, research implicates distinctive cognitive mechanisms in the operation of independent and dependent identity-related processes (Kuhnen, Hannover, & Schubert, 2001).

**Important Controversies Pertaining to Self-Concept**

Three important controversies in the self-concept literature merit special mention in view of the basic premise that identification with a leadership self-aspect is subject to variability across events and time. They are the manner in which someone’s relevant identities are organized, the extent to which identities are stable versus malleable, and the degree to which espoused identities are context-dependent as opposed to context-independent. The following section provides a brief overview of each of these debates as well as their significance to the research at hand.
Structural Organization of Identities

The existence of multiple self-relevant identities necessitates an organizing framework that can assist in the efficient retrieval and activation of various identities as they are needed (Higgins, 1987; Markus & Nurius, 1986; Markus & Wurf, 1987; Roberts & Donahue, 1984). A variety of structures for self-concept organization have been proposed. Some scholars contend that all self-relevant information is grouped into a single category (e.g., Baumeister, 1998; Forgas & Williams, 2002), making it unnecessary to distinguish between contextually-nuanced identities. For instance, Greenwald et al. (2002) present a model of self-concept where social roles (e.g., father, teacher) and personally-relevant attributes (e.g., nurturing, intelligent) both represent informational nodes that act as descriptors of a unitary self-concept (i.e., “me”). The most poignant critiques of this single-self structure are rooted in cognitive psychology. For instance, Kurzban and Aktipis (2007) note that the modular nature of information storage and retrieval would make it highly inefficient and impractical to relegate all self-relevant information to a single category.

Recognizing this issue, other scholars have framed alternative identities (e.g., leader, follower) in terms of discrete categories that vary only in the extent to which they are activated at a particular time (Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2004). McConnell (2011) seemingly integrates the unitary and modular structure views with his Multiple Self Aspects Framework (MSAF) model, which consists of a universal (unitary) self-concept composed of “a collection of multiple, context-dependent selves” (p. 3). The MSAF (McConnell, 2011) frames self-organization in terms of an associative network, where aspects of the self can be activated or inhibited as a function of contextual cues. Notably,
Fiske and Dyer (1985) advocated a similar structure at the level of individual “schemata” or self-representations, which they defined in terms of two components: (1) units or nodes of information, and (2) associative linkages connecting information.

The present research assumes that individuals possess not one, but multiple self-conceptualizations (McConnell, 2011). A secondary assumption is that these identities are organized in a modular way that resembles an associative network (Fiske & Dyer, 1985; Kurzban & Aktipis, 2007), such that features of context are responsible for either activating or inhibiting their use as organizing frameworks for internal/external cues. To the extent these suppositions are tenable, it will be important to establish that a leadership self-concept, as defined later on in this section, is activated and/or associated with the tasks subjects are asked to complete as a part of this research. This is due to the fact that failing to activate a leadership self-concept could cause a subject to apply a different self-structure (e.g., student) to the tasks at hand, which could lead to different results.

**Self-Concept Stability/Malleability**

In order for self-concepts to maintain their structural integrity as coherent organizing frameworks, or cognitive schemas (Markus, 1977) some degree of temporal stability needs to exist. Even the most dynamic and fluid views of person construal (e.g., Freeman & Ambady, 2010) acknowledge the existence of “attractor regions” or points of stability that emerge as informational structures are repeatedly and similarly activated over time. Consistent with this viewpoint, Farmer (1997) notes that “the notion of the enduring substantial entity called the ‘self’ . . . is an abstraction to be explained in terms of the repeated patterns found in a certain series of interrelated events” (p. 65). Nevertheless, efforts to continuously modify and adapt identities by means of identity
work (Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2010) can only be successful inasmuch as established self-concepts are flexible or malleable to revision.

Attempts to reconcile self-concept stability and malleability have taken a number of forms. Early attempts to resolve this dialectical tension suggested that different aspects of identity may be stable, while others are malleable. For instance, Markus and Nurius (1986) contend that an individual’s actual self is well-established and relatively stable because of the consistent feedback it engenders from others and the surrounding environment. Meanwhile, possible selves, which have yet to be fully-established, engender inconsistent feedback, making them more malleable. A similar approach is taken by Ibarra and Babulescu (2010), who suggest that self-concepts are stable while the narratives one constructs to socially legitimate desired self-descriptions are highly malleable. Gioia, Schultz, and Corley (2000) make a related suggestion in the context of organizations; namely that the labels used to reference identities can remain stable while the meaning derived from those labels is subject to dynamic adaptation.

Another school of thought, based in cybernetic theory and neurological research, contends that identities themselves, and not just the labels or narratives used to describe them, are dynamic and malleable. Cybernetic views of identity (e.g., Pratt, Rockmann, & Kaufmann, 2006) propose that self-concepts maintain a high degree of stability until a discrepancy necessitates a temporary state of malleability while the identity is sufficiently modified. Pratt et al. (2006) label these discrepancies “work-identity integrity violations,” and they document a variety of processes medical residents undertook (e.g., “enrichment,” “patching,” “splinting”) in order to construct a more acceptable identity. Notably, the work-identity integrity violations described by these residents were fairly
commonplace (e.g., criticism from an attending physician), suggesting that discrepancies occurred on a regular basis. Neurological views (e.g., Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2004) attribute identity malleability to the prominence of a particular self-concept’s accessibility, which allows an individual to possess, as well as readily alternate amongst, conflicting social identities (e.g., leader, follower).

The present research is predicated upon the assumption that identities themselves are significantly malleable, yet stable in terms of their mental representation, consistent with the cybernetic view advanced by Pratt et al. (2006). A key proposal is that individuals vary in terms of the extent to which they detect identity-related discrepancies in leadership scenarios, as evidenced by cross-situational variability in their self-conceptualizations as leaders. Whereas some will rarely perceive a discrepancy between who they are and who they ought to be, consistent with minimal identity variability, others will perceive such discrepancies often (high identity variability) and will subsequently act in an attempt to reduce these discrepancies (high identity regulation).

**Context Independence/Dependence**

Scholars have also differed in terms of whether self-concepts are best conceptualized in terms that are context-independent or dependent. At the heart of this issue, according to Stryker and Burke (2000), are inconsistent definitions regarding the basis of identity in context-independent categories (e.g., male or female) as opposed to context-dependent roles (e.g., teacher or student).

Markus and Kitayama (1991) were among the first to distinguish between independent and interdependent self-construals. A hallmark of independent self-construals is their situational consistency, whereas interdependent self-construals are
believed to vary as individuals strive to conform to relevant norms and prototypical behaviors, even at the expense of consistency. Kuhnen, Hannover, and Schubert (2001) found that both context-dependent and context-independent modes of thinking can be primed, and these two types of thinking affect the manner in which contextual stimuli are processed. Subjects primed to define themselves in independent terms (i.e., “think about how you are different from your family and friends”) were better able to distinguish stimuli from the context in which they occur, as opposed to subjects primed to define themselves in interdependent terms (i.e., “think about how you are similar to your family and friends”). Nevertheless, context has been shown to play a critical role in self-concept-based evaluations. Lord et al. (1999) attribute the primacy of context to attention-based processing limits, which allows external cues play a pivotal role in determining the self-relevant information that is most immediately accessible. Markus and Wurf (1987) refer to this heavily context-dependent aspect of identity as working self-concept, or one’s dynamic and momentary sense of self (see also Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1986; Deaux, 1996; Lord & Brown, 2003; Markus & Nurius, 1986). Among the factors contributing to context-dependent identity are social motives (self-knowledge, self-enhancement, self-improvement), which inform contextual applications of identity (Banaji & Prentice, 1986).

This research project proceeds from the premise that a leadership self-concept is highly context dependent, consistent with a recent shift in the leadership literature that emphasizes “leadership” as being informal and dynamic rather than formal and static (i.e., context-independent) (Day, 2001; DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Pearce & Conger, 2003). Accordingly, the extent to which one identifies with a leadership self-concept is
subject to change as a function of situational features and internal/external feedback, consistent with the notion of variability in identity. Contexts perceived as amenable to an individual’s leadership skills and abilities are likely to engender a high degree of leadership self-concept identification, whereas situations perceived as inconsistent with one’s sense of leader identity are likely to engender less identification with a leadership self-schema.

A critical precursor to assessing identity dynamics is to carefully delineate the dimensions constituting “identification” with a particular self-concept such as a “leadership” identity. The following section identifies and discusses three such dimensions on the basis of previous research.

### Dimensions of Self-Concept

Given the prominence of self-concept research, it is somewhat surprising that little to no research has attempted to identify or explore the dimensional nature of identity. This may be due to the fact that scholarly interest has largely been focused on articulating self-concept “types.” For instance, in their seminal article pertaining to self-concept definition, Markus and Wurf (1987) specify several “types of self-representations.” Amongst the identity “types” they describe are (1) core/peripheral, (2) achieved/unachieved, (3) past/present/future, and (4) positive/negative self-conceptualizations. Although this typology provided an initial means of classifying self-concepts, efforts to delineate important factors existing within a particular self-concept (e.g., self as leader) have been less common.

Two exceptions to this observation merit mentioning. First, in a review of research pertaining to collective, or group-based identity Ashmore, Deaux, and
McLaughlin-Volpe (2004) organize the literature within a taxonomy of seven dimensions; (1) self-categorization, (2) evaluation, (3) importance, (4) attachment and sense of interdependence, (5) social embeddedness, (6) behavioral involvement, and (7) content and meaning. Notably, a number of these dimensions are explicitly collective in nature (e.g., social embeddedness) and thus, would not translate well to leadership self-concept as it will be defined in this research. The dimensions identified by Ashmore et al. (2004) are also pertinent to identifying with a social group, which has a different nuance than determining one’s fit with a specific identity.

A second attempt to delineate dimensions of self-concept was undertaken at the individual level of identity by Cross and Markus (1994). These authors assessed the extent to which a specific identity (i.e., problem-solver) was self-schematic or aschematic by asking participants to indicate (a) how good they were at problem-solving (i.e., how self-descriptive a problem-solver identity was) and (b) how important a problem-solver identity was to them. Subjects appeared to distinguish between their ratings of these items, suggesting that self-descriptiveness and importance are two distinct judgments someone can make with regard to an identity. Unfortunately, Cross and Markus (1994) utilized single-item scales at a single time point, which did not enable them to rigorously test a two-factor model of their identification with a “problem solver” self-concept.

One contribution of the present study is to foster exploration of the dimensional nature of self-concept by building on the work of Cross and Markus (1994) to develop and scrutinize a three-dimensional view of identity. Retaining the two dimensions they identify – (1) self-descriptiveness, and (2) importance – seems reasonable given their findings, which suggest that subjects were able to differentiate between these two
judgments as they pertained to being a “problem solver.” Meanwhile, the literature reviewed above suggests that a third dimension, activation, ought to be considered as well. In particular, as Kuhnen and colleagues (2001) note, “Intra-individual changes in construing identity result from contextual influences that situationally increase a self-construal’s accessibility” (p. 398). Thus, identities can differ meaningfully in terms of whether or not they are presently activated. Kuhnen et al. (2001) suggest semantic priming as a means of facilitating the activation of context-specific identities (e.g., leadership identity). Semantic priming activates a specific self-concept by getting subjects to process identity-pertinent issues or situations. This priming renders information linked with the identity easier to access and retrieve.

The notion of dimensional identity, along with the dynamics discussed thus far in this chapter, are ubiquitous across self-concepts. In other words, any self-representation (e.g., leader, follower, female, student, etc.) could be classified in terms of its activation, self-descriptiveness, and importance. The present research applied these concepts to a specific identity, leadership self-concept. The following section briefly defines and distinguishes leadership identity.

**Defining Leadership Self-Concept**

In a recent review of literature pertaining to leadership self-concept, Ibarra, Wittman, Petriglieri, and Day (2014) identify three predominant stands of identity theory as it pertains to leadership. The first is rooted in the broader concept of Identity Theory (Gecas, 1982) and positions being a leader as a “role” that people can willingly take on or refuse. According to this line of thinking, people identify more with a leader identity as they practice being in the role and socializing with others in a leadership capacity (Day &
Harrison, 2004; Lord & Hall, 2005). A second stream of theorizing on leadership self-concept is based on Social Identity Theory (van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003), which defines a leader as the person who best embodies the values and characteristics of a group. Here, leader identity is framed in terms of “prototypicality,” such that people become more leader-like as they align their personal identity with important features of the group (see Haslam, Reicher, & Platow, 2011, for four distinct ways that leaders do this).

A third approach has come to define more recent thinking although its roots can be traced to foundational work on the self (James, 1890; Mead, 1934), and is based on the notion of self-concept being determined by the way others see an individual (Bartel & Dutton, 2001). In this instance, leader identity reflects the reciprocal process of would-be leaders attempting to “claim” a leadership identity and would-be followers “granting” authority status to the person requesting it (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Success or failure in these interactions can contribute to the subsequent strengthening or weakening of leadership self-concept (DeRue et al., 2009). The claiming-granting process is also viewed to be highly contextual and dynamic, such that being the recognized leader in one situation does not guarantee that similar status will be conferred in other scenarios. The current research best aligns with this third view, where leadership identity is considered at the level of events and not necessarily as a stable or enduring individual characteristic.

Consistent with this view, a clear distinction has been noted in the leadership literature between “leaders” as static entities occupying formal positions of hierarchical influence within organizations and “leadership” as an action that is highly context-dependent (Day, 2001). Indeed, as noted by Ibarra et al. (2014), “the idea of [leader]
identity as multiple, relatively fluid, and highly contextual is especially pertinent for the study of leadership today” (p. 291). Accordingly, leadership scholars have called for an increased focus on the dynamic nature of identity-related processes (e.g., Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000). A key implication here is that formal leaders may not always be actively engaged in the act of leadership. Indeed, effective leadership has been linked to the ability of leaders to exhibit self-complexity, or skill in assuming a variety of self-representations in response to different situational demands (Hannah, Woolfolk, & Lord, 2009). For instance, effective delegation may require a superior to temporarily assume the identity of “follower” in deference to the task-specific expertise of a subordinate.

Thus, a leadership self-concept is one of multiple self-aspects constituting a formal leader’s identity (cf., McConnell, 2010). A leadership self-concept is accordingly best defined as a context-specific identity rooted in the action of leadership, which Pearce and Conger (2003) define as “a dynamic interactive influence process” (p. 1). It coincides with other aspects of the self that are subject to being activated or dormant as a function of contextual and social cues.

As previously noted, this process is best described by DeRue and Ashford (2010) in terms of identity claiming and granting. Potential leaders attempt to exert an influence by making “identity claims,” but in order to succeed, these claim attempts must be “granted” or affirmed by followers. Multiple iterations of this process occur over time, producing two types of change. An upward or positive spiral occurs as a leadership self-concept is successfully “claimed” by the would-be leader and “granted” by followers repeatedly, such that an individual’s ability to influence grows with stronger and/or more frequent claim attempts. A downward or negative spiral occurs as follower reluctance to
“grant” makes prospective leaders more reluctant to “claim” and the person’s influence subsequently dwindles over time (DeRue et al., 2009).

The process of establishing a leadership identity can also be viewed from the vantage-point of followers. Lord and Brown (2001) note that one of the critical mechanisms whereby leaders exercise influence over followers is via the activation of a subordinate self-concept. According to this view, the position of influence a leader has is inferred when the leader’s efforts to elicit a follower identity are successful (see also Reicher, Haslam, and Hopkins, 2005; van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004). Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963) referred to this process as *altercasting*, a process whereby defining someone else’s identity subsequently lends to self-definition (see also Luhrmann & Eberl, 2007).

Notably, a multidimensional view of identity is inferred by these processes. Attempting to “claim” the status of leader implies that an individual has cast themselves in the role of leader for a given situation (identity activation) and has deemed a leadership self-concept to be a) self-descriptive and b) important enough to assert. The same could be said for implicitly “granting” the status of follower to interaction partners and deeming such a role as descriptive and important to those who are subject to the leader’s influence. In this study, a multidimensional view of leadership self-concept was tested in a manner consistent with the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1:** A leadership self-concept can be classified in terms of three distinct dimensions; (1) activation, (2) self-descriptiveness, and (3) importance, such that: (a) A leadership self-concept will be more activated in some situations than others,
and (b) Individuals will make distinct self-assessments of a leadership self-concept’s
self-descriptiveness and importance.

It should be noted that alternative definitions of leadership self-concept exist. On the one hand, leadership self-concept can and has been developed at relational (e.g., dyadic) as well as collective (e.g., group) levels of analysis (Lord, Brown, & Freiberg, 1999). For instance, at the collective level, Hogg (2001) contends that a leadership self-concept is better defined in terms of group-prototypical features rather than traditional leader attributes or characteristics. His Social Identity Theory of leadership specifies that leadership influence will always be granted to the individual whose characteristics are the most common among group members (i.e., prototypical of the group) regardless of whether or not that person possesses any of the competencies typically associated with leadership (e.g., decisiveness). Nevertheless, for the purpose of the present research, leadership self-concept was defined at the individual level. Furthermore, leadership self-concept was conceptualized as one self-representation or identity within a broader associative network (McConnell, 2010)

Thus far, leadership self-concept has been defined and discussed in terms of its multiple dimensions. The following section introduces the notion of variability in leadership identity, whereby a) the activation of a leadership self-concept along with subjective perceptions of the identity’s b) self-descriptiveness and c) importance are believed to vary over time.

Variability in Leadership Identity

The dynamic and interactive process of leadership described by DeRue and Ashford (2010) as well as Pearce and Conger (2003) implies a certain degree of
variability, not only in terms of the followers who “grant” a leader influence, but also in terms of the leaders who attempt to “claim” this role. Specifically, the extent to which individuals identify with a leadership self-concept is likely to vary across events and time, and this can be considered in terms of the three dimensions of identity previously discussed.

Events differ in meaningful ways (Hoffman & Lord, 2013) that are likely to influence identification with a leadership self-concept. First, some events are more likely to activate a leadership self-concept than others. Leadership is not necessary for many work-related tasks, while other types of situations and/or subordinates can enhance the potential for a would-be leader to influence outcomes (Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001; Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Schriesheim, 1997). Second, some situations are more consistent with the knowledge, skills, and abilities a given individual possesses than others (Pearce & Conger, 2003), rendering a leadership self-concept more (or less) self-descriptive. Third, the perceived importance of exerting leadership influence is likely to vary across events. One reason for this is described by Hollander’s (2012) notion of idiosyncrasy credits, or permissions for a leader to influence in a manner that is not in accordance with established norms and expectations. Leaders are believed to possess a limited number of these credits, making them reluctant to exercise influence unless a situation is deemed important enough to do so.

Time is also likely to play a critical role in leadership self-concept variability. In one respect, self-concepts change and evolve over time as individuals engage in identity work, defined above in terms of efforts to maintain or modify existing self-conceptualizations (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). Identity work is a continuous
process that individuals engage in as they monitor internal reactions and external feedback as well as outcomes (Ibarra, 1999). Throughout the course of one’s career, leadership self-concepts change and become more nuanced as skills develop (Lord & Hall, 2005) and identities become more personalized through the construction of coherent and customized narratives (Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010). In another respect, subjective assessments of leadership self-concept can change as a function of when individuals reflect on a focal event. For instance, one’s assessment of the importance of “claiming” a leadership identity may be different one month after the focal event than it was as the event was unfolding or as he or she was anticipating the event.

For the primary study, leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance were measured in terms of subjective assessments, whereas leadership self-concept activation was primed. Accordingly, the following hypothesis reflects anticipated variability in terms of leader identity self-descriptiveness and importance judgments across events and time:

**Hypothesis 2:** Across events and time, significant intra-individual variability will exist in terms of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance.

A key proposal of this research is that some individuals experience a greater degree of variability in identification with a leadership self-concept, across events and time, than others do. Figure 2.1 illustrates this phenomenon as it might be observed amongst three fictitious leaders. Numerous factors are likely to contribute to this, including the person-level and event-level antecedents introduced later in this chapter, but such effects can generally be explained in terms of factors known to a) facilitate or b) inhibit the dynamic construction and expression of contextual identities.
Figure 2.1. Examples of variability in leadership identity.

Identity resources (Luhrmann & Eberl, 2007) constitute a broad category of facilitators, or factors that are likely to activate a leader identity and/or contribute to one’s
perceptions that a leadership self-concept is self-descriptive and important. Such resources include a formal leadership role, previous leadership success, strong impression management skills (Gardner & Avolio, 1998), a coherent leadership narrative or biography (Ibarra & Barbalescu, 2010), strategic capital, and the support of would-be followers. Anderson and Betz (2001) describe such resources as a critical means of building social self-efficacy, defined in this context as belief in one’s ability to lead and/or influence others. The ability to learn from identity-relevant experience as well as from identity exemplars (e.g., mentors) has also been associated with increased identification (Goldstein & Cialdini, 2007; Popper, 2005).

Other factors could inhibit or impede identification with a leadership self-concept. As a result, a leadership self-concept either fails to be activated or is viewed as non self-descriptive or unimportant. Minority status can make it challenging to interact with and/or influence a group in a manner consistent with leading (Banaji & Prentice, 1994; Eagly, 2005; Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). Follower resistance or indifference to leadership “claims” can act to delegitimize an individual’s self-ascribed leadership status (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; DeRue et al., 2009). Conflicting self-categorizations (Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2004) can make it difficult to maintain one’s assertion of a leader identity, such as when an individual’s desire to befriend a colleague interferes with their ability to influence the colleague’s behavior. Justice perceptions (Johnson & Lord, 2010), low self-esteem (Atwater et al., 1999), depletion of self-regulatory resources (Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco, 2005), and self-presentation concerns (Tice, 1992) have also been identified as obstacles to positive identification. Notably, the presence or absence of these factors is likely to vary across
events. For instance, would-be leaders may hold minority status in one group, while clearly embodying the characteristics of another group.

Leader identity variability is essentially brought about as individuals experience both facilitators and inhibitors across events and time. However, individuals differ in their experience of these factors in at least two important respects. First, the relative proportion of facilitators to inhibitors people experience is likely to differ. For instance, female leaders are likely to face a greater proportion of obstacles relative to male leaders (Eagly, 2005). Second, the relative impact of facilitators and inhibitors on one’s propensity to identify with a leadership self-concept is likely to differ as a function of individual characteristics. For instance, leaders high in self-efficacy are likely more resilient to the potential negative impact of follower resistance (see Chemers, Watson, & May, 2000). The net outcome of these differences is a range or continuum of identity variability, represented at one end by people who are fairly stable and consistent in terms of their identification with a leader self concept and at the other end by those who identify strongly with a leader identity for some situations but not for others. The following hypothesis describes this effect in terms of significant differences in leader identity variability:

*Hypothesis 3: Individuals will differ from one another in terms of the extent to which they experience variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance.*

Variability in leadership identity ought to be distinguished from related constructs in the leadership and self-concept literatures. One such construct is the notion of *identity change* (Burke, 2006), which reflects a more permanent and context-independent
modification of self-representation than what is implied by the construct of identity variability. Identity change is typically accompanied by a critical event (e.g., a promotion). For instance, Ibarra (1999) documents the process of identity change undertaken by junior investment bankers as they transitioned from technical and managerial functions to the role of client advisor. Rather than producing variability within a pre-existing self-aspect, as is the case with identity variability, identity change appears to bring about the creation of a new self-aspect (McConnell, 2010). That is to say, the junior investment bankers in Ibarra’s (1999) research will retain their pre-existing managerial and technician “identities,” but these identities will no longer be activated (at least as often), nor will they be deemed as self-descriptive or important relative to their new central role of advising clients.

Distinction should also be made between leadership identity variability and leader self-confidence. Two aspects of leader self-confidence have traditionally been identified; an internal (intrapersonal) sense of self-assurance and an external (social), behavioral display of poise (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). On the surface, this may appear to be akin to low amounts of leadership identity variability (See Figure 2.1a), otherwise described as stability in one’s identification with a leadership self-concept. However, it is possible for unconfident leaders to have consistently low experiences of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance. Such leaders question their fit with a leader identity or the importance of leading, but do so in a stable fashion across events and time. Leader self-confidence is also framed in context-independent and dispositional terms, whereas leadership identity variability has been introduced here in context-interdependent and situational terms.
When describing variability in leadership identity, it is also important to specify that the variability in question is occurring with regard to identification within a single self-concept (e.g., leadership), rather than between self-concepts (e.g., leader, follower, manager). This is a key distinction to make because a term like “leadership identity variability” could be used, for instance, to describe the extent to which members of shared leadership teams alternate between the conceptually distinct identities of “follower” and “leader” (Pearce & Conger, 2003). A limited amount of research has explored this phenomenon of switching from one activated identity to another and mechanisms such as goals (McConnell, Shoda, & Skolbergstad, 2012), environmental features (Smith & Semin, 2004), and embodiment (Niedenthal, Barsalou, Winkielman, Krauth-Gruber, & Ric, 2005) that are believed to facilitate this process. In contrast to these studies, a unique contribution of this research is to examine the extent to which variability can be experienced with regard to a single self-concept. A secondary contribution of this study is determining whether variability within a leadership self-concept constitutes a meaningful individual difference, consistent with Figure 2.1.

**Summary**

In summary, variability in leadership identity represents the extent to which an individual fluctuates over the course of time and events in terms of their identification with a leadership self-concept, as measured by subjective assessments of a leader identity’s self-descriptiveness and importance. A number of internal (e.g., Core Self-Evaluations) and external (e.g., follower reluctance to perceive someone as a leader) factors make it likely that different leaders exhibit low, moderate, and high levels of variability. This variance can manifest itself in different ways across the self-
descriptiveness and importance dimensions, making it important to consider the unique contribution of both dimensions. Leader identity variability shares some similarity with other constructs described in the leadership and self-concept literature, but can and ought to be distinguished.

The instability brought about by self-concept variability is uncomfortable, prompting efforts by leaders to regulate identity. Regulation efforts also vary both within and between individuals, for reasons described in the following section.

**Variability in Leadership Identity Regulation**

Research has consistently shown that self-concept stability represents a preferred state (Greenwald, 1980; Markus, 1977; Swann & Read, 1981). For instance, Swann and Read (1981) demonstrate that individuals seek out self-confirmatory feedback with regard to their identity while dismissing non-confirmatory evaluations as less diagnostic and accurate (see also Markus, 1977). Underlying this behavior is a desire to achieve a close alignment of external feedback and preferred self-views. A primary means of accomplishing this, particularly in the midst of leader identity variability is to engage in *leadership identity regulation*, or efforts designed to restore one’s preferred view of a leadership identity’s self-descriptiveness and importance. Control is a primary motive with regulation efforts and would-be leaders are likely to engage in identity regulation for one of two purposes; (1) stabilizing their self-view as a leader, and (2) modulating other’s perceptions of their leadership ability.

The notion of regulation strategies has yet to be explored in depth as it relates to leadership identity (see Wilson, Gunn, & Ross, 2009 for a notable exception) but it has received extensive attention within the emotions literature. This is likely due to the
widely-accepted view that individuals vary substantively across events and time in terms of their emotional experience and expression, giving them a range of emotionality to regulate. Applying such a view to identity in general, and leadership identity in particular, is far more novel and untested, resulting in a relative dearth of research directly pertaining to self-concept regulation. Nevertheless, important insights can be borrowed from the emotional regulation literature inasmuch as the structure and processes that underscore identification with specific emotions and self-concepts are similar. Emotions and identities have traditionally both been classified as mechanisms of self-regulation (Baumeister & Vohs, 2003; Carver & Scheier, 2001), and both have been described in terms of discrete representations (e.g., “happy” emotion, “leader” identity), discrepancies (e.g., Higgins, 1987), discrepancy-reduction motives (e.g., Kirkland & Cunningham, 2012), and the contrast between internal experience and external perception (e.g., Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002; Markus & Wurf, 1987).

Two broad categories of regulation strategies are generally studied within the emotions literature (Gross & John, 2003). *Antecedent-focused* strategies are used to control the experience of emotions by modifying the situations that give rise to them. Examples of this strategy include choosing situations that are likely to produce desired emotions and modifying one’s assessment of a situation in order to inhibit the experience of undesired emotions. *Response-focused* strategies enable individuals to cope with an emotion once it has already been experienced. Coping behaviors, physiological responses, and cognitive processes can all be employed to control the manner in which one responds to desired or undesired emotions. Applied to leadership self-concept regulation, each of these strategies makes intuitive sense.
For the present study, cognitive reappraisal was selected to represent an antecedent-focused strategy of identity regulation. From an emotional regulation standpoint, individuals engage in cognitive reappraisal when they modulate the emotional impact of a situation by changing the way they construe it (Lazarus & Alfert, 1964). This strategy has been shown to benefit leaders by making social interactions more predictable (Glaso & Einerson, 2008) in terms of the emotions they elicit. Effective reappraisal has also been linked to more positive and constructive relationships as well as higher levels of leader-member exchange (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002). Applying this idea to leadership identity, cognitive reappraisal is defined as regulating the impact of an event on one’s self-conceptualization as a leader by controlling the way an event is perceived. For instance, framing a leadership scenario as irrelevant to one’s sense of leader identity increases the likelihood that the outcome will not cause the individual to question his or her identity as a leader.

Suppression was chosen to represent a response-focused regulation strategy in this research. In emotion regulation terms, suppressed emotions are felt and experienced but they are not behaviorally expressed (Richards & Gross, 2000). This strategy has been shown to be advantageous in terms of promoting strong leader-follower relationships (Popper & Amit, 2009) inasmuch as other parties react to what they see and not necessarily to what the leader is experiencing. Nevertheless, suppression comes at a cost to the regulating leader, consuming limited resources and drawing the leader’s attention away from other things (Grandey, 2003). Leadership identity suppression occurs when someone questions their identity as a leader, but does not express those doubts in a way that others can observe. For instance, a leader’s first day on the job may cause them to
question their leadership abilities, yet most leaders will suppress those doubts in order to come across to others as confident and poised.

Reappraisal and suppression can be utilized in distinct ways to regulate assessments of leader identity (a) self-descriptiveness and (b) importance, resulting in four types of leadership identity regulation. Self-descriptiveness reappraisal consists of viewing a leadership episode in a way that favors the assessment of a leadership identity as self-descriptive. Importance reappraisal occurs when the significance of a leadership identity-disconfirming event is downplayed to lessen its impact on one’s self-evaluation as a leader. Self-descriptiveness suppression entails a leader’s efforts to mask that positive or negative influence of an event on their impression that a leadership identity is self-descriptive. Finally, importance suppression happens when a leader refrains from revealing the significance or non-significance of an episode to their leader self-view.

The following hypothesis frames these regulation strategies as separate and distinct components of leadership identity regulation:

**Hypothesis 4:** Efforts to regulate leadership identity can be classified in terms of four distinct dimensions: reappraisal of self-descriptiveness, suppression of self-descriptiveness, reappraisal of importance, and suppression of importance.

Like emotional regulation, identity regulation is not always necessary or useful (Tamir, Chiu, & Gross, 2007). Regulation efforts are designed to ameliorate discrepancies between experienced and desired states, whether they are in reference to affective states, goals, or activated identities (Carver & Scheier, 2012). Kuppens et al., (2010) describe a desired state as a “home base” that individuals are attracted to for varying reasons (e.g., goals, rewards). When perceptions are close to home base, actual
and desired states align, change is unnecessary and regulation efforts are relatively
dormant. As perceptions get further away from this desired state, a stronger pull exists
for individuals to regulate as a means of realigning current evaluations of identity with
the state the individual desires to experience.

Applying this to leadership identity, “home base” constitutes a prototypical
representation of behaviors or actions exemplifying the category of leadership, as
developed and defined by the individual (cf. Hopfield, 1982). For events where a
negligible discrepancy is perceived to exist between one’s desired and actual leadership
self-concept, identity regulation is unnecessary and unlikely to occur. Self-regulation is
resource-consuming, and individuals possess a limited amount of cognitive and
emotional resources, requiring them to be judicious about the manner in which these
resources are allocated (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). In contrast, for events where
someone’s self-assessment of leadership identity is at odds with what they wish to
experience or portray, identity regulation will be used as a means of narrowing the gap
between actual and desired states. Over time and across events, this has the potential to
produce variability in an individual’s use of identity regulation strategies, with minimal
usage in some situations and extensive usage in others, consistent with the following
hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 5: Across events and time, significant intra-individual variability will
exist in terms of individual efforts to regulate leadership identity.*

The use of identity regulation strategies is also likely to vary in a meaningful way
between individuals. Highly-experienced leaders, for instance, are likely to experience
fewer leadership identity-related discrepancies than novice leaders (Komives et al., 2005;
Those who are self-assured and confident in their leadership identity are likely to rely on identity regulation efforts less frequently than those who sometimes question their ability to lead (e.g., Leary, Robertson, Barnes, & Miller, 1986). A number of dispositional and contextual factors can contribute to these differences and some of these will be explored in greater depth later on in this chapter.

What results is a similar phenomenon to that which is illustrated in Figure 2.1. People who are low in leadership identity regulation variability tend to regulate within a narrow range consistently. It is important to note that low variability in identity regulation is distinct from low identity regulation in that the amount of leadership identity regulation is not being emphasized, but rather, the degree of fluctuation. In other words, people who engage in high levels of leadership identity regulation consistently are low in identity regulation variability. High levels of variability in leadership identity regulation are represented by those whose reliance on identity regulation strategies tends to vary widely across events and time. Such individuals rarely regulate their leadership identity for some types of events, but will frequently regulate the same identity when faced with other types of events, such as those perceived as posing a threat to their leadership identity (see Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996, for one example of the negative consequences of failing to regulate). Between these two extremes are individuals who regulate their leadership identity with a moderate degree of variability, showing some fluctuation at different times or in response to different types of events, but also some stability.

The above paragraphs suggest that variability in leadership identity regulation is a meaningful individual difference, as the following hypothesis suggests:
Hypothesis 6: Individuals will differ from one another in terms of the extent to which they experience variability in leadership identity regulation.

Variability in leadership identity regulation fits into the broader framework of this research as a phenomenon that ought to directly correspond with an individual’s experience of leadership identity variability. Identity regulation strategies are only useful inasmuch as variability in self-assessments of leadership identity make them necessary as a means of reducing uncomfortable discrepancies. Individuals who tend to be more variable in their identification with a leadership self-concept ought to likewise be more variable in their usage of the regulation techniques mentioned above. In contrast, those who tend to experience more stability in their assessments of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance should also be consistent in their reliance on regulation tools. For instance, someone who consistently regards a leadership identity as moderately self-descriptive and highly important will also regulate at a consistent level, which could be high or low depending on how well a moderately-descriptive, highly-important leadership identity aligns with their goals. Thus, leadership identity variability and leadership identity regulation variability were projected to be highly inter-related constructs, as the following hypothesis states:

Hypothesis 7: Variability in leadership identity will predict variability in leadership identity regulation, such that individuals experiencing higher levels variability in leadership identity will also experience higher levels of variability in leadership identity regulation.
Summary

In summary, leadership identity regulation variability represents the extent to which an individual fluctuates across events and time in their efforts to reconcile actual and desired perceptions of leadership identity. Different strategies exist for regulating identity and they tend to be resource-consuming, such that individuals are not inclined to use them unless necessary. Variability in the usage of regulation strategies is likely to occur within individuals as some events require regulation whereas others do not. Differences between individuals are also likely based on dispositional characteristics as well as unique contextual features. Variability in leadership identity is also likely to be positively related to variability in leadership identity regulation, with more variable identifications with a leadership self-concept yielding more variable regulation efforts.

The following section begins to build a nomological framework around the notions of variability in leadership identity and regulation by identifying factors that are believed to contribute to the within- and between-person differences hypothesized above. Figure 2.2 provides a visual depiction of the model and serves as a point of reference for the hypotheses developed below. Within-person variability represents a consistency estimate for each individual around a) their leadership self-assessments and b) their use of regulation strategies. It is modeled in Figure 2.2 at the person level with the understanding that people will differ from one another in terms of how stable or variable they are with regard to these constructs across events. Arriving at a consistency estimate
Antecedents of Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation

Two person-level antecedents of variability in leadership identity and regulation are proposed; Core Self-Evaluations and Implicit Person Theories. Additionally, features of events are hypothesized to function as event-level antecedents of variability. They are also depicted as moderators of the influence of CSEs and IPTs on cross-situational variability in leadership self-concept identification and regulation.

Core Self-Evaluations

*Core Self-Evaluations* (CSEs) are “fundamental appraisals that people make of their own self-worth, competence, and capabilities” (Chang, Ferris, Johnson, Rosen, & Tan, 2012, p. 82; cf. Judge et al., 1997). Many scholars regard CSEs as a higher-order construct consisting of four traits representing a long history in the psychological literature; (a) *self-esteem* (Harter, 1990), or one’s subjective assessment of self-worth, (b)
generalized self-efficacy (Locke, McClear, & Knight, 1996), defined as one’s perceived ability to be successful in a variety of situations, (c) emotional stability (Eysenck, 1990), or one’s ability to remain composed or calm regardless of the circumstances, and (d) locus of control (Rotter, 1966), defined as the extent to which events are perceived to be either within or beyond one’s sphere of influence. People with high CSEs tend to be assured and self-confident due to a strong sense of self-worth, a minimal amount of anxiety, and belief in their ability to succeed (Hiller & Hambrick, 2005). Favorable CSEs have been linked to a variety of positive outcomes, including better job performance and increased job satisfaction (Judge & Hurst, 2007), reduced stress and burnout (Best, Stapleton, & Downey, 2005), and greater receptivity to developmental feedback (Bono & Colbert, 2005).

Traits feeding into the CSE construct were selected based on three criteria (Bono & Judge, 2003). First, they had to be self-evaluative, meaning that they characterized internal assessments of the self as opposed to external-driven assessments. Second, they had to be fundamental to the self as opposed to reflecting surface-level characteristics (see Cattell, 1965). The third prerequisite pertained to the scope or reach of the trait (see Allport, 1961). Based on these requirements, CSEs appear to fit naturally within the framework advanced in this chapter, which revolves around components related to identity. Of particular note is the contrast between CSEs, which are thought to be stable across situations (e.g., Rode, Judge, & Sun, 2012) and leadership identity variability and regulation, which are characterized as highly dynamic and contextual. Event-specific appraisals have been shown to proceed directly from CSEs, which are more universal (Judge et al., 1997). Furthermore, CSEs exist for multiple domains of self, such as one’s
identity as a leader, but domain-specific manifestations are highly influenced by global self-assessments (Judge et al., 1998).

Interestingly, the observed influence of CSEs on satisfaction and performance-based outcomes has been largely indirect (Judge et al., 2007) with CSEs affecting cognitive appraisals which in turn effectuate desired outcomes. Chang et al. (2012) provide a summary of these mediating appraisals, which include identity-related mechanisms such as self-enhancement (Garcia, Triana, Peters, & Sanchez, 2009), the setting of self-concordant goals (Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005), role clarity (Sears & Hackett, 2011), and social comparisons (Brown, Ferris, Heller, & Keeping, 2007).

Event-level self-assessments of leadership identity and efforts to regulate identity, as defined in earlier sections, fall into this category of cognitive appraisals and have yet to be specifically linked to CSEs. However, promising evidence that such a connection exists was recently provided by Yagil, Luria, and Gal (2008), who associated lower levels of emotional regulation with higher CSEs. Yagil et al. (2008) also showed that emotional regulation serves as a mediating mechanism that contributes to lower levels of burnout amongst those possessing more favorable CSEs.

Similar findings are expected within the realm of leadership identity variability and regulation. Individuals with high CSEs are likely to be confident in their assessment of a leadership identity’s self-descriptiveness and importance regardless of situational factors, yielding minimal variability in leadership identity across events. As a result, discrepancies between actual and desired states of leadership identity are bound to be perceived less frequently, making regulation efforts more stable across time. Alternatively, those possessing lower CSEs are more vulnerable to the influence of
contextual elements on their self-assessment of leadership identity. When outcomes are favorable to affirming a leader status, identification with a leadership self-concept is relatively high. Less favorable results may cause them to question or downplay a leadership identity, prompting efforts to regulate these self-perceptions around a desired state. In this instance, both identification and regulation are likely to be more variable. The net result of these dynamics is a predictive relationship between CSEs and variability in leadership identity and regulation, consistent with the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 8:** Core self-evaluations will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, individuals exhibiting high core self-evaluations will exhibit lower levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation.

Whereas CSEs reflect universal assessments of self-efficacy and control, Implicit Person Theories indicate the extent to which people believe that self-characteristics are subject to change and can influence subsequent efforts to undertake change, as described in the following section.

**Implicit Person Theories**

*Implicit Person Theories* (IPTs) reflect implicitly-held beliefs that people have regarding the stability or malleability of human attributes (Dweck, 1996, 1999). At one end of the spectrum, abilities are viewed as fixed and static entities that cannot be adapted over time regardless of the quality or quantity of developmental interventions. Adherents to this view are labeled *entity theorists*. At the other end of the spectrum are those who believe that experience and development can enable attributes to be modified in meaningful ways. People subscribing to this view are referred to as *incremental*
theorists, given their belief that abilities can undergo incremental changes. Research has largely supported the notion that IPTs represent a stable individual difference (Butler, 2000; Plaks & Stecher, 2007). IPTs have also been shown to affect investment in developmental interventions (van Dijk & Kluger, 2004), with entity theorists anticipating minimal benefits and remaining relatively disengaged in contrast to incremental theorists, who see more opportunity and accordingly invest greater effort.

Research on IPTs traditionally focused on the way in which entitist and incrementalist mindsets affect one’s evaluations of others (e.g., Chiu, Hong, & Dweck, 1997; Heslin, Latham, & Vandewalle, 2005; Heslin & Vandewalle, 2011; Sue-Chan, Wood, & Latham, 2012), yet strong evidence suggests that self-evaluations can also stem from these beliefs. When faced with personal setbacks, incremental theorists attribute their subpar performance to mitigating circumstances that affected the outcome and are subject to change. The circumstances identified can be internal (e.g., lack of drive or focus) or external (e.g., lack of adequate resources or support). In contrast, entity theorists are more inclined to appeal to personal traits and stereotypes when accounting for performance (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Failures serve as confirmatory evidence that skills in a particular domain are lacking. Interestingly, these belief-based differences have been found to persist amongst people who are otherwise objectively similar in terms of their attributes and abilities (Hong & Dweck, 1992).

Plaks, Levy, and Dweck (2009) frame IPTs as “meaning systems” that serve a specific function in that they “provide perceivers with a framework for perceiving, judging, and acting upon social information” (p. 1076), much like identities do. Social information can sometimes violate these systems and their assumptions, prompting
cognitive efforts to preserve consistent beliefs. Plaks, Grant, and Dweck (2005) confirmed this in a series of studies by providing participants with details that contradicted their entity theory (i.e., evidence that someone had undergone significant change) or incremental theory (i.e., evidence that someone was incapable of change) and assessing a variety of outcomes. Both entity and incremental theorists experienced increased anxiety and ultimately chose to give less attention to instances that violated their beliefs while honing in on evidence they could use to support their convictions.

Similar findings were observed in a later study where the feedback provided pertained to self-evaluations (Plaks & Stecher, 2007). In this case, intelligence tests were used to indicate whether subjects improved, declined, or remained steady in their performance over time. Entity theorists responded most negatively to results suggesting improvement or deterioration, while incrementalist theorists had the least favorable response to results indicating consistency. Plaks et al. (2009) frame these results within a larger framework of motivated cognition (e.g., Clark, Wegener, & Fabrigar, 2008; Dunning & Cohen, 1992; Kunda, 1990) and reference the various cognitive distortions people will engage in to maintain their fundamental beliefs regarding self and others.

Applying these findings to leadership identity implies that individual IPTs may directly influence the nature of events that people recall when they are asked to reflect upon their leadership self-views. Specifically, entity theorists could be more inclined to recall instances that promote a consistent evaluation of themselves in a leadership role. Accordingly, observed variability in ratings of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance will be relatively low across time and events. Incremental theorists, in contrast, will be more comfortable recalling events that reflect a broader spectrum of
identification with leadership, given their belief that a variety of mitigating circumstances can contribute to their efforts and success in claiming a leader identity. Consistent with these views, self-assessments of leadership identity will likely be more variable across events and time for those subscribing to an incrementalist mindset.

When this reasoning is extended to attempts made to regulate leadership identity, a similar trend can be expected. Entitists, having already recalled a series of leadership episodes that are largely consistent with self-views, experience minimal anxiety and do not perceive a need to engage in regulation efforts. Above and beyond their selective recollection of events, they are likely to question the value and benefit of regulation efforts. As a result, their engagement in leadership identity regulation will be minimal across events, resulting in a negligible amount of variability. This response is notably distinct from what can be expected for incrementalists, who qualify their self-view in terms of mitigating factors. For this group, the leadership exhibited in some events is more reflective of a leader identity’s true self-descriptiveness and importance than it is for others. Where discrepancies exist between desired and actual states of leadership identity, anxiety prompts efforts to regulate. The existence of smaller or larger discrepancies across events yields cross-situational variability in identity regulation.

The following hypothesis summarizes the dynamics that were expected to occur with regard to variability in leadership identity and regulation as a function of IPTs:

Hypothesis 9: Implicit Person Theories will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, individuals exhibiting entitist beliefs will exhibit lower levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation.
whereas individuals exhibiting incrementalist beliefs will exhibit higher levels of variability.

As explained in the previous section, person-level characteristics such as CSEs and IPTs are best considered alongside event-level dynamics, at least as they exist in the eye of the perceiver, when examining their influence on issues pertaining to leadership identity. The following section frames event characteristics as important antecedents of situational identification with, and regulation of, leadership identity.

Event Characteristics

The fluid nature of leadership relative to stable and formalized leader roles (Day, 2001) makes it important to consider factors that unfold at the level of individual events rather than solely considering antecedents that are cross-situational in nature. Events are defined as “distinguishable units of activity, occurring in a specific time and location, and having a perceptible beginning and end” (Hoffman & Lord, 2013, p. 559; cf. Zacks, Tversky, & Iyer, 2001). Events have a number of distinct characteristics that enable perceivers to compare and contrast situations with one another. Once perceived and identified, these characteristics can drive behavioral responses by means of the cognitive and affective processing mechanisms they trigger (Mischel & Shoda, 1995).

In a recent article, Hoffman and Lord (2013) synthesized existing research to propose that events evoking leadership can be characterized according to at least seven distinct dimensions. First, events can be perceived at different levels of specificity. At the macro level, the time period being considered is larger and event-related information tends to be general and broader in scope (Hard, Tversky, & Lang, 2006; Mumford, 1993). Micro-level events have shorter time scales and lend themselves to finer-grained analysis.
where identity-related distinctions are more likely to be made. A second characteristic of events pertains to their perception as static and complete, or dynamic and continuing to evolve (e.g., Rerup & Feldman, 2011; Sonnentag, 2012). For more dynamic events, conclusions pertaining to leadership identity remain in a state of flux, giving them more potential to vary. A third dimension distinguishes between familiar events, which are firmly embedded in established schemas and scripts, and novel events, which are relatively unprecedented, requiring more active interpretation and response (Carpenter & Grossberg, 2003; Kerr & Jermier, 1978). A fourth distinction delineates situations seen as extraordinary, meaning that they stand apart in terms of their importance to perceivers, from situations that are ordinary, lacking any special import or significance (Ballinger & Rockman, 2010; Hannah, Uhl-Bien, Avolio, & Cavarretta, 2009). Fifth, events can be interpreted as positive and favorable to the achievement of desired goals, or negative and detrimental to sought-after outcomes (George & Zhou, 2007; Pescosolido, 2002). Negative events have been shown to prompt more careful scrutiny on the part of perceivers (Sinclair, Mark, & Clore, 1994), increasing the likelihood that identity-inconsistent information will be identified. The sixth characteristic of events identified by Hoffman and Lord (2013) is their relevance. Relevant events have implications for the person while irrelevant events are viewed as having minimal if any ultimate significance (Lazarus, 1991; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Finally, events can be categorized in terms of where they fall in time, with past occurrences happening prior to perception, present occurrences unfolding as perception is happening, and future occurrences having an anticipated start time after perception (Dinh, Lord, & Hoffman, 2012; Sonnentag, 2012). Present and future events continue to be actively assessed,
making variable identity judgments more of a possibility than they are with past events where firm conclusions have already been drawn. Hoffman and Lord (2013) acknowledge that additional event characteristic “dimensions” are likely to exist, such as proximity (Morgeson, Mitchell, & Liu, in press) but this possibility merely supports the argument that situations differ in meaningful ways that drive leadership behavior.

Event characteristics provide a valuable layer of explanation to the observation of variability in self-assessments of leadership identity and regulation. Amongst individuals experiencing variability in these constructs, it seems reasonable to expect that certain types of events are more likely to challenge self-identification with a leadership identity, prompting subsequent efforts to regulate, than others are. For events perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented, cognitive and affective processing tends to be more idiosyncratic (e.g., Mischel & Shoda, 1995). Leadership identity has yet to be experimented with and reinforced to the point where its self-descriptiveness and importance are clearly defined in the mind of the perceiver (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). The relative absence of defined roles leads to greater variety in assessments of leadership identity as potential leaders are actively involved in the social process of negotiating identity. This active negotiation process can lead to a greater frequency of discrepancies between actual and desired forms of leadership identity, triggering variable efforts to engage in regulatory efforts such as cognitive reappraisal and suppression. In contrast, more stability is proposed to exist when events are perceived to be macro-level, static, familiar, ordinary, positive, irrelevant, and past-oriented. For these events, leadership identity has either been previously negotiated or it is viewed as a low-stakes proposition to the perceiver.
Accordingly, more established and predictable approaches to cognitive and affective processing are employed, which promotes more consistency in terms of leadership self-construals. Discrepancies are likely to be rare inasmuch as heuristic processing strategies are designed to foster and maintain stability as a means of promoting efficiency and minimal resource requirements (Carpenter & Grossberg, 2003). The following hypothesis summarizes these ideas:

**Hypothesis 10:** Event characteristics will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, more variability will be observed as events are perceived to be more micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented.

**Conditional Effects as a Function of Event Characteristics**

There is strong support for the notion that the most effective way to model coherence in social-cognitive phenomena such as leadership identity variability and regulation is to model the interaction of person and situation factors (Cervone & Shoda, 1999; Shoda, Mischel, & Wright, 1993; Vansteelandt & Van Mechelen, 1998). Mischel and Shoda (1995) theorize that information pertaining to self is encoded as individuals consider their stable characteristics and beliefs alongside the specific event conditions they are being exposed to. This theory was later supported by a series of studies (Mendoza-Denton, Ayduk, Mischel, Shoda, & Testa, 2001) showing that individuals tend to encode the identity-related feedback they receive from events as they unfold in one of two ways. Those who view themselves according to *trait-like unconditional terms* (i.e., I am…) generalize event-level failure or success to their identity as a whole. Conversely, individuals who view themselves with an *interactionist or conditional mindset* (i.e., I
am…when…) tend to be more discerning in their assessment of and response to event-level feedback. Mendoza-Denton et al. (2001) primed these two modes of self-encoding in order to study their effects on affective responses and stereotype endorsements. Thus, while their research implies that person-based and situation factors interact to determine variable self-perceptions and responses, they do not directly test these phenomena.

In the present research, Core Self Evaluations (CSEs) and Implicit Person Theories (IPTs) were positioned as stable person features while event characteristics were depicted as a source of situational variability. High CSEs and entitist IPTs have both been associated with the type of global, trait-level processing of event-level feedback that Mendoza-Denton et al. (2001) describe. That is to say, individuals embodying high CSEs and entitist IPTs are relatively immune to variability in leadership identity when faced with events possessing features that prompt more idiosyncratic processing (e.g., micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented). Event-level feedback confirming their sense of leadership identity is used in support of pre-existing notions, while disconfirming feedback is either suppressed or discounted with the net result of stable cross-situational perceptions. Low CSEs and incremental IPTs, on the other hand, are vulnerable to variability in self-identification for reasons discussed in earlier sections. Events that promote active information processing are likely to engender even greater levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation amongst these individuals than their more predictable counterparts, given the tendency they have to monitor for negative feedback and circumstances signaling change.

In summary, a moderation effect was expected, whereby event characteristics would interact with person-level features to predict variability in leadership identity and
regulation when CSEs are low or when IPTs are incremental, but not when CSEs are high or when IPTs are entitist. The following two hypotheses summarize the proposed effects:

*Hypothesis 11:* Core self-evaluations and event characteristics will interact to predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. In particular, individuals with low core self-evaluations and high perceptions of event relevance, novelty, dynamism, and extraordinariness will experience the greatest variability in leadership identity and regulation.

*Hypothesis 12:* Implicit person theories and event characteristics will interact to predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. In particular, individuals with strong incrementalist beliefs and high perceptions of event relevance, novelty, dynamism, and extraordinariness will experience the greatest variability in leadership identity and regulation.

Having now identified three potential person and event-level antecedents of leadership identity and regulation variability, the following section switches focus to identify outcomes of interest to leaders and organizations that are likely to be impacted by the extent to which self-identification with leadership is variable as opposed to stable.

**Outcomes of Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation**

Two outcomes are selected and discussed in the following sections based on their natural link to leadership identity dynamics as well as their significance to being successful in the realm of leadership influence; developmental readiness and other-source ratings of leadership.
Developmental Readiness

Engaging in leadership effectively across a variety of contexts requires a broad repertoire of skills and abilities (Lord & Hall, 2005). Recognizing this, organizations have consistently invested significant time and expense into leadership skill development. Return on investment can be modest to say the least if learner engagement is negligible, prompting Avolio and Hannah (2008) to argue that close attention ought to be paid to developmental readiness.

The developmental readiness construct emerged from an exploration of the clinical, cognitive, and social psychology literature designed to explain the basis for a meta-analysis showing that some developmental interventions were still more effective than others even when all known factors (e.g., setting, development medium) were controlled for (Avolio, Reichard, Hannah, Walumbwa, & Chan, 2009). Several existing variables from these literatures were identified as key missing elements and thought to be subsumed within a broader concept depicting “readiness.” Amongst them were interests and goals, goal orientation, developmental efficacy, self-awareness and self-concept clarity, leader complexity, and meta-cognitive ability. Hannah and Lester (2009) synthesize these concepts to define developmental readiness as “both the ability and motivation to attend to, make meaning of, and appropriate knowledge into one’s long-term memory structures” (p. 37). Assessing readiness can aid individuals and organizations in the allocation of developmental resources, such that more is invested into people who are capable of, and sufficiently motivated to, engage in the strengthening of leadership-relevant knowledge and skills.
Ability to develop is generally defined as a combination of constructs whose presence or absence can aid or impede one’s propensity for processing developmentally-relevant information (Avolio & Hannah, 2008). For this research, three constructs were utilized to represent ability to develop; general cognitive ability, openness to experience, and organizational support for development. General cognitive ability and openness to experience have been shown to promote increased levels of adaptability to changing features of context (LePine, Colquitt, & Erez, 2000), resulting in behavior indicative of receptivity to development and change. Organizational support for development has been shown to be an important contextual factor that can assist or hinder one’s ability to focus on and engage with developmental programs (Orvis & Leffler, 2011). Organizations or groups that signal their investment in an individual’s career development have been shown to obtain more favorable results (e.g., Kraimer, Seibert, Wayne, Liden, & Bravo, 2011) due to trainee perceptions that career progression and growth are feasible.

Motivation to develop was likewise conceptualized as a combination of constructs, and appears to be a function of work-related motives as well as dispositional goal orientation and developmental efficacy (Avolio & Hannah, 2008). Work-related motives are construed as existing along a continuum that ranges from the absence of motives (i.e., amotivation) to externally-driven motives (i.e., extrinsic motivation) to internally-driven motives (i.e., intrinsic motivation), which are the most resistant to external threats because of their independence from situational factors (see Ryan & Deci, 2001). Goal orientation reflects an individual’s tendency to engage in actions such as development for competition with others as opposed to learning (i.e., performance versus mastery) and to approach success as opposed to avoiding failure (i.e., prove versus avoid;
see Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Developmental efficacy pertains to the belief that developmental goals are attainable (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Low developmental efficacy can be de-motivating in the sense that low expectancy of success engenders the perception that investing time and effort into change is futile, making the necessary allocation of resources unlikely (Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, & Harms, 2008).

According to Avolio and Hannah (2008), ability and motivation characteristics jointly feed into developmental readiness by giving rise to one of two types of self-reflection (see also Avolio, Wernsing, Chan, & Griffeth, 2007). *Adaptive* self-reflection entails the constructive application of lessons learned to leadership skill development (Trapnell & Campbell, 1999), whereas *maladaptive* self-reflection results in negative affect (e.g., anxiety) and cognitions, prompting disengagement from potential development (Mor & Winquist, 2002). Maladaptive self-reflection can feasibly occur whether variability in leadership identity is low or high. When variability is low, feedback that implies a need to develop can be perceived as an identity threat, prompting a defensive reaction that is other-focused or situation-focused. When variability is high, one’s sense of leadership identity is ambivalent, causing perceivers to migrate toward the activation and development of other self-concepts that provide more stability in terms of identification. Moderate levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation are most consistent with readiness in that they reflect an internally-consistent view of where one is best poised to develop and where they are not. Meanwhile, low and high levels of identity and regulation variability are likely to engender the types of maladaptive self-reflection previously described, hindering ability and motivation to develop.
Taken together, these aspects of developmental readiness suggest that the impact of variability in leadership identity and regulation may be curvilinear. Recent research by Pierce and Aguinis (2013) labels this type of phenomenon the “too-much-of-a-good-thing effect,” whereby certain psychological phenomena have a positive impact on outcomes up to a certain point, above which higher levels can actually be detrimental. A notable example of this phenomenon is self-efficacy, which is typically positively associated with higher levels of leadership performance (e.g., Prussia, Anderson, & Manz, 1998) even as excessively high levels have been linked to overconfidence and performance decline (Audia, Locke, & Smith, 2000). Taken to a certain degree, more variability in leadership identity and regulation can be positive from a developmental perspective in that it evidences nuanced interpretation and, potentially, learning and adaptation over the course of time. However, beyond a certain threshold, variability can actually detract from development in a number of ways. For instance, individuals may be more inclined to identify with aspects of self that have greater definition and stability. Another issue mentioned previously is that regulation efforts consume valuable cognitive resources that may otherwise be devoted to applying identity-relevant information to leadership development and growth. Based on this reasoning, the following hypothesis frames the effect of leadership variability on developmental readiness as curvilinear in shape:

**Hypothesis 13:** The relationship of variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation with developmental readiness will be curvilinear. Specifically, an inverted-U relationship will occur, whereby moderate levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation will be associated with an optimal level of developmental readiness.
Other-Source Ratings of Leadership

A point of emphasis throughout this chapter has been on the way in which leadership identity is jointly-negotiated by those who would claim a situational leadership role and those who are in a position to either grant or deny the claimer’s petition (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Shamir (2007) goes so far as to label followers “co-producers of leadership,” making other-source ratings a valuable outcome to consider as a function of variability in leadership identity and regulation. As a recent article by Hansbrough, Lord, and Schyns (2015) notes, follower perceptions of leadership are conceptually distinct from actual leadership performance in that they tend to be subjective and biased by a number of dispositional and measurement-related phenomena. Nevertheless, these authors acknowledge that perceptions of leadership can be valuable outcome measures in certain contexts such as identity, where perceptions are important drivers of follower decisions to ascribe someone leadership status as well as leader decisions to engage in identity-claiming behaviors.

Minimal levels of variability in identity and regulation could initially be regarded as advantageous, in that they enable individuals to come across as self-assured and stable in terms of whether a leadership identity either fits or does not fit them. However, other-source ratings will be less related to the identity variability one experiences and more related to whether or not an individual asserts a leadership role. That is to say, when variability is at a minimum and someone consistently attempts to assert themselves as the leader in various situations, other-source ratings of the individual’s leadership are likely to be high, barring other factors that may discredit the person’s leadership. Similar lack of variability could be displayed by people with no intention of claiming or regulating a
leadership identity. This behavior gives perceivers no basis for granting a leader identity, and the leadership ratings of outside observers are expected to reflect a lack of claiming efforts on the potential leader’s part. What results is an inconsistent relationship between variability and other-source ratings amongst individuals exhibiting minimal levels of cross-situational identity or regulation variance.

Excessive variability in leadership identity and regulation yield a similar outcome. In the absence of a clear and coherent leader identity narrative (Ibarra & Barbalescu, 2010), it can be difficult for would-be followers to ascertain whether or not someone ought to be regarded as a leader, and other-source ratings are likely to reflect this confusion. Early research on leadership perceptions (e.g., Smith & Foti, 1998) describes a prototype-matching process that enables followers to match potential leaders to pre-existing schemas for what leaders ought to look like when determining whether someone matches the characteristics of a leader. Inconsistent internalization of a leadership identity is likely to manifest itself in outward behavior, leaving followers without a defined behavioral sample they can use to compare someone with pre-existing schemas for leadership. DeRue et al. (2009) refer to this condition as identity ambiguity, where potential leaders encounter difficulty processing internal information as well as external signals to determine whether a leadership identity fits in a given situation. Social interactions are often a means individuals will utilize to resolve such ambiguity (Bartel & Dutton, 2001), but where the social cues one displays to signal a leadership identity are inconsistent, followers are hard-pressed to ascribe authority to the individual. DeRue et al. (2009) refer to this process as a downward leadership identity spiral, where ambivalence in claiming a leadership role is met by reluctance on the part of others to
grant such a role, which increases the would-be leader’s hesitance in a cyclical pattern that reiterates over the course of time and events.

At moderate levels of identity and regulation variability, leaders are displaying some consistency that others can acknowledge while providing nuanced signals regarding the importance and self-descriptiveness a leadership role has for them in different contexts. In one respect, predictable and well-defined efforts to claim a leadership role make it easier for followers to apply the prototype-matching process previously described (Smith & Foti, 1998). In another respect, a noticeable level of variability is capable of triggering systematic processing that deters more heuristic forms of thinking and associated applications of implicit leadership theories and stereotypes (Lord & Maher, 1993; Phillips & Lord, 1981). A complex and detailed depiction of one’s identity as a leader is perceived (Hannah, Lord, & Jennings, 2011), prompting others to provide more favorable assessments of leadership aptitude.

The hypothesis below encapsulates the curvilinear relationship described above:

**Hypothesis 14:** The relationship of variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation with other-source ratings of leadership will be curvilinear. Specifically, an inverted-U relationship will occur, whereby moderate levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation will be associated with the most favorable leadership perceptions.

**Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation as Mechanisms**

A central aim of this chapter has been to position the constructs of variability in leadership identity and regulation within a larger framework of well-established antecedents and outcomes. From the outset, it has been argued that these phenomena are
best construed as cognitive-affective mechanisms that mediate the impact of person-level and event-level variables on development as well as social perceptions. In other words, Core Self Evaluations, Implicit Person Theories, and Event Characteristics have predictable effects on Developmental Readiness and Leadership Perceptions as a function of someone’s propensity to engage in varying levels of identification with a leadership self-concept as well as varying efforts to regulate perceptions by means of suppression and cognitive reappraisal.

An important analog to this aim is the notion of core affect variability (e.g., Kuppens et al., 2010), an individual difference reflecting the extent to which people’s experiences of emotional valence and arousal vary across events. Core affect variability has been used as a linking mechanism to account for the differential impact of stressful events on positive and negative psychological adjustment (Kuppen et al., 2007). Stress-inducing events are believed to give rise to different levels of core affect variability over time, with some individuals experiencing large fluctuations in affect while others encounter negligible changes. Greater variability is associated with deleterious outcomes such as neuroticism and depression, while diminished variability is linked to positive outcomes such as higher self-esteem. In an effort to mitigate the negative consequences of variable reactions, individuals can engage in emotional regulation, but this involves emotional labor and can cost the individual valuable and limited affective resources.

To date, such a notion has yet to be conceptually or empirically applied to the general domain of self-concept research as well as the specific domain of leadership identity. The present research constituted an initial step towards establishing a similar effect as it pertains to identity dynamics. Summarizing these claims, variability in
leadership identity and regulation were expected to mediate the relationships of antecedents and outcomes discussed throughout this chapter, consistent with the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 15: Variability in leadership identity will mediate the relationship between:

a) Core self-evaluations and developmental readiness
b) Implicit person theories and developmental readiness
c) Event characteristics and developmental readiness
d) Core self-evaluations and other-source ratings
e) Implicit person theories and other-source ratings
f) Event characteristics and other-source ratings

Hypothesis 16: Variability in leadership identity regulation will mediate the relationship between:

a) Core self-evaluations and developmental readiness
b) Implicit person theories and developmental readiness
c) Event characteristics and developmental readiness
d) Core self-evaluations and other-source ratings
e) Implicit person theories and other-source ratings
f) Event characteristics and other-source ratings

Event Characteristics as Conditional Influencers

Previous sections position features of events as moderating variables in the sense that certain types of events are more likely to elicit the effects described throughout this chapter than others are. Situations prompting heuristic forms of processing, such as
events perceived to be familiar, ordinary, or positive in nature (Hoffman & Lord, 2013), are less conducive to triggering cross-situational variability in leadership identity and regulation. Pre-existing self-schemas are likely to be activated and applied with minimal modifications and as a result, the ability of variability to function as a mechanism that mediates personal characteristics and leadership outcomes is limited. In contrast, for events requiring more systematic forms of processing, such as those that appear to be novel, relevant, or negative in nature, closer attention to leadership identity and regulation efforts increases the likelihood that variable self-evaluations will occur amongst those individuals who are prone to experiencing variability for the reasons outlined in previous sections. Accordingly, the role of variability as a mechanism of leadership perceptions and development becomes more prominent and the mediation described in Hypotheses 15 and 16 is more likely to be observed.

The following four hypotheses outline these proposed relationships in the context of Core Self-Evaluations and Implicit Person Theories being linked to developmental readiness and other-source ratings of leadership through variability in leadership identity and regulation when events are perceived as exhibiting certain features:

Hypothesis 17: The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity on the relationship of Core Self-Evaluations to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence of variability will be highest when Core Self-Evaluations are low and events are perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented.
Hypothesis 18: The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity regulation on the relationship of Core Self-Evaluations to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence of regulation variability will be highest when Core Self-Evaluations are low and events are perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented.

Hypothesis 19: The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity on the relationship of Implicit Person Theories to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence of variability will be highest amongst those with incrementalist beliefs who perceive events to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented.

Hypothesis 20: The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity regulation on the relationship of Implicit Person Theories to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence regulation variability will be highest amongst those with incrementalist beliefs who perceive events to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the notion of variability in leadership identity was introduced and described as an individual difference. Figure 2.1 was used to illustrate the ability for some would-be leaders to experience highly consistent levels of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance across events and time while others are prone to
experiencing significant change in their identification with a leadership self-concept within a similar time-frame. Variability in leadership identity regulation was also introduced as an individual difference bearing similar features to variability in leadership identity, but having the distinct purpose of assisting in the resolution of discrepancies between perceived and desired states of leadership identity. Antecedents of these novel constructs were then introduced at both the level of people and events. At the person-level, Core Self-Evaluations (Judge et al., 1997) and Implicit Person Theories (Dweck, 1996) were selected based on a number of features they possess that make them promising antecedents for identity-related dynamics. Features of events were selected to represent event-level influences, based on previous research suggesting the critical role context plays in determining self-concept identification (e.g., Mendoza-Denton et al., 2001).

Two outcomes of interest were also identified and linked conceptually to variability in leadership identity and regulation; Developmental Readiness and other-source perceptions of leadership. A curvilinear relationship between the variability constructs and each of the outcomes was proposed, suggesting that some variability is optimal. Too much or too little variability can be detrimental in terms of distracting attention from leadership development or putting off perceivers who are in the key position of granting or denying leadership influence. In this respect, variability in leadership identity and regulation were proposed to act as important mediating mechanisms between global self-evaluations (Core Self-Evaluations) and beliefs (Implicit Person Theories) as they impact outcomes of interest to leaders and organizations alike.
Meanwhile, event characteristics were expected to play a moderating role, such that certain types of events give rise to the hypothesized dynamics more than others do. Table 2.1 provides a summary of proposed hypotheses.

### Table 2.1. Summary of Hypothesized Relationships

| Hypothesis 1 | A leadership self-concept can be classified in terms of three distinct dimensions; (1) activation, (2) self-descriptiveness, and (3) importance, such that: (a) A leadership self-concept will be more activated in some situations than others, and (b) Individuals will make distinct self-assessments of a leadership self-concept’s self-descriptiveness and importance. |
| Hypothesis 2 | Across events and time, significant intra-individual variability will exist in terms of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance. |
| Hypothesis 3 | Individuals will differ from one another in terms of the extent to which they experience variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance. |
| Hypothesis 4 | Efforts to regulate leadership identity can be classified in terms of four distinct dimensions; reappraisal of self-descriptiveness, suppression of self-descriptiveness, reappraisal of importance, and suppression of importance. |
| Hypothesis 5 | Across events and time, significant intra-individual variability will exist in terms of individual efforts to regulate leadership identity. |
| Hypothesis 6 | Individuals will differ from one another in terms of the extent to which they experience variability in leadership identity regulation. |
| Hypothesis 7 | Variability in leadership identity will predict variability in leadership identity regulation, such that individuals experiencing higher levels of variability in leadership identity will also experience higher levels of variability in leadership identity regulation. |
| Hypotheses 8a-8b | Core self-evaluations will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, individuals exhibiting high core self-evaluations will exhibit lower levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation. |
| Hypotheses 9a-9b | Implicit Person Theories will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, individuals exhibiting entitist beliefs will exhibit lower levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation whereas individuals exhibiting incrementalist beliefs will exhibit higher levels of variability. |
| Hypotheses 10a-10b | Event characteristics will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, more variability will be observed as events are perceived to be more micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. |
Hypotheses 11a-11b  Core self-evaluations and event characteristics will interact to predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. In particular, individuals with low core self-evaluations and high perceptions of event relevance, novelty, dynamism, and extraordinariness will experience the greatest variability in leadership identity and regulation.

Hypotheses 12a-12b  Implicit person theories and event characteristics will interact to predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. In particular, individuals with strong incrementalist beliefs and high perceptions of event relevance, novelty, dynamism, and extraordinariness will experience the greatest variability in leadership identity and regulation.

Hypotheses 13a-13b  The relationship of variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation with developmental readiness will be curvilinear. Specifically, an inverted-U relationship will occur, whereby moderate levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation will be associated with an optimal level of developmental readiness.

Hypotheses 14a-14b  The relationship of variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation with other-source ratings of leadership will be curvilinear. Specifically, an inverted-U relationship will occur, whereby moderate levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation will be associated with the most favorable leadership perceptions.


Hypotheses 16a-16f  Variability in leadership identity regulation will mediate the relationship between: a) Core self-evaluations and developmental readiness, b) Implicit person theories and developmental readiness, c) Event characteristics and developmental readiness, d) Core self-evaluations and other-source ratings, e) Implicit person theories and other-source ratings, and f) Event characteristics and other-source ratings.

Hypotheses 17a-17b  The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity on the relationship of Core Self-Evaluations to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by events. Specifically, the mediating influence of variability will be highest when Core Self-Evaluations are low and events are perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented.

Hypotheses 18a-18b  The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity regulation on the relationship of Core Self-Evaluations to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence of regulation variability will be highest when Core Self-Evaluations are low and events are perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented.
| Hypotheses 19a-19b | The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity on the relationship of Implicit Person Theories to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence of variability will be highest amongst those with incrementalist beliefs who perceive events to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. |
| Hypotheses 20a-20b | The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity regulation on the relationship of Implicit Person Theories to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence regulation variability will be highest amongst those with incrementalist beliefs who perceive events to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. |
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS OF PILOT STUDY

Pilot Study Rationale

The present research was intended to test the idea that leadership identity and the strategies undertaken to regulate it vary in ways that impact important developmental and perception-based outcomes (Alvesson & Wilmott, 2002; Bosma & Kunnen, 2001; Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2010). Doing so required a paradigm for quantifying intra-individual variability in leadership identity and regulation, making pilot work necessary to establish a suitable methodological framework. Three steps were taken in the pilot phase to accomplish this aim; ensuring that provided instructions were successful at activating a leadership identity, developing dimensional scales of leadership identity and regulation, and ensuring that these scales could be utilized to model cross-situational variability.

Activation is a critical boundary condition to assessing identity-related dynamics. This requirement made it important to confirm that a leadership identity, and not an alternative role identity (e.g., student), would be activated when the proposed methodology and instructions were used. Toward this end, undergraduate students with leadership experience were asked to envision a total of six situations that recently occurred (past), were in the process of occurring (present), or would soon be occurring (future). For the first set of three past/present/future events, participants were prompted to focus on writing about and rating someone else’s non leadership-related experiences.
The purpose of this condition was to create a situation where the respondent’s leadership identity would not be activated. For the second set of three past/present/future events, subjects were instructed to write about events that reflected their active, first-hand engagement with a leadership role. The order in which subjects were asked to provide each set of three events was counterbalanced to rule out order effects. Following each set of three events, a lexical decision task was used to assess activation differences in leadership identity as a function of primed social role (e.g., external observer, leader).

To develop psychometrically-acceptable scales of variability in leadership identity and regulation, participants were asked to complete a series of Likert-type rating scales for the three leadership-related events they experienced and wrote about. Items intended to assess two dimensions of leadership identity (i.e., self-descriptiveness and importance) and four dimensions of leadership identity regulation (i.e., re-appraisal and suppression of identity self-descriptiveness and importance) were responded to by subjects in reference to each event. Factor analysis and reliability estimates were used to refine these scales in the interest of maximizing psychometric qualities.

Finally, in order to ensure that writing about and rating multiple leadership events constituted a sufficient paradigm for studying variability in leadership identity and regulation, an exploratory analysis of dispositional variability was conducted using the ratings participants provided for each of the leadership events. Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICCs) were used to indicate the extent to which event-level variability in leadership identity and regulation could be reasonably aggregated and studied at the person-level using three observations. Results of this analysis were also closely examined to determine an optimal number of events to collect in the primary study.
Method

Subjects completed the pilot study in a laboratory setting. In addition to providing a series of leadership and non-leadership examples, participants completed measures for the leadership episodes and also took part in two lexical decision tasks.

Participants

Data were collected from 100 undergraduate students at a large Midwestern university. Direct and active (i.e., current) experience with management and/or leadership was a pre-requisite for participation. To account for this, subjects were asked to indicate the amount of time, in months and years, they engaged in a role with management or leadership responsibility, both (a) overall and (b) within their current role. Participation was compensated for with extra credit for a psychology course.

Procedure

Upon their arrival at the laboratory, participants were provided with basic information regarding the experiment and were asked to provide informed consent. Subjects consenting to participate completed a series of computerized measures as described below. After completing these measures, subjects were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Stimulus Materials and Measures

Participant-generated events. In order to prime self-identification with leadership and non-leadership identities, subjects were asked to write about and reflect on a total of six events, divided amongst two conditions (see McConnell, Rydell, & Brown, 2009, for a similar approach to priming). In each condition, they were asked to write about one event occurring in the past, one event occurring in the present, and one event
occurring in the future (see Appendix B). This was done as a means of ensuring that the three events they wrote about were distinct from one another.

For the personal leadership experience condition, a leadership identity was primed. For the past-oriented event, subjects were instructed to “Visualize a specific, work-related event you faced as a leader in the recent past.” For the present-oriented event, subjects were asked to “Visualize a specific, work-related event you are currently facing as a leader (not including this experiment).” For the future-oriented event, subjects were prompted to “Visualize a specific, work-related event you anticipate facing as a leader in the near future.” Subjects were asked to provide a brief (2-4 sentences) summary of the event as well as an additional description (1 or 2 sentences) of the attitudes, thoughts, and feelings they had about themselves as a leader.

A similar set of prompts were used for the non-leadership experience condition, with the notable exception that participants were prompted to identify scenarios that someone else they knew had either faced, were in the process of facing, or would soon be facing, priming a non-leadership identity. For the past-oriented event, subjects were instructed to “Visualize a specific event someone else you know faced in the recent past.” For the present-oriented event, subjects were asked to “Visualize a specific event someone else you know is currently facing.” For the future-oriented event, subjects were prompted to “Visualize a specific event someone else you know anticipates facing in the near future.” As with condition one, subjects were asked to provide a brief (2-4 sentences) summary of each event as well as an additional description (1 or 2 sentences) of the attitudes, thoughts, and feelings they had when they heard about each event.
The order in which participants received and responded to these prompts was counterbalanced to rule out ordering effects. A flow chart for the two conditions is illustrated in Figure 3.1. As this Figure illustrates, subjects in Condition 1 wrote about personal leadership experiences first and other-related, non-leadership experiences second, while subjects in Condition 2 completed the two tasks in reverse order.

**Identity activation.** As a means of confirming that participant-generated content pertaining to personal leadership experiences was successful in activating a leadership identity, a lexical decision task was developed (See Table 3.1 and Appendix C). In a lexical decision task, participants are presented with words and comparable non-words. The speed and accuracy with which participants are able to classify words and non-words constitutes an implicit measure of activation (Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2004) when the words are relevant to the type of activation being studied.

The lexical decision task was administered at two points during the experiment; 1) immediately following completion of the first set of three participant-generated events and 2) immediately following completion of the second set of participant-generated events. At each phase, subjects completed a series of 10 practice trials (5 generic words, 5 non-words) to ensure familiarity with the task, followed by 20 experimental trials (see Bargh & Chartrand, 2000, for a series of recommendations pertaining to measures of priming). For each trial, a letter string appeared on the screen that either represented a word or non-word. Participants were then instructed to indicate whether the letter string was a word or non-word using two number keys on their keyboard (1 = word; 3 = non-word). Reaction times were measured and averaged for the trials containing actual words.
that were correctly responded to, and this average was used as a dependent variable for activation. Of the 20 trials that subjects completed at each phase, 10 consisted of leadership-related attributes (e.g., directing, responsible, determined; Gerstner & Day, 1994), and 10 consisted of comparable non-words (e.g., reprobable). Table 3.1 provides a list of the words and non-words that were used. Reaction time data were assessed for outliers idiosyncratic to each subject (± 3 SD from subject means). When outliers were identified, subject mean reaction times were substituted.

**Condition 1: Personal Leadership Experiences First (n = 50)**

**Condition 2: Non-Personal, Non-Leadership Experiences First (n = 50)**

Figure 3.1. Flow chart of pilot study
Table 3.1. Leadership Words (Gerstner & Day, 1994) and Non-words Used in the Lexical Decision Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Decision Task 1 (Phase 2)</th>
<th>Leadership Words</th>
<th>Non-Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>Pashinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Channingful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Humbull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Concenated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Definity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>Imperable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insightful</td>
<td>Baws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Fexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Owtsphoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Stirkt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Decision Task 2 (Phase 4)</th>
<th>Leadership Words</th>
<th>Non-Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>Dicusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>Ferm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Maskerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Aritculit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Custagious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Onederful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Talinted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Unipionated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Imparshal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Lykable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the study was counterbalanced, half the subjects completed Lexical Decision Task 1 after they had written about and rated personal leadership experiences, while remaining participants responded to these items after they had reflected on non-personal, non-leadership experiences. The same was true of Lexical Decision Task 2, enabling a comparison of reaction times as a function of a) condition, defined as the type of events subjects previously wrote about; and b) order, defined in terms of whether subjects were completing their first or second lexical decision task after writing about and rating their personal leadership experiences.
Variability in leadership identity. A scale developed for this study was used to solicit event-level ratings of each of the two dimensions of leadership identity previously mentioned; self-descriptiveness and importance. Six items were initially developed to capture these two dimensions with the expectation of retaining a scale of 3-4 items per dimension for the focal study, based on psychometric characteristics (See Appendix D for a full listing of items).

Following each of the three participant-generated events pertaining to leadership, subjects provided ratings for the 12 initial items as they pertained to the prompt: “In this situation:” using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) to indicate the direction and extent of their agreement. A sample item for the self-descriptiveness dimension is; “I questioned my identity as a leader.” For the importance dimension, a sample item is; “Having me as the leader made a big difference.”

Responses were summed and averaged for each dimension in order to provide identity self-descriptiveness and importance measures. An index of variability in leadership identity was created by aggregating ratings across events.

Variability in leadership identity regulation. A scale was developed for this study based on Gross and John’s (2003) Emotional Regulation Questionnaire to assess identity regulation efforts (See Appendix E for a full listing of items). Two specific strategies for regulation were targeted by this questionnaire: reappraisal and suppression.

It is conceivable that these regulation strategies could be used in different ways to preserve either self-descriptiveness or importance. For instance, to regulate the perceived importance of a leadership identity within a given situation, an individual could a) reappraise the situation in a way that makes a leadership identity more or less significant.
to them, or b) suppress, or control their outward expression of a leader self-concept’s meaningfulness. Proceeding from this assumption, an initial pool of 20 items was developed for this scale to reflect a 2 (suppression versus reappraisal) x 2 (self-descriptiveness versus importance) matrix. A total of 12 items (six for self-descriptiveness, six for importance) were designated to assess reappraisal, while an additional 8 items (four for self-descriptiveness, four for importance) were designated to assess suppression.

Following each of the three participant-generated scenarios pertaining to leadership, subjects provided ratings for each of the 20 initial items using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). A sample item for suppression regulation is “I control my doubts about myself as a leader by not expressing them.” For the reappraisal dimension, a sample item is “When I want to feel less doubt about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.”

Responses were summed and averaged for each dimension in order to provide reappraisal and suppression measures specifically pertaining to identity self-descriptiveness and importance. An index of variability in leadership identity regulation was created by aggregating ratings across events.

**Event characteristics.** An event characteristics scale was included in the pilot study to serve two functions; it provided a manipulation check of past, present, and future events and it provided data for future exploratory analyses. The items for this scale were based on a recent conceptual article (Hoffman & Lord, 2013) that presents a taxonomy of event-related characteristics. According to Hoffman and Lord (2013), events vary meaningfully in terms of being a) past versus present versus future-oriented, b) relevant
versus irrelevant, c) extraordinary versus ordinary, d) micro versus macro-focused, e) familiar versus novel, f) static versus dynamic, and g) positive versus negative.

Following all six participant-generated scenarios, subjects classified each event along these seven dimensions using a 7-point Likert scale with varying response anchors based on the distinctions made above (Appendix F). For instance, in terms of assessing how novel an event is, subjects rated the event along a continuum ranging from familiar (1) to novel (7). Definitions of event dimensions were provided along with rating scales in order to facilitate a consistent conceptualization of each dimension across participants.

**Time Orientation.** People have been shown to vary reliably in terms of their identification with past, present, or future-oriented mindsets (Shipp, Edwards, & Lambert, 2009). This study’s instructions to reflect on past, present, and future events made this an important dynamic to consider. In order to control for temporal focus, subjects completed the 12-item Temporal Focus Scale (TFS) developed by Shipp et al. (2009; Appendix G), using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = never; 3 = sometimes; 5 = frequently; 7 = constantly) to rate the extent of their agreement with each item. A sample statement for present orientation is “I focus on what is currently happening in my life.” Shipp et al. (2009) report reliabilities for the TFS that range from .78 - .88 along with evidence suggesting its validity as a measure of temporal focus.

**Demographic Variables.** In addition to providing information pertaining to gender, race, age, and academic major, subjects were asked to indicate how many hours they function as a manager/supervisor/leader each week, as well as their total number of years of leadership experience (Appendix A). Tenure with the current organization as an a) employee and b) manager/supervisor/leader were also collected. Finally, subjects
completed three single-item 9-point Likert-type scales assessing self-perceived leadership experience (1 = no leadership experience at all; 9 = extensive leadership experience) leadership self-views (1 = in no way whatsoever do I see myself as a leader; 9 = I see myself first and foremost as a leader), and perceived variability in leadership identity (1 = my view of myself as a leader is very consistent across situations; 9 = my view of myself as a leader changes dramatically across situations).

Results

Results are organized below according to the three major research questions the pilot study was designed to ascertain: activation of a leadership self-concept, dimensionality of leadership identity and regulation, and variability in leadership identity and regulation at the person-level across events.

Sample Characteristics

Complete and acceptable survey-based data were collected for 97 participants. Three additional subjects provided data, but their responses were excluded due to lack of leadership experience (n = 2) and failure to complete the experiment (n = 1). An additional nine subjects were excluded from reaction-time data analyses due to (1) unreasonable responses (e.g., reaction times below 100 milliseconds, pressing all “1s”; n = 5) and (2) computer program issues (e.g., failure to record data; n = 4). Thus, a total sample of 88 participants (30 males, 58 females; mean age = 21.43; mean leadership experience (months) = 31.20) was utilized for the reaction time data analyses, while 97 subjects (35 males, 62 females; mean age = 31.08; mean leadership experience (months) = 31.08) were retained for the survey-based data analyses.
Leadership Self-Concept Activation

In order to assess the extent to which reflecting on first-hand leadership experiences successfully activated a leadership self-concept, subjects completed a lexical decision task containing leadership attribute words and non-words at two points during the pilot study; after writing about personal leadership experiences, and after writing about non-leadership experiences involving someone else (see Appendix B). The order in which they wrote about these two sets of experiences was counterbalanced, and reaction time data for correct responses was compared for the two lexical decision tasks in order to provide a test of activation differences. Mean reaction times for correctly-identified leadership words were calculated for each participant in the two conditions, following an analysis for outliers (i.e., reaction times ± 3 standard deviations above/below individual mean reaction time).

A 2 (condition: personal leadership versus other non-leadership) x 2 (order in which participants completed each condition) repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted in order to simultaneously test for ordering effects as well as activation differences. A statistically significant interaction term ($F_{1, 86} = 14.51, p < .001$, partial eta square = .144) was indicative of activation differences. Figure 3.2 provides an illustration of this interaction. In particular, regardless of whether participants wrote about personal leadership experiences ($\text{Mean RT}_{\text{leader}} = 845.48 \text{ ms, Mean RT}_{\text{other}} = 942.69$) or someone else’s non-leadership experiences ($\text{Mean RT}_{\text{leader}} = 810.28, \text{Mean RT}_{\text{other}} = 929.76$) first, reaction times to leadership words were quicker when participants had just written about personal leadership experiences. Mean reaction time differences were confirmed by
splitting the sample into each of the two conditions and obtaining significant results using paired-samples t-tests (condition 1 $t_{46} = -2.687, p = .01$; condition 2 $t_{40} = 2.679, p = .01$). A non-significant between subjects effect for order ($F_{1, 86} = 0.22, p = .640$) appeared to rule out the potential influence of an ordering effect, consistent with what is illustrated in Figure 3.2. Nevertheless, a significant interaction term suggests that some of the observed effect could have been attributable to the order in which participants completed the measures.

![Figure 3.2](image_url)

Figure 3.2. Interaction of condition and order on leadership self-concept activation.

In summary, these results show that having subjects write about their personal leadership experiences was an effective means of activating leadership self-concept.

**Dimensional Scales of Leadership Identity and Regulation**

Participants completed a 12-item “leadership identity” measure and a 20-item “leadership identity regulation” measure for each of the three personal leadership
experiences they wrote about. Both measures were developed for the purpose of this research, and thus, their psychometric qualities were unclear. In order to analyze each scale for factor dimensionality and reliability, a total of 291 observations (i.e., 97 participants x 3 completions of each scale) were used. It was decided to aggregate the data across past, present, and future events at the pilot stage to create a more robust and comprehensive initial perspective on the manner in which items represented identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression. Taking this approach results in errors that are non-independent, and hence, events will be analyzed separately from one another in the focal study for the purpose of validation.

Table 3.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for 12 Items Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>370.07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.99</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>274.08***</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 291 events.*

**Leadership identity scale development.** Two dimensions were hypothesized for the leadership identity scale: a self-descriptiveness dimension and an importance dimension. An initial exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the total item pool (12 items) and results of this analysis are reported in Table 3.2. Factor one, which had an eigenvalue of 4.16, appeared to consist of items capturing self-descriptiveness. Factor two (eigenvalue = 1.85) was comprised of a combination of self-descriptiveness and importance items. A third factor had an eigenvalue over 1 (eigenvalue = 1.10), but no independently-loading items were discovered when a three factor solution was explored. Table 3.3 provides factor loadings for the full 12-item scale, given a two-factor solution.
Table 3.3. Factor Loadings for a Two-Factor Scale Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance (12 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extracted Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I questioned my identity as a leader. (LISD-1, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I was certain that I should take a leadership role. (LISD-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt less like a leader than I usually do. (LISD-3, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I was qualified to be a leader. (LISD-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I had less confidence in being a leader than I usually have. (LISD-5, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My knowledge, skills, and abilities made me unfit to lead. (LISD-6, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being a leader was important to me. (LII-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt motivated to lead. (LII-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt like someone else could have taken the lead. (LII-3, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No one was counting on me to lead. (LII-4, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Having me as the leader made a big difference. (LII-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Serving in a leadership capacity was a priority for me. (LII-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *N = 291. LISD = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness; LII = Leadership Identity Importance; RC = Reverse-Coded; Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.

On the basis of these results, a second exploratory factor analysis was conducted on a six-item pool reflecting those items with the strongest initial factor loadings on the self-descriptiveness and importance dimensions. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 3.4. Factor one had an eigenvalue of 2.64 and represented items developed to assess identity self-descriptiveness. Factor two had an eigenvalue of 1.68 and consisted of identity importance items. A third factor was not discernible from the data (Factor three eigenvalue = 0.62). Model fit for the two-factor solution was exceptional, as indicated by a significant chi-square model fit value ($\chi^2 = 5.02, p = 0.29$). Factor loadings for this model are provided in Table 3.5.

Table 3.4. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for 6 Items Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>252.20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>247.18**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *N = 291 events. **p >.05, suggesting that the data align with a 2-factor solution.
Table 3.5. Factor Loadings for a Two-Factor Scale Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance (6 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extracted Factor</th>
<th>LID</th>
<th>LII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I questioned my identity as a leader. (LISD-1, RC)</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt less like a leader than I usually do. (LISD-3, RC)</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I had less confidence in being a leader than I usually have. (LISD-5, RC)</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being a leader was important to me. (LII-1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt motivated to lead. (LII-2)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Serving in a leadership capacity was a priority for me. (LII-6)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 291. LISD = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness; LII = Leadership Identity Importance; RC = Reverse-Coded; Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.

An 8-item model was also subjected to exploratory factor analysis in order to assess the psychometric characteristics of a more robust item set (i.e., 4 items per dimension rather than 3). Given a lack of four strong items for the self-descriptiveness dimension (see Table 3.3), the highest-loading remaining item for this dimension (LISD2) was selected for retention. Results of this analysis are reported in Table 3.6.

Model fit for a two-factor solution remained fairly strong with the addition of two items ($\chi^2 = 23.80, p = 0.03$). Factor one had an eigenvalue of 3.43 and once again consisted of items tapping the self-descriptiveness dimension of leadership identity. Factor two had an eigenvalue of 1.80 and was primarily comprised of items designed to tap identity importance, although the added self-descriptiveness item once again loaded on the importance dimension. Factor loadings for this scale are provided in Table 3.7.

Table 3.6. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for 8 Items Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$ df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>284.03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.80***</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>260.23***</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 291 events. **$p > .05$, suggesting that the data align with a 2-factor solution.**
Table 3.7. Factor Loadings for a Two-Factor Scale Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance (8 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extracted Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I questioned my identity as a leader. (LISD-1, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I was certain that I should take a leadership role. (LISD-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt less like a leader than I usually do. (LISD-3, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I had less confidence in being a leader than I usually have. (LISD-5, RC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being a leader was important to me. (LII-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt motivated to lead. (LII-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Having me as the leader made a big difference. (LII-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serving in a leadership capacity was a priority for me. (LII-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 291. LISD = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness; LII = Leadership Identity Importance; RC = Reverse-Coded; Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.

Two additional points merit mentioning with regard to the cross-loading self-descriptiveness item (i.e., LISD2). First, the wording of this item, which is positive in valence, differs from the negative wording valence of the other three self-descriptiveness items. Second, the dimensional loading of this item (- 0.297) fell just short of the .30 threshold established in Table 3.7.

In summary, the data appear to support the proposed two-dimensional scale for leadership identity that was developed for this study. A scale consisting of six items (e.g., 3 items per dimension) appeared to be superior and thus, was retained for the primary study. Data were also collected for the two additional items reported in Table 3.7 in order to provide some flexibility in terms of data analysis.

**Leadership identity regulation scale development.** Four dimensions were hypothesized for the leadership identity regulation scale. In particular, leaders were hypothesized to regulate identity self-descriptiveness and importance by engaging in two
Table 3.8. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for 20 Items Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance Reappraisal and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \Delta \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta df )</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1803.02</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>605.22</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1197.80***</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>403.01</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>202.21***</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Failed to converge</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 291 \) events.

regulatory behaviors; reappraisal and suppression. An initial exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the total item pool (20 items) and results of this analysis are reported in Table 3.8. Interestingly, a model attempting to fit the data to a four-factor solution, as proposed, failed to converge. Instead, a three-factor solution, whereby the two suppression dimensions (i.e., self-descriptiveness suppression and importance suppression) collapsed into a single dimension, appeared to be optimal. Factor one, which had an eigenvalue of 6.94, appeared to consist of items that captured the self-descriptiveness reappraisal dimension, with one exception (i.e., Item LIIR1). Factor two (eigenvalue = 4.33) was comprised of a combination of self-descriptiveness suppression and importance suppression items. A third factor had an eigenvalue of 1.20 and consisted of items designed to tap importance reappraisal. Table 3.9 provides factor loadings for the full 20-item scale, given a three-factor solution.

Although these results were encouraging, one objective of the pilot study was to utilize factor analysis as a means of developing leaner measures of these constructs. Accordingly, a second exploratory factor analysis was conducted on a nine-item pool reflecting those items with the strongest initial factor loadings on the three dimensions
identified in Tables 3.8 and 3.9. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 3.10.

Factor one had an eigenvalue of 4.03 and represented items developed to assess identity regulation.

### Table 3.9. Factor Loadings for a Three-Factor Leadership Identity Regulation Scale

Assessing Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal, Suppression, and Importance Reappraisal

(20 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extracted Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I control my view of myself as a leader by changing the way I think about the situation. (LISDR-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I want to feel less doubt about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LISDR-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I want to feel more confident about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LISDR-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In order to feel more confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about. (LISDR-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In order to avoid feeling less confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about. (LISDR-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I’m faced with a threat to my identity as a leader, I make myself think about it in a way that helps me assert myself as a leader. (LISDR-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I control my doubts about myself as a leader by not expressing them. (LISDS-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I am questioning my identity as a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LISDS-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I keep my level of confidence as a leader to myself. (LISDS-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When I am confident in my abilities as a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LISDS-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I control my doubts about the importance of being a leader by not expressing them. (LIIS-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I am questioning the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LIIS-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I keep my thoughts regarding the importance of personally being a leader to myself. (LIIS-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When I feel strongly about the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LIIS-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I control the impact of an event on my identity as a leader by changing the way I think about the situation I’m in. (LIIR-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I want to feel like an outcome is less important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LIIR-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I want to feel like an outcome is more important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LIIR-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In order to feel like being a leader is important to me, I change what I’m thinking about. (LIIR-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In order to avoid feeling like being a leader is unimportant to me, I change what I’m thinking about. (LIIR-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I’m faced with a stressful situation, thinking about the importance of being a leader helps me stay calm. (LIIR-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LISDR = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal; LIS = Leadership Identity Suppression; LISDS = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptive Suppression; LIIS = Leadership Identity Importance Suppression; LIIR = Leadership Identity Importance Reappraisal; Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.
self-descriptiveness reappraisal. Factor two had an eigenvalue of 2.09 and consisted of identity importance reappraisal items. A third factor consisting of identity suppression items had a weak eigenvalue (Factor 3 eigenvalue = 0.91), but strongly-loading items that did not cross-load onto other factors. Model fit for the three-factor solution was exceptional, as indicated by a significant chi-square model fit value ($\chi^2 = 20.05, p = 0.07$). Factor loadings for this model are provided in Table 3.11.

A 12-item model was also subjected to exploratory factor analysis in order to assess the psychometric characteristics of a more robust item set (i.e., 4 items per dimension rather than 3). Results of this analysis are reported in Table 3.12. Model fit for a three-factor solution remained fairly strong with the addition of three items ($\chi^2 = 61.89, p = 0.002$). Factor one had an eigenvalue of 5.18 and once again consisted of items tapping the self-descriptiveness reappraisal dimension. Factor two had an eigenvalue of 2.46 and was primarily comprised of items designed to tap identity importance reappraisal. Factor 3 had an eigenvalue of 1.01 and consisted of items assessing identity regulation suppression. Factor loadings for this scale are provided in Table 3.13.

Table 3.10. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for 9 Items Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal, Importance Reappraisal, and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>572.47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>159.91</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>412.56**</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.05**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>139.85***</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **$p >.05$, suggesting that the data align with a 3-factor solution
Table 3.11. Factor Loadings for a Three-Factor Leadership Identity Regulation Scale

Assessing Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal, Importance Reappraisal, and Suppression (9 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extracted Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When I want to feel less doubt about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LISDR-2)</td>
<td>1 LISDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I want to feel more confident about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LISDR-3)</td>
<td>2 LIIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to feel more confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about. (LISDR-4)</td>
<td>3 LIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I want to feel like an outcome is more important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LIIR-3)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In order to feel like being a leader is important to me, I change what I’m thinking about. (LIIR-4)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to avoid feeling like being a leader is unimportant to me, I change what I’m thinking about. (LIIR-5)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I am questioning the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LIIS-2)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I keep my thoughts regarding the importance of personally being a leader to myself. (LIIS-3)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I feel strongly about the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LIIS-4)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LISDR = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal; LIIR = Leadership Identity Importance Reappraisal; LIS = Leadership Identity Suppression; LIIS = Leadership Identity Importance Suppression; Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.

Table 3.12. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for 12 Items Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal, Importance Reappraisal, and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>778.56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>237.73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>540.83***</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.89**</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>175.83***</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 291 events. **p > .05, suggesting that the data align with a 3-factor solution.
Table 3.13. Factor Loadings for a Three-Factor Scale Assessing Leadership Identity

Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal, Importance Reappraisal, and Suppression (12 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extracted Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When I want to feel less doubt about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LISDR-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I want to feel more confident about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LISDR-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to feel more confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about. (LISDR-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In order to avoid feeling less confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about. (LISDR-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I want to feel like an outcome is less important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LIIR-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I want to feel like an outcome is more important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LIIR-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to feel like being a leader is important to me, I change what I’m thinking about. (LIIR-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In order to avoid feeling like being a leader is unimportant to me, I change what I’m thinking about. (LIIR-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I control my doubts about myself as a leader by not expressing them. (LISDS-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I am questioning the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LIIS-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I keep my thoughts regarding the importance of personally being a leader to myself. (LIIS-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When I feel strongly about the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LIIS-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LISDR = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal; LIIR = Leadership Identity Importance Reappraisal; LIS = Leadership Identity Suppression; LISDS = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness Suppression; LIIS = Leadership Identity Importance Suppression; Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.

In summary, the data did not appear to support the proposed four-dimensional model for leadership identity regulation. Instead, a three-factor solution whereby identity self-descriptiveness suppression and importance suppression are considered together seemed to provide the best data fit. A scale consisting of 9 items (e.g., 3 items per dimension) appeared to be superior and thus, was retained for the primary study. Data were also collected for the three additional items reported in Table 3.13 in order to provide some flexibility in terms of data analysis.
**Overall measurement model.** In order to further assess an optimal combination of items across the two scales developed for this study, a series of confirmatory factor analyses were conducted. Multiple item-configurations described above were compared to each other in terms of data fit, and the results of these analyses are reported in Table 3.14. Consistent with the results described above, the optimal alternative appeared to be a measurement model consisting of a six-item, two-factor leadership identity scale and a nine-item, three-factor leadership identity regulation scale (i.e., Model Six in Table 3.14). Structural coefficients and residual variances for this model are provided in Figure 3.3.

Reliabilities appeared to fall within acceptable range (i.e., above .70; see Nunnally, 1978) for each of the scales and constituent subscales. The 6-item leadership identity scale had a full-scale reliability of .74. The three self-descriptiveness items had decent reliability (Cronbach’s α = .76), while higher reliability was observed for the three importance items (Cronbach’s α = .83). The 9-item leadership identity regulation scale had a .84 reliability overall. Sub-scale reliabilities for self-descriptiveness reappraisal, importance reappraisal, and identity suppression were .87, .84, and .86, respectively.

**Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation Across Events**

Each participant completed the above-referenced measures of leadership identity and regulation a total of three times; once for each of the personal leadership experiences they wrote about and reflected upon. It was hypothesized that both measures would reflect substantive variability when event-level ratings were aggregated to the person level. The analyses reported below were derived from scale and sub-scale scores that reflected (a) the 6-item, 2-factor leadership identity scale and (b) the 9-item, 3-factor leadership identity regulation scale proposed above (see Model Six in Table 3.14).
Table 3.14. A Comparison of Measurement Models Using Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model One</strong></td>
<td>495.69</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-item LID (2 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-item LIDreg (4 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Two</strong></td>
<td>298.03</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>197.66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-item LID (2 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-item LIDreg (4 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Three</strong></td>
<td>265.42</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-item LID (2 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-item LIDreg (3 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Four</strong></td>
<td>229.92</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-item LID (2 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-item LIDreg (3 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Five</strong></td>
<td>187.70</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-item LID (2 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-item LIDreg (3 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Six</strong></td>
<td>120.77**</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66.93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-item LID (2 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-item LIDreg (3 factors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* LID = Leadership Identity Scale; LIDreg = Leadership Identity Regulation Scale.
Figure 3.3. Confirmatory factor analysis of 6-item questionnaire for leadership identity and 9-item questionnaire for leadership identity regulation.
**Variability in leadership identity.** A repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted as an initial test of mean differences in self-reported leadership identity across the three events. The results were statistically significant ($F_{2,192} = 3.26, p < .05$, partial eta square $= .033$), but a visual inspection of the means, the between-subjects intercept, and the error term made it clear that these differences were nominal. This is likely due to limitations inherent in using a repeated-measures ANOVA paradigm, such as its assumption that covariates (e.g., subjects and event-level ratings) cannot significantly interact. In order to ameliorate this issue, the data were tested for a nested structure using Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM). Three event-level (i.e., level one) ratings of leadership identity were nested within each participant (i.e., level two) for a total of 291 event-level ratings nested within 97 participants. The results for model one in Table 3.15 are consistent with the results of this analysis. An intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.4766 was obtained, suggesting that nearly 48% of the variability in leadership identity resided at the between-subjects level. The significant random coefficients for residual ($\sigma^2 = 0.56, p < .001$) and intercept ($\tau_{00} = 0.51, p < .001$) effects suggest that additional factors could be modeled to account for differences in the extent to which individual leaders vary in their identification with a leadership self-concept across events. Null models were also calculated for each of the two dimensions of leadership identity, yielding ICCs of 0.3564 and 0.5205 for leadership self-descriptiveness and importance, respectively. In each case, the random coefficients remained statistically significant.
Table 3.15. HLM Results for a Null Model of Leadership Identity and a Model Where Past, Present, and Future Temporal Orientation Are Modeled as Fixed Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effects</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept $\gamma_{00}$</td>
<td>5.25** (0.08)</td>
<td>4.14** (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSpast $\gamma_{01}$</td>
<td>-0.17** (0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSpresent $\gamma_{02}$</td>
<td>0.17 (0.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSfuture $\gamma_{03}$</td>
<td>0.18* (0.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Random Effects</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept $\tau_{00}$</td>
<td>0.51** (0.10)</td>
<td>0.43** (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual $\sigma^2$</td>
<td>0.56** (0.06)</td>
<td>0.56** (0.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>787.69</td>
<td>783.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ Deviance ($\Delta$ df)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>4.19 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>791.69</td>
<td>787.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>799.03</td>
<td>794.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Level 1 $n = 291$; Level 2 $n = 97$. Standard errors are reported in parentheses.

For reasons previously described, the influence of time orientation on self-perceptions of identity was also assessed by modeling past, present, and future time orientation as a set of fixed effects, per the recommendation of Shipp, Edwards, and Lambert (2009). As model two in Table 3.15 illustrates, a significant and negative fixed effect for past temporal focus was observed ($\gamma_{01} = -0.17, p = .009$), suggesting that participants with a tendency to focus on the past also tended to rate themselves lower, on average, in terms of identity. A significant and positive fixed effect for future temporal focus was also observed ($\gamma_{03} = 0.18, p = .038$), suggesting that subjects who focused on the future also tended to rate themselves higher in terms of identity. Despite these encouraging findings, modeling temporal focus failed to improve the model in terms of
overall data fit (Δdeviance from null model = 4.19, Δdf = 3). It could be that prompting subjects to write about past, present, and future events diminished the impact of time orientation on self-assessments of leadership identity. For instance, even someone with a strong future orientation would have felt obliged to think in terms of the past when asked to provide an example of a leadership event occurring in the past.

Similar analyses were performed for identity self-descriptiveness and importance. Regarding self-descriptiveness, a significant coefficient was observed for past orientation (γ₁ = -0.26, p = .002). The negative sign of the relationship suggests that past-oriented participants rated a leadership identity as less self-descriptive. Minimal improvement was observed in terms of data fit when the temporal focus fixed effects were added to the model (Δdeviance from null model = 4.65, Δdf = 3). For identity importance, significant results emerged for future orientation only (γ₃ = 0.32, p = .002) in a manner suggesting that future-oriented subjects perceived a leadership identity as more important. Data fit slightly improved for a model including the temporal orientation constructs (Δdeviance from null model = 5.87, Δdf = 3).

**Variability in leadership identity regulation.** A repeated-measures ANOVA failed to indicate significant mean differences in self-reported leadership identity regulation across the three events (F₂, 192 = 0.28, p = .76, partial eta square = .003). Furthermore, consistent with the output obtained for leadership identity variability, a visual inspection of the results suggested that the use of a flat (i.e., non-nested) data structure was possibly obscuring the ability to analyze variability across events in leadership identity regulation efforts.
Table 3.16. HLM Results for a Null Model of Leadership Identity Regulation and a Model Where Past, Present, and Future Temporal Orientation Are Modeled as Fixed Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effects</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept $\gamma_{00}$</td>
<td>4.53**</td>
<td>2.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSpast $\gamma_{01}$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSpresent $\gamma_{02}$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSfuture $\gamma_{03}$</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Random Effects</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept $\tau_{00}$</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual $\sigma^2$</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit Statistics</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>682.76</td>
<td>681.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ Deviance ($\Delta$ df)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.66 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>686.76</td>
<td>685.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>694.10</td>
<td>692.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Level 1 $n = 291$; Level 2 $n = 97$. Standard errors are reported in parentheses.

HLM was utilized to model a nested data structure, yielding the results reported in Table 3.16. A total of 291 ratings of leadership identity regulation were nested within 97 participants. An ICC of .7611 was obtained for the null model, suggesting that 76% of the variability in leadership identity regulation efforts resided at the between-subjects level. The significant random coefficients for residual ($\sigma^2 = 0.28, p < .001$) and intercept ($\tau_{00} = 0.86, p < .001$) effects suggest that additional factors could be modeled to account for differences in the extent to which individual leaders vary in their self-reported efforts to regulate leadership identity across events. Null models were also calculated for each of the three sub-dimensions of leadership identity regulation described above, yielding
ICCs of 0.6011, 0.6480, and 0.7333 for self-descriptiveness reappraisal, importance reappraisal, and identity suppression, respectively. In each case, the random coefficients remained statistically significant.

The influence of time orientation on self-perceived leadership identity regulation was evaluated by testing a second model (see model two, Table 3.16) that contained fixed effects for past, present, and future time orientation. None of these effects were statistically significant, and model fit was not improved by accounting for these factors (Δdeviance from null model = 1.66, df = 3). Thus, temporal focus did not appear to influence assessments of leadership identity regulation as a whole.

Separate analyses conducted for identity self-descriptiveness reappraisal, importance reappraisal, and suppression yielded mixed results. For self-descriptiveness reappraisal, future-orientation emerged as a significant predictor (γ₀³ = 0.34, p = .004) in a direction implying that future-oriented subjects engaged in more self-descriptiveness reappraisal. Data fit improved when the temporal orientation constructs were added to the model (Δdeviance from null model = 9.42, Δdf = 3). An analysis of importance reappraisal also yielded a significant effect for future orientation (γ₀³ = 0.35, p = .005). This finding suggests that future-oriented participants reappraised information pertaining to the importance of a leadership identity more. Once again, data fit improved as a result of incorporating the temporal orientation constructs (Δdeviance from null model = 11.15, Δdf = 3). For suppression, none of the effects approached significance and data fit was worse when past, present, and future temporal orientation were included in the model (Δdeviance from null model = -5.75, Δdf = 3). Overall, these mixed results likely cancelled each other out when the scale as a whole was analyzed in Table 3.16. Isolating
aspects of leadership identity regulation provided a more accurate depiction of the influence of temporal orientation.

**Manipulation Check**

As a means of ensuring that participants wrote about perceptually-distinct experiences of leadership, they were guided to write about a past event, a present event, and a future event. The extent to which they did so was assessed by asking participants to rate each event in terms of its temporality using a single, 7-point Likert scale item (1 = past; 7 = future). A repeated-measures ANOVA of these three event-ratings was statistically significant ($F_{2,192} = 152.00$, $p < .001$, partial eta square = .613), and a visual inspection of the means (past event mean = 2.24; present event mean = 4.11; future event mean = 6.14) suggests that subjects responded appropriately as they wrote and reflected on their leadership experiences.

**Limitations**

Despite the promising nature of these findings, a couple of limitations merit mentioning. First, the HLM analyses above are based on three event-level observations for each participant, which may not be adequate to model the full scope and range of variability in leadership identity and regulation. For this reason, a total of six event-level observations of leadership were collected from each participant in the primary study to facilitate a more robust sample. The three additional first-hand experiences of leadership replaced the events that subjects were asked to supply that were non-leadership oriented and connected with someone else’s experience.

A second area of limitation pertained to the relatively small time period during which leadership episodes and event-level ratings were collected. By having subjects
provide these things in one sitting and within a manner of minutes, the effects of certain types of rater bias (e.g., primacy effects) may have been exacerbated. Accordingly, a three-wave data collection was used in the primary study, whereby subjects were asked to provide two leadership episodes per week over the course of a three week data collection period.

**Summary**

A pilot study was undertaken to establish a defensible methodology for modeling variability in leadership identity and regulation. The results of this chapter provide support for the core methodology that was used in the primary study, while identifying potential concerns that were addressed with minor adjustments to the overall paradigm.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY OF FOCAL STUDY

Method

Subjects completed the primary study online over a period of three weeks, as illustrated in Figure 4.1. At each stage, participants were asked to provide two distinct examples of their leadership within the past week, which they rated and reflected on using the scales developed in Chapter III. Subjects were also asked to complete additional measures at the initial stage as described below. Upon completion of the study, an MBA instructor or work supervisor identified by the participant was contacted via e-mail and asked to rate the participant’s leadership.

Participants

The targeted sample size for the primary study was 100 graduate students from MBA programs in the Midwestern United States. In order to arrive at the proposed sample size, a power analysis was conducted using Cohen’s (1988) power tables. When alpha is set at 0.05 (two-tailed), a medium effect size (0.30) is expected, and a relatively high degree of power (0.85) is desired, the suggested sample size is 97 (see Cohen, 1988, pg. 102). Direct experience with management and/or leadership was a pre-requisite for participation.
Procedure

This study unfolded in three phases occurring over the course of two weeks. All measures in this study were computerized. At Time 1, subjects were briefed about the nature of the study. Those consenting to participate wrote about and rated two personal experiences of leadership. Subjects also responded to a series of measures designed to assess the various relationships hypothesized in Chapter II. At Time 2 and Time 3, subjects were asked to provide and rate two additional and distinct leadership experiences, one week and two weeks following Time 1. Subjects were asked to complete these measures via an e-mail sent to them by the primary researcher containing a link to the second and third surveys, respectively. Following the study, subjects were asked to provide the names and e-mail addresses of three of their MBA faculty and/or work supervisors. An e-mail was sent to these individuals mid-semester (i.e., once the faculty had adequate time to become acquainted with them), asking them to complete a brief measure of the research participant’s leadership ability. Permission to contact them was sought from participants at the conclusion of Time 1. In order to incentivize participation, subjects were told that each completed survey constituted an entry into a drawing for five $50 gift cards.

Event-Level Measures

Participant-generated leadership events. At each of the three time points shown in Figure 4.1, subjects were asked to write about and reflect on two distinct episodes of leadership they had engaged in within the last week. For each event, subjects were asked to provide a brief (2-4 sentence) description of the actual event as well as an
Figure 4.1. Flow chart of primary study.

additional description (1 or 2 sentences) of the attitudes, thoughts, and feelings they had about themselves as a leader surrounding the event (see Appendix H). Participants providing a complete response at all three time points (i.e., initial response, one week later, two weeks later) generated a total of 6 events.

**Variability in leadership identity.** Subjects rated the extent to which a leadership identity was a) self-descriptive and b) important to them with regard to each event they provided, using the six-item leadership identity scale that was developed in Chapter III. Responses were provided using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). As mentioned previously, data were also collected for two additional items that were originally developed for this scale in order to afford flexibility in data analysis (see Appendix I for full scale). Responses across the events participants wrote about were aggregated to model variability in leadership identity.

**Variability in leadership identity regulation.** Subjects rated the extent to which they regulated leadership identity for each event via cognitive reappraisal and/or suppression, using the nine-item leadership identity regulation scale that was developed in Chapter III. Responses were provided using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly
disagree; 7 = strongly agree). Data were also collected for three additional items that were originally developed for this scale in order to afford flexibility in data analysis (see Appendix J for full scale). Responses across the events participants wrote about were aggregated to model variability in leadership identity regulation.

**Event characteristics.** Subjects rated each scenario they provided in terms of seven items that corresponded to the seven event dimensions identified by Hoffman and Lord (2013), using a 7-point Likert scale with varying response anchors based on the distinctions made above (Appendix F). For instance, in terms of assessing how novel an event is, subjects rated the event along a continuum ranging from familiar (1) to novel (7). As in the pilot phase, definitions of each event dimension anchor were provided along with the rating scales.

**Dispositional Measures**

**Core self-evaluations.** Core self-evaluations were measured with the 12-item Core Self Evaluation Scale (CSES) developed by Judge, Erez, Bono, and Thoreson (2003; Appendix K). Subjects rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). A sample reverse-coded item is; “I do not feel in control of my success in my career.” Judge et al. (2003) report that the CSES performs well as a measurement model ($\chi^2_{48df} = 97.51$, RMSEA = .08, CFI = .92) while exhibiting strong reliability ($\alpha = .84$).

**Implicit person theories.** An 8-item scale developed by Levy and Dweck (1997) was used to measure implicit person theories (Appendix L). Four of these items gauged incrementalist beliefs (e.g., “People can substantially change the kind of person they are”) while the other four measured entitist beliefs (e.g., “Everyone is a certain kind of
person, and there is not much they can really change about that”). Participants rated each item using a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 6 = strongly agree). Consistent with previous studies (e.g., Heslin, Latham, & Vandewalle, 2005), the entitist items were reverse-scored and a mean item response score was calculated to produce a subject’s IPT score. This scale has been shown to exhibit high internal consistency (α = .93, Levy & Dweck, 1997) and construct validity (Dweck, 1999).

**Developmental readiness.** Data from six scales reflecting ability and motivation to develop were collected to model developmental readiness as described below.

General cognitive ability was assessed by asking participants to self-report their scores on the Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT; Appendix M). The GMAT consists of four assessments that are timed; an analytical writing exercise and items assessing integrated, quantitative, and verbal reasoning. A total score is calculated on the basis of the verbal and quantitative assessments, with scores ranging from 200-800. Subjects also receive a separate score for the analytical writing assessment (i.e., 0-6 in half-point intervals) as well as the integrated reasoning portion (i.e., 1-8 in single-point intervals). Numerous studies have utilized the GMAT as a proxy of cognitive ability (e.g., Farh, Seo, & Tesluk, 2012; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1994; Quigley, 2013), and it is frequently utilized as an admission criterion for MBA programs.

Openness to experience was assessed with the 8-item Openness scale from Thompson’s (2008) International English Mini-Markers (Appendix N). A notable strength of this scale is its consistent validity across subjects who vary in terms of their English-speaking background. For this measure, subjects were presented with a single word (e.g., “Intelligent,” “Creative”) and asked to rate the extent to which the word was
an accurate descriptor of them in comparison to other people they knew of a similar demographic makeup (e.g., age, sex). Accuracy ratings were made according to a 5-point Likert scale (1 = accurate; 5 = accurate). Thompson (2008) reports a reliability of .85 for this subscale.

Organizational support for development was measured using a modified version of the 12-item scale developed by DeVos, DeHauw, and VanderHeijen (2011) to assess perceptions of support for competency development (Appendix O). Subjects used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = completely disagree; 5 = completely agree) to indicate the extent of their agreement with each of the statements. Sample items included; “This program makes sure that I develop the competencies that I need for my career” and “I get the necessary time and means to further develop my competencies.” The original version of this scale had an internal consistency of .82 (DeVos et al., 2011).

Work-related motives were measured using an adapted version of the 18-item Work Extrinsic Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS) developed by Tremblay, Blanchard, Taylor, Pelletier, and Villeneuve (2009; Appendix P). For each item, subjects were asked to “indicate to what extent each of the following items corresponds to the reasons why you are presently involved in an MBA program” using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = does not correspond at all; 4 = corresponds moderately; 7 = corresponds exactly.” A sample item for intrinsic motivation is “For the satisfaction I experience from taking on interesting challenges.” For extrinsic motivation, a sample item is “For the income it provides me.” Responses to the 18 items are combined into a single score using a formula outlined by Tremblay et al. (2009) whereby higher scores are indicative of internally-driven motives. According to Tremblay et al. (2009), reliability estimates for
the WEIMS subscales range from .72 - .87 and the measurement model fits the data well \( (\chi^2_{273\text{df}} = 540.32, \text{RMSEA} = .05, \text{CFI} = .90). \)

Goal-orientation was measured using the 12-item Achievement Goals Questionnaire (ACQ: Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Appendix Q). The ACQ measures four types of goal orientation; performance-avoid, performance prove, mastery-avoid, and mastery prove. In the context of modeling developmental readiness, the mastery-prove and mastery-avoid items were used as a measure of learning goal-orientation. Participants rated each item on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all true of me; 7 = very true of me). Responses to the subscales were combined by reverse-coding the mastery-avoid items, such that higher scores were indicative of mastery-prove orientation. Reliabilities for the ACQ range from .85 - .97 (Elliot & McGregor, 2001) and the scale as a whole exhibits strong properties \( (\chi^2_{48\text{df}} = 60.49, \text{RMSEA} = .04, \text{CFI} = .99). \)

Leadership developmental self-efficacy was measured using an adapted version of the eight item general self-efficacy scale developed by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001; Appendix R). Given the domain-specific nature of developmental self-efficacy, the items in this scale were modified to reflect employee development. Subjects rated each item on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). Sample items include; “I will be able to achieve most of the developmental goals I have set for myself as a leader” and “Compared to other leaders, I can develop my abilities very well.” Chen et al. (2001) report an average internal consistency of .88 for this scale.

Average item-response scores were used to represent each of the six subscales. Consistent with Hannah and Avolio’s (2010) conceptual view of developmental
readiness, an attempt was made to model the six subscale items as manifest indicators of developmental readiness.

**Other-source ratings of leadership.** The Conger-Kanungo leadership scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994; Appendix S) consists of 25 items that enable other-source raters such as faculty or supervisors to evaluate leaders in terms of their vision and articulation, environmental sensitivity, unconventional behavior, personal risk, sensitivity to member needs, and disregard for the status quo. Although this scale is written for use in organizational settings, it can and has been adapted to other contexts such as small groups (see Cote, Lopes, Salovey, & Miners, 2010). Participants were asked to provide the names and/or e-mails of three MBA instructors and/or work supervisors. The first instructor/supervisor identified was contacted via e-mail and asked to complete the C-K leadership scale for the participant in question. If this instructor/supervisor did not respond within a week, the second instructor/supervisor identified was contacted and a similar process was used, if necessary, for the third instructor/supervisor listed.

Instructors/supervisors responded to the C-K leadership scale using a 6-point Likert scale (6 = very characteristic; 1 = very uncharacteristic). A sample item is “appears to be a skillful performer when presenting to the group.” Conger and Kanungo (1994) report reliabilities ranging from .88 - .91 for this scale as well as validity evidence ($\chi^2_{52df} = 200.30$, CFI = .94).

**Stereotype threat.** Although this study offered no hypotheses pertaining to stereotype threat, it stands to reason that important differences applying to variability in leadership identity and regulation may exist as a function of one’s experience of stereotype threat (e.g., Woodcock, Hernandez, Estrada, & Schultz, 2012). Specifically,
the perception of stereotype threat could exacerbate variability in leadership identity as well as subsequent efforts to regulate, inasmuch as the perception is held that a leadership identity is not traditionally associated with members of an individual’s age, gender, or race. In order to facilitate exploratory analyses, subjects completed an adapted version of the 8-item Stereotype Vulnerability Scale (SVS; Spencer, 1994; Appendix T). Subjects completed each item relative to the prompt; “Because of my age/gender/race…,” using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = never; 5 = almost always). Sample items include; “Professors are less likely to encourage you” and “If you ask a simple question, people will think it is because of your age/gender/race.” Internal consistency for the original scale is .84 (Spencer, 1994).

**Control Variables**

The influence of gender differences in leadership perceptions is well-documented (see Carli & Eagly, 2011). Accordingly, gender was controlled for with regard to the effects proposed in this study.

Students in MBA programs represent varying degrees of business and leadership experience, which could have a bearing on the hypothesized effects. Specifically, students representing different levels of skill development (e.g., novice, intermediate, expert: Lord & Hall, 2005) may differ in the extent to which they experience dimensional identity variability. Thus, years of business experience and leadership experience were controlled for (see Appendix M).

Observed variability in identity self-descriptiveness and importance could be explained in terms of wavering self-confidence in one’s ability to lead. In order to rule out this possibility and provide support for the discriminant validity of identity variability
from related constructs, subjects completed a leadership self-confidence measure adapted from Hardy, Arthur, Jones, Shariff, Munnoch, Isaacs, and Allsopp (2010; Appendix U). Subjects responded to the phrase “Compared to the most confident leader you know, how would you rate your confidence in your ability to…” using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = low; 3 = medium; 5 = high). Sample item stems included; “meet the challenges of leadership,” “think and respond successfully in leadership situations,” and “concentrate well enough to be successful as a leader.” Hardy et al. (2010) report a reliability of .83 for the original version of this scale as well as strong measurement features ($\chi^2_{5df} = 5.19$, RMSEA = .01, CFI = 1.0).
CHAPTER V
RESULTS OF FOCAL STUDY

Results

A brief discussion of sample characteristics is followed by three main categories of results. First, Hypotheses 1-9 test the measurement features of scales developed for this study to assess variability in (a) leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance and (b) leadership identity regulation reappraisal and suppression. Second, Hypotheses 10-20 situate the four variability constructs within a larger framework, consistent with what was presented in Chapter II. A third and final section is devoted to reporting the results of two exploratory analyses.

Sample Characteristics

Table 5.1 provides a summary of participant attempts and completions for each of the four study phases. In total, 125 complete datasets were collected from students enrolled in MBA classes at a Midwestern university. Seven participants had more than one instructor/supervisor complete the follow-up survey on their behalf, resulting in 132 responses for the fourth and final phase. For these seven subjects, the first instructor/supervisor response received was incorporated into the subject’s dataset. The events participants wrote about and rated were content-analyzed to ensure they reflected leadership examples. This process resulted in the elimination of 12 complete datasets based on either (a) a significant amount of incomplete or missing data or (b) events
Table 5.1. Survey Attempts and Completions for Each of the Four Study Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Phase</th>
<th>Attempts</th>
<th>Completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write about/rate 2 leadership experiences</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete other self-report measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time 2 (one week after Time 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write about/rate 2 additional leadership experiences</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time 3 (one week after Time 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write about/rate 2 additional leadership experiences</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time 4 (post-completion)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/supervisor leadership survey</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Attempts do not always constitute different subjects. Several participants “attempted” a phase of the study more than once. When this happened, the first response received was incorporated into the participant’s dataset.

that were clearly not leadership-oriented. A total sample of 113 MBA students (70 males, 43 females; mean age = 28.26; mean leadership experience (months) = 40.23) was retained. Data were retained for subjects who provided distinct and legitimate content for at least four of the six requested leadership episodes. Of the 113 people comprising the final sample, 96 (85%) provided acceptable data for six events while eight (7%) provided five events and nine (8%) provided four events, resulting in a total of 652 leadership events. When duplicate events were provided, the first set of ratings was retained and the second set of ratings was coded as missing. Responses also were coded as missing when subjects failed to provide a leadership scenario.

Variability in Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance

Two dimensions were hypothesized for a questionnaire developed to measure variability in leadership identity; self-descriptiveness and importance. Eight items were retained from pilot testing to comprise these scales, which subjects completed multiple
Note. Eigenvalues appear on the y-axis and factors are delineated on the x-axis.

Figure 5.1. Scree plot of exploratory factor analysis for a scale assessing leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance.

times as they rated their identity in reference to each of the 4-6 leadership events they wrote about. Pooling together multiple ratings per subject for factor analysis raises the potential for common method bias and related issues. As a means of mitigating these concerns, a three-step approach was taken to assessing dimensionality and item retention. First, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the total item pool for the first of six events that participants were asked to rate. It stands to reason that this data is the purest in that it reflects the first time subjects were exposed to the scales. Results of this analysis, which are based on the use of Geomin (oblique) rotation, are reported in Figure 5.1 and Table 5.2. Factor one, which had an eigenvalue of 3.51, appeared to consist of items capturing self-descriptiveness. Factor two (eigenvalue = 2.00) was comprised of the importance items as well as one self-descriptiveness item. Table 5.3 provides
Table 5.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for 8 Items Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>170.47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.17**</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>148.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **$p > .05$, suggesting that the data align with a 2-factor solution.*

factor loadings for each of the 8 items, given a two-factor solution. Item LISD-2 loaded primarily on the importance dimension, although it also appeared to cross-load on the self-descriptiveness dimension. Interestingly, this also occurred in the pilot study (cf. Table 3.7) and could be due to the positive wording of the item, which contrasts with the negative wording of the other self-descriptiveness items. Thus, item LISD-2 was removed from subsequent analyses.

Table 5.3. Factor Loadings for a Two-Factor Scale Assessing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance (8 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extracted Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td>LISD</td>
<td>LII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I questioned my identity as a leader. (LISD-1, RC)</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I was certain that I should take a leadership role. (LISD-2)</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt less like a leader than I usually do. (LISD-3, RC)</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I had less confidence in being a leader than I usually have. (LISD-4, RC)</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being a leader was important to me. (LII-1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt motivated to lead. (LII-2)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Having me as the leader made a big difference. (LII-3)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serving in a leadership capacity was a priority for me. (LII-4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 113$. LISD = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness; LII = Leadership Identity Importance; RC = Reverse-Coded; Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.
To provide further confirmation of these results, a second step was taken whereby the ratings provided for the first event subjects wrote about at Time 2 were subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis. Given the time that transpired between Time 1 and Time 2 (i.e., approximately one week), participants are less inclined to engage in the rating biases that could pose concerns in this type of experimental paradigm. Figure 5.2 provides an illustration of the final measurement model, which appears to have good fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 23.77^*, p = 0.03$, RMSEA = .09, CFI = .97, SRMR = .06). No item inter-

Figure 5.2. Confirmatory factor analysis of 7-item questionnaire for variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance at Time 2 (n = 113 events).

corrrelations were specified, as modification indices were not suggested for this factor solution. Factor loadings were all statistically-significant and ranged from .640-.926 for the self-descriptiveness dimension and from .504-.871 for the importance dimension. The inter-correlation of the latent variables for self-descriptiveness and importance was non-significant ($r = .185$, $p = .08$).
A third and final step was taken in an effort to replicate these findings by conducting a confirmatory factor analysis on the first leadership event subjects wrote about at Time 3. As with Time 2, the time that transpired between Time 2 and Time 3 (i.e., approximately one week) ought to be sufficient to ameliorate concerns pertaining to common method bias. Figure 5.3 illustrates the measurement model, which possessed good data fit ($\chi^2 = 24.35^*, p = 0.03$, RMSEA = .09, CFI = .98, SRMR = .06). Factor loadings were statistically-significant and appeared to be stronger than they were for the first CFA, ranging from .751-.963 for self-descriptiveness and from .753-.889 for importance. In this case, the inter-correlation of the latent variables for self-descriptiveness and importance was highly significant ($r = .307$, $p < .001$).

Figure 5.3. Confirmatory factor analysis of 7-item questionnaire for variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance at Time 3 (n = 111 events).
Scale reliabilities (Coefficient α) ranged from .807-.848 across the six events for a three-item scale of identity self-descriptiveness. For a four-item scale of identity importance, reliability estimates ranged from .809-.893 across the six events.

Table 5.4. Final Questionnaire Used to Measure Variability in Leadership Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variability in Leadership Identity Questionnaire (7 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Self-Descriptiveness (3 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I questioned my identity as a leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt less like a leader than I usually do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I had less confidence in being a leader than I usually have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Importance (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being a leader was important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt motivated to lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Having me as the leader made a big difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serving in a leadership capacity was a priority for me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the data appear to support the proposed two-dimensional questionnaire that is used in this study to assess variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance. When interpreted alongside the pilot study findings, which yielded consistent factor analysis results, these findings provided support for Hypothesis 1. Specifically, individuals made distinct self-assessments of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance. The two dimensions denoted in Table 5.4 were retained to measure variability in leadership identity as it pertains to the remaining hypotheses.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that significant intra-individual variability would be found to exist across events with regard to self-assessments of leadership identity. That is to say, the extent to which individuals regarded a leadership identity as self-descriptive and important in different situations would vary across events above and beyond what can be
attributed to statistical error. To test this notion, a nested structure was created for the data using Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM). Figure 5.4 illustrates an example of this structure. HLM is able to partition variance into three parts, such that a single event-level observation of leadership identity is a function of (a) an individual’s average leadership identity (i.e., a fixed effect), (b) the extent to which an individual’s leadership identity varied from the average in a given event (i.e., a random effect), and (c) statistical error. This is represented by the decomposed equation:

\[ Y_{ij} = \gamma_{00} + \mu_{0j} + e_{ij} \]  

In Equation 1, \( Y_{ij} \) is self-assessment of leadership identity for a single event (i.e., event “j” nested within individual “i”), \( \gamma_{00} \) is the individual’s average leadership identity, \( \mu_{0j} \) represents an adjustment to the individual’s average identity that accounts for the

Figure 5.4. A nested data structure for self-descriptiveness and importance variability.
influence of a given event, and $e_{ij}$ is unaccounted-for variability. This equation can also be modeled in a way that represents multiple levels of a nested-data structure, as follows:

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + e_{ij} \quad (2)$$

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \mu_{0j} \quad (3)$$

Equation 2 is also known as a “Level 1” or event-level equation, and specifies that event-level observations of leadership identity can be thought of in terms of (a) that which can be explained by event factors, and (b) that which cannot be explained by these factors, or error. Equation 3 is commonly referred to as a “Level 2” equation, in that it divides event effects into (a) a fixed component that holds true across events and (b) a random component that varies across events. From this basic structure, which scholars refer to as a “null model,” predictors can be subsequently modeled at level 1, level 2, or across levels to account for observed variability. Significance coefficients are used to determine whether predictors account for significant variance, while model deviance statistics assist in determining whether a given predictor has made an incremental contribution to model prediction. To determine the suitability of a nested-model, an intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) is calculated. In the context of this study, a favorable ICC would suggest that the four to six leadership events being modeled for each participant bear sufficient resemblance to each other to be aggregated within participants. Such an ICC would ideally not be too low, suggesting a lack of internal consistency within participants, nor too high, suggesting a lack of event-level variability.

To test Hypothesis 2, four to six event-level (i.e., level one) ratings of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance were nested within each participant (i.e., level two) for a total of 652 leadership event-level ratings nested within 113 respondents.
Each “rating” represented an average of the items selected to comprise the dimension in question, based on the factor analyses discussed above. Table 5.5 reports the results of null models assessing variability in self-descriptiveness and importance. The results for Model 1 indicate that significant intra-individual variability existed across events with reference to leadership identity self-descriptiveness. An intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.4074 was obtained, suggesting that nearly 41% of the variability in leadership identity resided at the between-subjects level. The significant random coefficient intercept ($\tau_{00} = 0.91, p < .001$) provided further support for event-level variability in self-descriptiveness judgments. Meanwhile the significant residual ($\sigma^2 = 1.33, p < .001$) coefficient provided an opportunity to model predictor variables in an effort to account for variability in self-descriptiveness assessments across events. Similar results were obtained with regard to ratings of leadership identity importance, depicted as Model 2 in Table 5.5. For this dimension, an ICC of 0.3979 suggests that approximately 40% of the variability in self assessments of leadership identity importance was attributable to between-subject differences. Again, the presence of highly significant random
Table 5.5. HLM Results for Null Models Representing Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept $\gamma_{00}$</td>
<td>5.20**</td>
<td>5.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept $\tau_{00}$</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual $\sigma^2$</td>
<td>1.33**</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Fit Statistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>2212.93</td>
<td>1974.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>2216.93</td>
<td>1978.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>2225.88</td>
<td>1987.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Level 1 $n = 652$; Level 2 $n = 113$. Standard errors are reported in parentheses.

coefficients for residual ($\sigma^2 = 0.92, p < .001$) and intercept ($\tau_{00} = 0.61, p < .001$) effects is an indicator that intra-individual variability existed and could be accounted for by modeling relevant predictors. Taken together, these results provided strong support for Hypothesis 2 and a fundamental assumption of this research; that identification with a leadership self-concept is subject to variability within individuals as they experience different events pertaining to leadership identity.

Whereas Hypothesis 2 predicted event-level variability within individuals pertaining to self-assessments of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance, Hypothesis 3 posited between-person differences in the extent to which event-level variability would be observed (see Figure 2.1 for a visual depiction). Specifically, it was expected that some individuals would demonstrate large amounts of identity variability, while others would exhibit moderate or minimal amounts. From an analysis perspective,
testing this hypothesis required creating an index to represent individual variability in self-descriptiveness and importance judgments. This is because the significant fixed effect coefficients (i.e., $\gamma_{00}$) in Table 5.5 merely suggest that participants differ in terms of their mean self-assessments of identity self-descriptiveness or importance, which is not equivalent to saying that some individuals vary more than others.

To test this hypothesis, a variability estimate was assigned to each individual by calculating the variance of their four to six event-level leadership self-descriptiveness and importance ratings. Descriptive statistics are provided in Table 5.6 to illustrate the dispersion within this sample as it pertained to variability in leadership identity. As a whole, the data had a slight positive skew, suggesting that a number of people demonstrated minimal variability across events (See Appendix V for histograms). Nevertheless, sizeable dispersion seemed to exist between participants, most notably with regard to identity self-descriptiveness. The results appeared to indicate that variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance differed across participants to a substantial degree, with some participants exhibiting minimal amounts and others varying greatly across events. Thus, Hypotheses 3a and 3b were both supported.

**Variability in Leadership Identity Reappraisal and Suppression**

Three dimensions were hypothesized, on the basis of pilot study work, for a scale developed to measure variability in leadership identity regulation. In particular, it was proposed that individuals regulate leadership identity by (1) reappraising situational self-descriptiveness, (2) reappraising situational importance, and (3) suppressing information that is contradictory to self-views. Twelve items were retained from pilot testing to compose a scale of identity regulation. Subjects rated these items multiple times and in
Table 5.6. Differences in Self-Descriptiveness and Importance Variability Across Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Descriptiveness Variability</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Variability</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 113. Descriptive statistics are based on variance, or variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance.*

reference to each of the four to six leadership events they wrote about. For reasons identical to those discussed above with regard to multiple subject ratings of leadership identity, common method bias was a concern that made pooling these ratings together into a single factor analysis impractical. Thus, a three-step approach was once again taken in order to ascertain dimensionality and item retention. First, exploratory factor analysis with Geomin (oblique) rotation was conducted on the total item pool for responses to the first of six leadership events that subjects were asked to rate. Results of this analysis appear in Figure 5.5 and Table 5.7. The data failed to converge for a three-factor solution, so a two-factor solution was interpreted instead and appeared to be supported by a visual inspection of Figure 5.5. Factor one consisted of items pertaining to reappraisal and had an eigenvalue of 5.36. Factor two, which had an eigenvalue of 2.20, appeared to be comprised of suppression items. Table 5.8 provides factor loadings for the full 12-item scale, given a two-factor solution. Items LIIR-1 and LIS-1 failed to load on their expected dimensions for reasons that are not readily discernible. Thus, these two items were removed from subsequent analyses.
Note. Eigenvalues appear on the y-axis and factors are delineated on the x-axis.

Figure 5.5. Scree plot of exploratory factor analysis for a scale assessing leadership identity regulation reappraisal and suppression.

Table 5.7. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for 12 Items Assessing Leadership Identity Reappraisal and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>306.38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>153.07</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>153.31***</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>**Failed to converge</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 113$ events.

As a second step, an attempt to further confirm these results was made by subjecting the remaining ten items to a confirmatory factor analysis based on ratings provided for the first event subjects wrote about at Time 2. Given the time that transpired between Time 1 and Time 2 (i.e., approximately one week), the risk of common method bias seemed minimal. Figure 5.6 provides an illustration of the final measurement model, which appeared to have reasonable fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 55.88$, $p = 0.01$, RMSEA = .08, CFI = .96, SRMR = .07). Two item pairs were allowed to inter-correlate based on modification indices and conceptual links. Items LISDR-3 and LISDR-4 share a
common theme of changing one’s thinking to cope with identity threats. The same can be said for items LIIR-3 and LIIR4, which were also specified to inter-correrate. Factor loadings were all statistically-significant and ranged from .651-.831 for the reappraisal dimension and from .531-.952 for the suppression dimension. Additionally, the inter-correlation of the latent variables for reappraisal and suppression was significant ($r = .274$, $p < .01$).

Table 5.8. Factor Loadings for a Two-Factor Leadership Identity Regulation Scale Assessing Reappraisal and Suppression (12 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extracted Factor</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIR</td>
<td>LIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I want to feel less doubt about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LISDR-1)</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I want to feel more confident about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LISDR-2)</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to feel more confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about. (LISDR-3)</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In order to avoid feeling less confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about. (LISDR-4)</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I want to feel like an outcome is less important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LIIR-1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I want to feel like an outcome is more important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation. (LIIR-2)</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to feel like being a leader is important to me, I change what I’m thinking about. (LIIR-3)</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In order to avoid feeling like being a leader is unimportant to me, I change what I’m thinking about. (LIIR-4)</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I am questioning the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LIS-1)</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I keep my thoughts regarding the importance of personally being a leader to myself. (LIS-2)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I feel strongly about the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. (LIS-3)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I control my doubts about myself as a leader by not expressing them. (LIS-4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 113$. LIR = Leadership Identity Reappraisal; LISDR = Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal; LIIR = Leadership Identity Importance Reappraisal; LIS = Leadership Identity Suppression; Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.
Figure 5.6. Confirmatory factor analysis of 10-item questionnaire for variability in leadership identity regulation at Time 2 (n = 113 events).

These findings were replicated in a third step, where a separate confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the first event subjects wrote about at Time 3. As with Time 2, the time that transpired from Time 2 to Time 3 (i.e., approximately one week) seemed sufficient to guard against the rater bias risks that are inherent in a repeated measures design. Figure 5.7 illustrates the measurement model, which once again demonstrated reasonable fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 60.40$, $p > 0.001$, RMSEA = 0.09, CFI = 0.97, SRMR = 0.06). In this instance, one item pair was permitted to inter-correlate based on modification indices. Items LISDR-1 and LISDR-2 are similar in terms of the way in which they are worded. Factor loadings were all statistically significant and trended higher than they did in the first CFA, ranging from 0.754-.859 for the reappraisal
Figure 5.7. Confirmatory factor analysis of 10-item questionnaire for variability in leadership identity regulation at Time 3 (n = 111 events).

dimension and from .695-.903 for the suppression dimension. Meanwhile, the inter-correlation of the latent variables for reappraisal and suppression was highly significant ($r = .430, p < .001$). Scale reliabilities (Coefficient α) ranged from .890-.947 across the six events for a seven-item scale of reappraisal regulation. For a three-item scale of suppression regulation, reliability estimates ranged from .789-.932 across the six events. The average reliability (i.e., for all six events combined) was .921 for the reappraisal subscale and .852 for the suppression sub-scale.

Summarizing these findings, the data appeared to support a two-dimensional model of leadership identity regulation, whereby reappraisal and suppression efforts were distinguishable in terms of self-assessments. The findings indicated partial support of Hypothesis 4, which posited four distinct dimensions of identity regulation, namely (a) self-descriptiveness reappraisal, (b) importance reappraisal, (c) self-descriptiveness
Table 5.9. Final Questionnaire Used to Measure Variability in Leadership Identity Regulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variability in Leadership Identity Regulation Questionnaire (10 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity Reappraisal Regulation (7 items)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I want to feel less doubt about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When I want to feel more confident about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In order to feel more confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In order to avoid feeling less confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I want to feel like an outcome is more important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In order to feel like being a leader is important to me, I change what I’m thinking about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In order to avoid feeling like being a leader is unimportant to me, I change what I’m thinking about.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Identity Suppression Regulation (3 items)**                  |
| 1. I keep my thoughts regarding the importance of personally being a leader to myself. |
| 2. When I feel strongly about the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it. |
| 3. I control my doubts about myself as a leader by not expressing them. |

suppression, and (d) importance suppression. In the pilot study, participants did not appear to distinguish between self-descriptiveness suppression and importance suppression as separate modes of identity regulation. In the main study, minimal distinction was made with regard to judgments of self-descriptiveness reappraisal and importance reappraisal. Instead, leadership identity regulation appeared to be construed and evaluated distinctly in terms of (a) reappraisal and (b) suppression. The two dimensions denoted in Table 5.9 were retained to measure variability in leadership identity regulation as it pertained to the remaining hypotheses.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that significant intra-individual variability would be found to exist across events with regard to leadership identity regulation. In other words, the extent to which the regulation strategies of reappraisal and suppression were utilized to
maintain a leadership identity would vary across situations. To test this notion, Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) was used. For a description of HLM and its applicability to this hypothesis, please refer to the discussion of Hypothesis 2 on page 34 as well as Figure 5.4. Four to six event-level (i.e., level one) ratings of leadership identity regulation reappraisal and suppression were nested within each participant (i.e., level 2) for a total of 652 leadership event-level ratings nested within 113 respondents. Each “rating” represented a scale or sub-scale average, using the items selected based on factor analysis above. Table 5.10 reports the results of two null models that were calculated to test this hypothesis. The results for Model 1 indicate that significant intra-individual variability existed across events with reference to the regulation strategy of leadership identity reappraisal. An intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.6726 was obtained, suggesting that 67% of the variability in reappraisal resided at the between-

Table 5.10. HLM Results for Null Models Representing Leadership Identity Reappraisal and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effects</th>
<th>Model 1 Reappraisal (7 items)</th>
<th>Model 2 Suppression (3 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept $\gamma_{00}$</td>
<td>3.94** (0.11)</td>
<td>4.46** (0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Effects</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept $\tau_{00}$</td>
<td>1.33** (0.19)</td>
<td>1.05** (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual $\sigma^2$</td>
<td>0.64** (0.04)</td>
<td>1.23** (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Fit Statistics</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>1851.28</td>
<td>2186.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>1855.28</td>
<td>2190.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>1864.23</td>
<td>2199.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Level 1 $n = 652$; Level 2 $n = 113$. Standard errors are reported in parentheses.*
subjects level. The significant random intercept \(t_{00} = 1.32, p < .001\) provided additional
evidence for variability at the level of events. Meanwhile, the presence of a significant
residual component \(\sigma_2 = 0.64, p < .001\) made it possible to model predictors as a means
of explaining self-descriptiveness variability at the event-level. Similar results were
obtained with regard to ratings of leadership identity suppression, depicted as Model 2 in
Table 5.10. For this dimension, an ICC of 0.4590 suggests that approximately 46% of
the variability in self assessments of leadership identity suppression was attributable to
between-subject differences. Again, the presence of highly significant random
coefficients for residual \(\sigma_2 = 1.23, p < .001\) and intercept \(t_{00} = 1.05, p < .001\) effects
was encouraging in terms of providing support for this hypothesis as well as the potential
for modeling predictor variables. The proportion of variance residing at the person-level
for reappraisal and suppression was notably larger than it was for leadership identity self-
descriptiveness and importance. This may reflect differing levels of sensitivity to
identification and regulation. Indeed, certain types of regulation have been shown to
have a strong implicit component (e.g., Gross, 2013) that may be difficult for people to
report on at the level of events. This possibility notwithstanding, the results provided
strong support for Hypothesis 5 and another core tenet of this research; that efforts to
regulate a leadership self-concept vary within individuals and across events.

Hypothesis 6 posited between-person differences in the extent to which event-
level variability in leadership identity regulation reappraisal and suppression was
observed (see Figure 2.1 for a visual depiction). Specifically, it was expected that some
would exhibit minimal variability in their efforts to reappraise or suppress identity-
relevant details, whereas others would demonstrate substantial variability. For
reasons described in reference to Hypothesis 3 and variability in leadership identity self-
descriptiveness and importance, testing this hypothesis required the calculation of a
variability index. This was done for each individual by calculating the variance of their
four to six event-level leadership identity regulation reappraisal and suppression ratings.
Table 5.11 reports the outcome of various dispersion statistics that were calculated on the
basis of participant variance. In each case, substantial variability differences were
observed between subjects, but this was particularly true with regard to variability in
suppression efforts. Data were positively-skewed, suggesting a sizeable proportion of
respondents who exhibited minimal variability (see Appendix W for histograms).
However, the results appeared to provide strong support for the notion that variability in
leadership identity reappraisal and suppression differed substantially across participants,
with some exhibiting minimal amounts and others varying greatly across events.
Therefore, Hypotheses 6a and 6b were both supported.

Table 5.11. Differences in Leadership Identity Reappraisal and Suppression Across
Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal Variability</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression Variability</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 113. Descriptive statistics are based on variance, or variability in identity regulation*

Hypothesis 7 concerned the nature of the relationship between (a) variability in
leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance and (b) variability in leadership
identity reappraisal and suppression. It was proposed that variable assessments of
leadership identity would give rise to regulation efforts, such that individuals who varied
more in their self-assessments of leadership would also vary more in their utilization of regulation strategies. Table 5.12 provides the results of separate hierarchical regression analyses that test this hypothesis while accounting for the influence of gender, years of leadership experience, and leadership self-confidence. Taking this approach allowed an examination of the extent to which each type of identity variability (i.e., self-descriptiveness and importance) predicted the variable use of two separate regulation strategies (i.e., reappraisal and suppression). Variability in leadership identity reappraisal appeared to be significantly associated with variability in self-descriptiveness \((\beta = -0.27, p < .01)\) but not importance variability \((\beta = 0.01, p > .05)\). Meanwhile, variability in leadership identity suppression was independently predicted by both self-descriptiveness \((\beta = -0.19, p < .05)\) and importance \((\beta = 0.18, p < .05)\) variability.

Table 5.12. Hierarchical Regression Results for Self-Descriptiveness and Importance Variability as Predictors of Reappraisal and Suppression Variability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>DV: Reappraisal Variability</th>
<th>DV: Suppression Variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(R^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Descriptiveness Variability</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Variability</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  \(N = 113\). DV = dependent variable. \(\beta\) represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete models. \(R^2\) is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. \(^a\)\(F\) ratio for \(R^2\) resulting from entry of variable(s) at each step. \(^*p < .05\), two-tailed. \(^{**}p < .01\), two-tailed.
Furthermore, the addition of variability in self-descriptiveness and importance was found to enhance prediction of both reappraisal variability ($F$ change = 4.16, $R^2$ change = .07, $p < .05$) and suppression variability ($F$ change = 4.82, $R^2$ change = .08, $p < .05$).

Hypothesis 7 was therefore partially supported, in that (a) variable self-descriptiveness appeared to give rise to both variable reappraisal and suppression while (b) variable importance appeared to engender variable suppression only.

**Testing a Broader Framework for Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation**

Having established a measurement model for variability in leadership identity and regulation, the next step consisted of testing antecedents and outcomes that were proposed to be linked with these constructs. An exploration of antecedents can lend further insight into the nature of variability in leadership identity and regulation and what gives rise to it, both at the level of individual differences and at the level of events. Meanwhile, linking these constructs to outcomes begins to provide a context for where they might fit within the leadership literature. Table 5.13 provides descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and inter-correlations for the antecedents and outcomes referenced below.

**Antecedents of variability in leadership identity and regulation.** Hypotheses 8 and 9 predicted that person-level variability in leadership identity and regulation would be higher amongst those with lower Core Self-Evaluations (Hypothesis 8) and incrementalist Implicit Person Theories (Hypothesis 9). It was proposed that each of these dispositional characteristics would lend itself to less stable self-conceptualizations. As a result, individuals would be more apt to consider situational cues when assessing their identity, whether due to lower self-confidence (i.e., low CSEs) or beliefs that they
and others are subject to change (i.e., incrementalist IPTs). This instability, in turn, was proposed to manifest itself in the form of higher cross-situational variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance. In turn, these conditions give rise to more variability in the utilization of identity regulation reappraisal and suppression.

A test of these hypotheses is illustrated in Tables 5.14, controlling for the effects of gender, years of leadership experience, and leadership self-confidence. An important limitation to consider in interpreting these analyses are those who demonstrated zero or near-zero variability across events in terms of self-descriptiveness and/or importance assessments (see Appendices V and W for histograms), which has the effect of biasing these estimates downward. Core Self-Evaluations (CSEs) were not found to be predictive of variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness ($\beta = 0.08, p > .05$), importance ($\beta = 0.01, p > .05$), reappraisal ($\beta = -0.04, p > .05$), or suppression ($\beta = 0.05, p > .05$). Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported. It is notable that CSEs were highly correlated with leadership self-confidence ($r = .49, p < .01$), suggesting that some link existed between CSEs and self-assessments of leadership. Leadership self-confidence reflects more of a global (i.e., cross-situational) self-assessment than the four variability constructs, which are subject to event-specific cues. Thus, CSEs may have more utility in terms of explaining long-term development and change in leadership identity than they do in explicating dynamic identification and regulation at the level of a working self-concept.
Table 5.13. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Person-Level Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Experience</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Avg. Self-Descriptiveness</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avg. Importance</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avg. Reappraisal</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Avg. Suppression</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-Descriptiveness Variability</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Importance Variability</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reappraisal Variability</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Suppression Variability</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Implicit Person Theories</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Developmental Readiness</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other-Source Ratings of Leadership</td>
<td>102.41</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Avg. Self-Descriptiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avg. Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avg. Reappraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Avg. Suppression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-Descriptiveness Variability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Importance Variability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reappraisal Variability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Suppression Variability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Core Self-Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Implicit Person Theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Developmental Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other-Source Ratings of Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 113. Scale reliabilities (Coefficient α) appear in parentheses on the diagonal. *p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed. Developmental readiness is a latent variable and the correlation coefficients represent standardized estimates.
Table 5.14. Hierarchical Regression Results for CSEs and IPTs as Predictors of Variability in Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness, Importance, Reappraisal, and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>DV: Self-Descriptiveness Variability</th>
<th>DV: Importance Variability</th>
<th>DV: Reappraisal Variability</th>
<th>DV: Suppression Variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F²</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Self Evaluations</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Person Theories</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 113. DV = dependent variable. β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete models. R² is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. 
*F ratio for R² resulting from entry of variable(s) at each step. 
*p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.

Implicit Person Theories (IPTs) were not found to be associated with variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness (β = -0.10, p > .05) or importance (β = -0.04, p > .05). However, as shown in Table 5.14, IPTs did predict variability in leadership identity reappraisal (β = -0.29, p < .01) and suppression (β = -0.28, p < .01) in a direction suggesting that those with an entitist mindset regulated identity less, whereas those with an incrementalist mindset regulated identity more. In both cases, adding IPTs to the model significantly enhanced prediction (F\text{change reappraisal} = 5.15, p < .01; F\text{change suppression} = 4.17, p < .05). The presence of significant prediction in these instances was all the more substantive in view of the downward bias created by the sizeable group of participants exhibiting minimal or no variability. Therefore, Hypothesis 9 received partial support as it pertained to variability in leadership identity reappraisal and suppression. Implicit Person Theories appeared to be most relevant to the dynamic regulation of leadership identity and it is ironic that those with stronger beliefs in the capacity of people to change were more apt to promote stable self-conceptualizations via
reappraisal and suppression. The presence of statistically-significant terms for leadership
self-confidence in both models (β = 0.20-0.22), however, suggests that incrementalists
regulated in a more variable way because they were simultaneously sensitive to people’s
capacity to change as leaders and assured of their ability to effectively lead. This
appeared to make them more judicious in terms of when they regulated information as
opposed to accepting it as a legitimate critique of their existing leadership self-view.

Two additional findings may assist in qualifying this result. First, IPTs were
significantly correlated with Leadership Self-Confidence (r = .19, p < .05) and also
carried positive prediction in the regression models predicting reappraisal (β = 0.20, p <
.10) and suppression (β = 0.22, p < .05) variability. Interpreting these findings together
implies that incrementalists with confidence in their leadership abilities regulated more,
perhaps in an effort to mitigate perceptions of change because of their belief that it was
capable of happening. A second finding of interest pertained to the positive direction of
the relationship between years of experience (β = 0.17, p < .10) and suppression
variability. It could be that seasoned leaders are more adept at being versatile in terms of
their usage of suppression to promote a consistent self-assessment of leadership when
they are confident in their leadership abilities. To the extent that they are suppressing
identity threats in a way that is consistently advantageous to them and their followers,
suppression versatility may constitute a valuable leadership skill.

Hypotheses 10-12 pertained to the level of events and predicted that various
features of events co-vary with leadership identity and regulation ratings as well as CSEs
and IPTs. In particular, event characteristics that foster instability and unpredictability
were proposed to result in greater variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness
and importance judgments as well as more variable usage of reappraisal and suppression strategies.

Hypothesis 10 predicted that variability in self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression would be greater when events were perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. Events reflecting these characteristics have been associated with more controlled as opposed to heuristic processing, which lends to finer-grained distinctions in terms of identification with a leadership role as well as efforts designed to mitigate identity threats. The existing data did not lend themselves to an accurate test of this hypothesis.

Modeling the data with HLM was originally proposed, whereby event characteristic ratings for the 652 leadership events participants wrote about would be modeled as level 1 predictors of the four variability constructs, which are illustrated in null model form in Tables 55 and 510. However, the true dependent variable in each of these null models is a single rating rather than a variability estimate. An intra-class correlation coefficient is ultimately used to test the intra-individual variability proposed in Hypotheses 2 and 5, but such an approach cannot be translated to assessing whether more variability results from experiencing certain types of events, as hypothesized here.

An interesting alternative that could be assessed is the notion that variable perceptions of event characteristics gave rise to variable judgments of leadership identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression. For instance, it could be that subjects rating 6 events that varied widely (in their perception) along the continuum of irrelevance-relevance would also vary widely when rating the self-descriptiveness and importance of a leadership identity in those six scenarios. The variable usage of identity
reappraisal and suppression may also be subject to variability as a function of fluctuating situational relevance. To test this idea, variability estimates were assigned to each individual’s set of event ratings by calculating the variance of their four to six event-level ratings of whether a situation was micro/macro-level, static/dynamic, familiar/novel, ordinary/extraordinary, negative/positive, irrelevant/relevant, and past, present, or future-oriented. This technique is consistent with what was done to model variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression. Descriptive statistics and inter-correlations are provided in Table 5.15. Histograms that illustrate person-level variability for each of the seven event characteristics are also provided in Appendix X. Given the substantial amount of inter-correlation that was observed, it was decided to proceed with a factor analysis to determine whether the seven event characteristics could be grouped together into meaningful factors. The resulting solution had an unclear conceptual interpretation (see Appendix Y) and thus, it was decided to proceed with looking at the seven event characteristics independently.

Hierarchical regression was initially used to determine the independent contribution of variability in each event characteristic to predicting variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression. The results of this analysis were biased by a substantial amount of multi-collinearity. For instance, the coefficient for familiar/novel events was negative and marginally-significant in a model predicting importance variability ($\beta = -.20, p < .10$), despite the near-zero correlation of these two variables in Table 5.15 ($r = .04, p > .10$). In another instance, the coefficient for irrelevant/relevant events was negative and marginally-significant in a model predicting reappraisal variability ($\beta = -.18, p < .10$) despite a low zero-order
Table 5.15. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Variability in Event Characteristics, Self-Descriptiveness, Importance, Reappraisal, and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Micro/Macro-Level</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Static/Dynamic</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Familiar/Novel</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ordinary/Extraordinary</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Negative/Positive</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Past/Present/Future</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-Descriptiveness</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Importance</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reappraisal</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Suppression</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 113. *p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.

correlation between the two variables (r = -.05, p > .10). As a means of resolving this issue, stepwise regression was used instead and the results of these analyses appear in Table 5.16 for event characteristics that emerged in one or more of the prediction models as statistically-significant. Stepwise regression is commonly used to control for the effects of multi-collinearity by excluding variables that do not uniquely contribute to variance observed in the dependent variable, which prevents them from erratically biasing predictor estimates.

Self-descriptiveness variability was predicted by more variable perceptions of events in terms of being irrelevant/relevant (β = .22, p < .05), meaning that assessments of a leadership identity’s fit would be more variable as situational relevance varies. Importance assessments were found to vary more amongst participants who perceived the
Table 5.16.  Stepwise Regression Results for Variability in Event Characteristics as Predictors of Variability in Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness, Importance, Reappraisal, and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>DV: Self-Descriptiveness Variability</th>
<th>DV: Importance Variability</th>
<th>DV: Reappraisal Variability</th>
<th>DV: Suppression Variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F*</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar/Novel</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary/Extraordinary</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative/Positive</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 113.  DV = dependent variable.  Omitted variables are indicated with 3 hyphens.  β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete models.  R² is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step.  F ratio for F² resulting from entry of variable(s) at each step.  *p < .05, two-tailed.  **p < .01, two-tailed.

... events they wrote about as varying more along the continuums of relevant/irrelevant (β = .40, p < .01) and negative/positive (β = .22, p < .05).  Across the two dimensions of leadership identity, relevance judgments were critical to variability while importance judgments were also influenced by the range of negativity/positivity attributed to the events participants wrote about.  Greater fluctuations in reappraisal efforts were predicted by events perceived to represent a wider range of being familiar/novel (β = .33, p < .01), which may be consistent with the well-established notion that novel events trigger a deeper level of processing consistent with reappraisal.  Finally, the more that events were rated differently in terms of being ordinary/extraordinary (β = .30, p <.01) and negative/positive (β = .20, p <.05), the more participants varied in their use of suppression as a regulation strategy.  While specific directions cannot be inferred from these relationships, suppression could be valuable to those attempting to assume leadership in extraordinary and negative circumstances in that it enables a focus on taking necessary action by eliminating the distraction of internal self-assessments.
Overall, four of the seven event features emerged as important factors to consider. Namely, as events were perceived to span a wider range of being (1) familiar/novel, (2) ordinary/extraordinary, (3) negative/positive, and (4) irrelevant/relevant, self-assessments of leadership identity and regulation followed suit. Furthermore, significant prediction was added to all four variability constructs by adding features of events to a model including gender, years of leadership experience, and leadership self-confidence; self-descriptiveness variability ($F_{\text{change}} = 5.29, p = .02$), importance variability ($F_{\text{change}(1)} = 25.85, p < .01; F_{\text{change}(2)} = 6.50, p = .01$), reappraisal variability ($F_{\text{change}} = 12.14, p < .01$), and suppression variability ($F_{\text{change}(1)} = 16.05, p < .01; F_{\text{change}(2)} = 4.92, p = .03$). Multiple F-change statistics are reported for importance and suppression variability because stepwise regression calculates the variance added by each event characteristic. In summary, the directional aspect of Hypothesis 10 was not confirmed. Nevertheless, examining the influence of situational variability on variable self-assessments of leadership identity and regulation has significant potential for enhancing theory and practice. Namely, exposing leaders to a wider or narrower variety of events and/or managing the way in which events are perceived has implications for dynamic assessments of self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression.

Hypotheses 11 and 12 proposed that features of events would interact with Core Self Evaluations (CSEs) and Implicit Person Theories (IPTs) in predicting variability in self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression. In particular, it was predicted that CSEs and IPTs would have the strongest associations with the four variability constructs for events perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. For reasons discussed in
reference to Hypothesis 10, it was not possible to directly test these hypotheses. However, to model the interactions in the context of event variability as a means of building upon what was done above in reference to Hypothesis 10, a series of hierarchical regressions were conducted. Promising results were found with regard to reappraisal variability. In particular, variable assessments of event familiarity/novelty were found to interact with implicit person theories in predicting the variable usage of reappraisal ($\beta = -.18\ p < .10$). Although the relationship demonstrated marginal strength, low power existed by virtue of the interaction being modeled, making it reasonable to establish a more liberal threshold for significance (McClelland & Judd, 1993). Incrementalists, or those who believe that people are capable of substantive change, varied most in their use of reappraisal efforts when they wrote about leadership events that varied widely in terms of familiarity. A potential line of reasoning for the tendency of incrementalists to engage in reappraisal regulation is discussed in a previous section with regard to Hypothesis 9. An additional implication worth consideration here is the possibility that novel events lend themselves to reappraisal amongst those who believe that such events have the capacity to change someone. However, for reasons previously discussed, this could not be confirmed with the data provided. Complete results for these analyses and an interpretation of them can be found in Appendix Z.

In summary, Hypotheses 10-12 were tested in the broader sense of event variability rather than in terms of specific directional effects. Evidence was found for the notion that perceptual features of the events that leaders are exposed to served as important antecedents of variability in identity self-descriptiveness, importance,
reappraisal, and suppression. A similar conclusion could be drawn regarding the interaction of CSEs and IPTs at the person level with features of events.

**Outcomes of variability in leadership identity and regulation.** An important aim of this research was to link variability in leadership identity and regulation to important developmental (Developmental Readiness) and perception-based (other-source ratings of leadership) outcomes. Hypothesis 13 predicted that variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression would impact developmental readiness in a manner that reflects an inverted U-shape. In other words, low and high amounts of variability were predicted to engender lower levels of developmental readiness, while moderate variability was believed to be optimal in terms of facilitating a leader’s willingness and ability to develop.

Developmental Readiness was introduced in Chapter II as a latent construct blending various aspects of motivation and ability to develop. As explained subsequently, only four of the six indicators described in Chapter IV were used to construct the latent variable measure of developmental readiness. An insufficient proportion of subjects (55%) provided responses when asked to list their standardized test scores on graduate admissions tests as an indicator of General Cognitive Ability. Numerous subjects referenced not taking the tests, while others could not recall their scores at the time they completed Study 1. Meanwhile, the measure of Support for Development did not load significantly on the latent construct, so it was also not included in the final model shown in Figure 5.8.
Figure 5.8 illustrates the measurement model for developmental readiness that demonstrated the best data fit ($\chi^2 = 5.86^{**}$, $p = 0.05$, RMSEA = .13, CFI = .91, SRMR = .05). Factor loadings for this model ranged from .251-.836 and were all statistically significant. It should be noted that a latent factor model including Organizational Support for Development (OSD) produced a factor loading for OSD that was not statistically significant. Thus, it was decided to proceed with four indicators of Developmental Readiness instead. Openness to Experience was the sole remaining indicator of ability to develop and it also had the weakest factor loading (.251).

However, it makes intuitive sense to associate a trait like openness with motivational indicators such as goal orientation. A model that only contained the three indicators for motivation to develop was also tested, but failed to converge.

Note. OPEN = Openness; WEIM = Work Extrinsic Intrinsic Motivation; AGQ = Achievement Goal Questionnaire; LDSE = Leadership Development Self-Efficacy.
Path models testing Hypothesis 13 are presented in Figures 5.9 and 5.10 for variability in leadership identity and regulation, respectively. Both linear and quadratic path estimates were specified as a means of testing the inverted u-shape hypothesized. A model examining the effect of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance on developmental readiness (see Figure 5.9) demonstrated good model fit ($\chi^2 = 26.62***$, $p = 0.23$, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .94, SRMR = .06) and the variables included accounted for 41.5% of the variance in developmental readiness. Neither the linear nor the quadratic estimates for self-descriptiveness and importance approached statistical significance in a model that accounted for the influence of gender, years of leadership experience, and leadership self-confidence. A separate model was estimated to examine the predictive nature of leadership identity regulation reappraisal and suppression with regard to developmental readiness (see Figure 5.10). This model also fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 30.60***$, $p = 0.10$, RMSEA = .06, CFI = .90, SRMR = .04) and accounted for 47.1% of the variance in developmental readiness. However, linear and curvilinear estimates for regulation variability were not statistically significant. Thus, Hypothesis 13 was not supported. Suppression variability was independently correlated with developmental readiness ($r = .28$, $p < .05$), yet person-level variables such as leadership self-confidence ($r = .58$, $p < .01$) and core self-evaluations ($r = .62$, $p < .01$) had stronger associations, making it likely that dynamic aspects of identity are less relevant to developmental readiness than stable features.
Figure 5.9. A path model for developmental readiness as an outcome of variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance.
Note. WEIM = Work Extrinsic Intrinsic Motivation; AGQ = Achievement Goal Questionnaire; LDSE = Leadership Development Self-Efficacy; OPEN = Openness
*p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.

Figure 5.10. A path model for developmental readiness as an outcome of variability in leadership identity regulation reappraisal and suppression.
Hypothesis 14 claimed that variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance as well as regulation reappraisal and suppression would predict other-source ratings of leadership in a curvilinear fashion. In particular, individuals experiencing low and high levels of variability were predicted to engender less favorable leadership perceptions than those whose identity and regulation varied a moderate amount. Tables 5.17 and 5.18 present the results of hierarchical regressions testing this proposition in the realm of variability in leadership identity and regulation, respectively. When controlling for the effects of gender, years of leadership experience, and leadership self-confidence, none of the four variability constructs were found to be significant predictors of external leadership perceptions.

Table 5.17. Hierarchical Regression Results for Other-Source Ratings of Leadership as an Outcome of Variability in Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Linear effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Descriptiveness Variability</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Variability</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Quadratic effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Descriptiveness Variability</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Variability</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 113$. DV = dependent variable. β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete model. $R^2$ is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. Predictor variables are mean-centered. $^*$F ratio for $R^2$ resulting from entry of variables at each step. *$p < .05$, two-tailed. **$p < .01$, two-tailed.
Table 5.18. Hierarchical Regression Results for Other-Source Ratings of Leadership as an Outcome of Variability in Leadership Identity Regulation Reappraisal and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Linear effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal Variability</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression Variability</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Quadratic effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal Variability</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression Variability</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 113. DV = dependent variable. β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete model. $R^2$ is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. Predictor variables are mean-centered. $^*F$ ratio for $R^2$ resulting from entry of variables at each step. *p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.

Overall, no support was found for Hypothesis 14. Indeed, the majority of variance accounted for by this prediction model was a function of leadership self-confidence (β = 0.17-0.20) in a manner suggesting that individuals with greater confidence in their abilities as leaders were more likely to engender positive leadership perceptions from others. It could be that other-source perceptions of leadership, like developmental readiness, were more amenable to being explored at the person level and in terms of more global aspects of leadership identity. Indeed, core self-evaluations ($r = .31, p < .01$) were found to be significantly associated with perceptions while leadership self-confidence approached significance as a predictor in the regression model (β = 0.20, p < .10). Another possible explanation is a methodological flaw whereby subjects wrote
about leadership episodes that occurred in outside contexts that raters were likely not privy to. This issue will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter V.

**Summary of main effects.** Although some hypotheses were not supported, there was strong support for measurement development as well as confirmation for the idea that some participants varied more than others in terms of cross-situational variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression. Valuable insight was gained regarding person and event-level factors contributing to reported variability. On the outcome side, the findings shed light on the importance of distinguishing global aspects of identity from more dynamic components such as the four variability constructs, while also alluding to some methodological flaws that future research could ameliorate. For instance, a measure of situational leadership perceptions may be better poised to account for event-level variability in leadership identity and regulation. Restriction of range also could be to blame for the lack of significant results, as a number of participants exhibited a minimal amount of variability across events with regard to the four identity constructs (see Appendices V and W). Although this could be due to genuine cross-situational stability, it is also possible that participants were biased by factors such as recall to select and rate a subset of leadership episodes that failed to adequately reflect the broad range of experiences they actually encountered in a leadership capacity.

**Mediational Hypotheses: Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation as Mechanisms**

A fundamental claim of this research is that variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression function as mechanisms
underlying important relationships between person and event-level characteristics and outcomes of relevance to leadership effectiveness. That is to say, the four variability constructs have been described as mediators that can assist in explaining the impact of CSEs, IPTs, and event characteristics on developmental readiness and leadership perceptions. The following section is intended to build upon previous hypotheses with the goal of modeling relationships between the aforementioned variables that are better nuanced. Such relationships have a greater potential of illustrating the value of considering leadership identity, and efforts to regulate it, as variable rather than stable.

Hypotheses 15 and 16 positioned variability in leadership identity and regulation as mediators between the various antecedents and outcomes explored in this study. No direct effects were found to exist between any of the four variability constructs and either Developmental Readiness or other-source ratings of leadership. Nevertheless, scholars have shown that mediation can exist in the absence of significant main effects (e.g., MacKinnon, Krull, & Lockwood, 2000; Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Thus, the four variability constructs were tested as mediators of the relationships between (a) CSEs and IPTs on the antecedent side and (b) Developmental Readiness and other-source ratings of leadership on the outcome side. Event characteristics were not included as antecedents in the analyses for reasons discussed in reference to Hypotheses 10-12. Results of these analyses are reported in Tables 5.19-5.22, and demonstrate that no significant mediation existed as a function of variability in leadership identity or regulation. Hypotheses 15 and 16 were therefore not supported.
Table 5.19. Bootstrap Results for Variability in Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance as Mediators of Antecedents and developmental Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% - CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Descriptiveness Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.04 to 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.04 to 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.04 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 113 \). Indirect effects are standardized estimates. \( SE \) = standardized error. \( p \) denotes statistical significance. 95%-CI is a bootstrapped confidence interval based on 1000 bootstrap samples. IDvar = variability in identity self-descriptiveness or importance. DR = developmental readiness. LSC = leadership self-confidence. CSE = core self evaluations. IPT = implicit person theories.

Table 5.20. Bootstrap Results for Variability in Leadership Identity Regulation

Reappraisal and Suppression as Mediators of Antecedents and Developmental Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% - CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reappraisal Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.06 to 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.05 to 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.07 to 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppression Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.06 to 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.05 to 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.09 to 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT → IDvar → DR</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.24 to 0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 113 \). Indirect effects are standardized estimates. \( SE \) = standardized error. \( p \) denotes statistical significance. 95%-CI is a bootstrapped confidence interval based on 1000 bootstrap samples. IDvar = variability in identity self-descriptiveness or importance. DR = developmental readiness. LSC = leadership self-confidence. CSE = core self evaluations. IPT = implicit person theories.
Table 5.21. Bootstrap Results for Variability in Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance as Mediators of Antecedents and Other-Source Leadership Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% - CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Descriptiveness Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 113. Indirect effects are standardized estimates. SE = standardized error. p denotes statistical significance. 95%-CI is a bootstrapped confidence interval based on 1000 bootstrap samples. IDvar = variability in identity self-descriptiveness or importance. Ratings = other-source leadership ratings. LSC = leadership self-confidence. CSE = core self evaluations. IPT = implicit person theories.*

Table 5.22. Bootstrap Results for Variability in Leadership Identity Regulation Reappraisal and Suppression as Mediators of Antecedents and Other-Source Leadership Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% - CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reappraisal Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.04 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.05 to 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppression Variability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.02 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.04 to 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.04 to 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.03 to 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT → IDvar → Ratings</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.05 to 0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 113. Indirect effects are standardized estimates. SE = standardized error. p denotes statistical significance. 95%-CI is a bootstrapped confidence interval based on 1000 bootstrap samples. IDvar = variability in identity self-descriptiveness or importance. Ratings = other-source leadership ratings. LSC = leadership self-confidence. CSE = core self evaluations. IPT = implicit person theories.*
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Hypotheses 17-20 further built upon the mediation effects predicted in Hypotheses 15 and 16. Moderated mediation was proposed, whereby variability in leadership identity (Hypotheses 17 and 19) and regulation (Hypotheses 18 and 20) would be stronger as a mediator for certain types of events than it was for others. In the absence of (a) direct effects linking the four variability constructs to Developmental Readiness and other-source ratings of leadership or (b) significant mediation results establishing the variability constructs as valuable mechanisms linking CSEs and IPTs to these outcomes, testing for moderated mediation was not tenable. Therefore, Hypotheses 17-20 were not supported.

Exploratory Analyses

**Stereotype vulnerability and variability in leadership identity and regulation.** No hypotheses were made regarding the influence of stereotype vulnerability on variability in leadership identity or regulation. Nevertheless, exploring the four variability constructs in the context of identity threats emerging from stereotypical characterizations of leaders (e.g., male) constituted a promising and meaningful avenue for additional exploration beyond the scope of this project. On the one hand, it could be that situational variability in leadership identification is driving some to be more vulnerable than others to the negative influence of stereotypes. On the other hand, it is possible that dynamic identity regulation could serve as a buffer against the adverse effects of stereotype vulnerability. To test these ideas, participant responses to a scale assessing stereotype vulnerability were regressed on the four leadership identity variability constructs. The results of these analyses are reported in Tables 5.23 and 5.24. Suppression variability ($\beta = 0.19, p < .10$) had the strongest association with stereotype
Table 5.23. Hierarchical Regression Results for Stereotype Vulnerability as an Outcome of Variability in Leadership Identity Self-Descriptiveness and Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Descriptiveness Variability</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Variability</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 113$. DV = dependent variable. β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete model. $R^2$ is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. Predictor variables are mean-centered.

$^aF$ ratio for $R^2$ resulting from entry of variables at each step.

*p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.

Table 5.24. Hierarchical Regression Results for Stereotype Vulnerability as an Outcome of Variability in Leadership Identity Regulation Reappraisal and Suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal Variability</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression Variability</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 113$. DV = dependent variable. β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete model. $R^2$ is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. Predictor variables are mean-centered.

$^aF$ ratio for $R^2$ resulting from entry of variables at each step.

*p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.
vulnerability in a manner suggesting that increased vulnerability perceptions were commensurate with more variable suppression efforts. It is interesting to note that suppression variability could represent one of two things in this instance; working harder to suppress the impact of certain events that lend themselves to stereotypical views of leadership, or giving more weight to the influence of events on one’s leadership identity in general. No such relationships were found between stereotype vulnerability and variability in self-descriptiveness ($\beta = 0.08$, $p > .05$), importance ($\beta = 0.09$, $p > .05$), or reappraisal ($\beta = 0.03$, $p > .05$). Additional research and exploration is warranted to explore the interplay of identity-related dynamics with issues pertaining to stereotype vulnerability and threat.

**Qualitative data analysis of events for subjects reporting high and low self-descriptiveness variability.** In Chapter II, the argument was made that variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness is a product of discrepancies that individuals experience between who they are and who they ought to be as leaders. The design of this study lended itself to a qualitative analysis of this idea, in that subjects were asked to write about the attitudes, thoughts, and feelings they experienced in tandem with the events they provided. An exploratory analysis was conducted by content-analyzing the responses provided by those who were amongst the top and bottom ten participants in terms of self-descriptiveness variability. Illustrative comments for each group are presented in Table 5.25. Members in the high group (n = 10) had self-descriptiveness variability estimates that ranged from 3.09 to 5.89 and frequently wrote about identity-related discrepancies that eroded their confidence. Members in the low group (n = 11, tenth position was a tie) had self-descriptiveness variability estimates that ranged from 0
to 0.16 and often indicated reactions that were affirming of their identities. Interestingly, the valence (i.e., positive or negative) of the comments provided by the high and low groups was fairly even. These findings provided initial support for the notion that variability in self-descriptiveness judgments reflects identity-related discrepancies. They also suggested that qualitative analysis is a promising avenue for future research exploring the nature of event-level variability in leadership identity and regulation.

Table 5.25. Illustrative Examples of the Presence and Absence of Leadership Identity-Related Discrepancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Illustrative Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Self-Descriptiveness</td>
<td>“I felt like my boss thought that I was not professional enough” (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I was a bit nervous because the other group members had previously had more authority and expertise than me” (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I felt as though I was not listened to or that my opinion was not valued like I felt it should have been” (102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I had many doubts on whether I was correct in my opinion” (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Descriptiveness</td>
<td>“I felt a positive vibe in not only myself, but also my peers as they entrusted in me” (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Felt really good that I was recognized for my skills and respected enough to be given this chance” (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I felt that I did a good job of getting the project underway. It seemed like everyone else was waiting for someone to take charge and start making things happen” (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I felt like I knew what I was doing, and was confident in my abilities” (18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Participant numbers are indicated in parentheses.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

The current study made a number of contributions to existing work on leadership identity. In both studies, a substantive amount of variability was observed across events for self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression, lending strong support to the assertion that using a single-measurement approach is not sufficient to capture their complexity (see ICC coefficients on pages 127 and 136). Of equal significance was the observation of significant event-level variability amongst some, but not all, of the participants. As predicted, some leaders demonstrated considerable stability across events and time, while others were found to vary a substantive amount. These findings were shown to exist above and beyond the statistical error one might associate with asking a single source to rate their leadership across multiple episodes. Another key finding pertains to the significance of Implicit Leadership Theories and event variability as antecedents of variable perceptions. Taken together, the influence of these variables underscores the significance of accounting for both contextual and individual dynamics as well as their interplay in driving identity-related processes.

In the following section, the guiding propositions of this research are revisited in terms of what was learned from the two studies conducted. Theoretical and practical implications, study limitations, and future research opportunities are then discussed. A summary of findings for hypothesized relationships can be found in Table 6.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1</strong></td>
<td>A leadership self-concept can be classified in terms of three distinct dimensions; (1) activation, (2) self-descriptiveness, and (3) importance, such that: (a) A leadership self-concept will be more activated in some situations than others, and (b) Individuals will make distinct self-assessments of a leadership self-concept’s self-descriptiveness and importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2</strong></td>
<td>Across events and time, significant intra-individual variability will exist in terms of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3</strong></td>
<td>Individuals will differ from one another in terms of the extent to which they experience variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4</strong></td>
<td>Efforts to regulate leadership identity can be classified in terms of four distinct dimensions; reappraisal of self-descriptiveness, suppression of self-descriptiveness, reappraisal of importance, and suppression of importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5</strong></td>
<td>Across events and time, significant intra-individual variability will exist in terms of individual efforts to regulate leadership identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6</strong></td>
<td>Individuals will differ from one another in terms of the extent to which they experience variability in leadership identity regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7</strong></td>
<td>Variability in leadership identity will predict variability in leadership identity regulation, such that individuals experiencing higher levels variability in leadership identity will also experience higher levels of variability in leadership identity regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypotheses 8a-8b</strong></td>
<td>Core self-evaluations will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, individuals exhibiting high core self-evaluations will exhibit lower levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses 9a-9b</td>
<td>Implicit Person Theories will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, individuals exhibiting entitist beliefs will exhibit lower levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation whereas individuals exhibiting incrementalist beliefs will exhibit higher levels of variability. Partially-Supported: Implicit Person Theories did not predict self-descriptiveness or importance variability. They did, however, predict reappraisal and suppression variability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses 10a-10b</td>
<td>Event characteristics will predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. Specifically, more variability will be observed as events are perceived to be more micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. Not Supported: The directional nature of the hypotheses could not be explored. Favorable results were observed, however, for variability in event characteristics as predictors of variability in leadership identity and regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses 11a-11b</td>
<td>Core self-evaluations and event characteristics will interact to predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. In particular, individuals with low core self-evaluations and high perceptions of event relevance, novelty, dynamism, and extraordinariness will experience the greatest variability in leadership identity and regulation. Not Supported: The directional nature of the moderation relationships hypothesized could not be tested for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses 12a-12b</td>
<td>Implicit person theories and event characteristics will interact to predict variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation. In particular, individuals with strong incrementalist beliefs and high perceptions of event relevance, novelty, dynamism, and extraordinariness will experience the greatest variability in leadership identity and regulation. Not Supported: The directional nature of the moderation relationships hypothesized could not be tested for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses 13a-13b</td>
<td>The relationship of variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation with developmental readiness will be curvilinear. Specifically, an inverted-U relationship will occur, whereby moderate levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation will be associated with an optimal level of developmental readiness. Not Supported: No significant linear or quadratic relationships were observed between the focal variability constructs and developmental readiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses 14a-14b</td>
<td>The relationship of variability in a) leadership identity and b) leadership identity regulation with other-source ratings of leadership will be curvilinear. Specifically, an inverted-U relationship will occur, whereby moderate levels of variability in leadership identity and regulation will be associated with an optimal level of other-source ratings of leadership. Not Supported: No significant linear or quadratic relationships were observed between the focal variability constructs and other-source ratings of leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses

Variability in leadership identity will mediate the relationship between: a) Core self-evaluations and developmental readiness, b) Implicit person theories and developmental readiness, c) Event characteristics and developmental readiness, d) Core self-evaluations and other-source ratings, e) Implicit person theories and other-source ratings, and f) Event characteristics and other-source ratings. Not Supported: No significant mediation was observed.

Variability in leadership identity regulation will mediate the relationship between: a) Core self-evaluations and developmental readiness, b) Implicit person theories and developmental readiness, c) Event characteristics and developmental readiness, d) Core self-evaluations and other-source ratings, e) Implicit person theories and other-source ratings, and f) Event characteristics and other-source ratings. Not Supported: No significant mediation was observed.

The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity on the relationship of Core Self-Evaluations to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence of variability will be highest when Core Self-Evaluations are low and events are perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. Not Supported: No significant moderated-mediation was observed.

The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity regulation on the relationship of Core Self-Evaluations to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence of regulation variability will be highest when Core Self-Evaluations are low and events are perceived to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. Not Supported: No significant moderated-mediation was observed.
### Hypotheses

| Hypotheses 19a-19b | The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity on the relationship of Implicit Person Theories to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence of variability will be highest amongst those with incrementalist beliefs who perceive events to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. | Not Supported: No significant moderated-mediation was observed. |
| Hypotheses 20a-20b | The mediating influence of variability in leadership identity regulation on the relationship of Implicit Person Theories to a) developmental readiness and b) other-source ratings will be moderated by event characteristics. Specifically, the mediating influence regulation variability will be highest amongst those with incrementalist beliefs who perceive events to be micro-level, dynamic, novel, extraordinary, negative, relevant, and present or future-oriented. | Not Supported: No significant moderated-mediation was observed. |

### Purpose of the Current Study

Valuable insight was gained in five core areas this project was designed around.

**Examine Leadership Identity at the Level of Events**

A central proposition of this study, which received strong support, is that valuable insight can be gained by assessing leadership identity at the level of events. Increasing emphasis is being given to the idea that leadership is fluid and dynamic (e.g., Day, 2001; DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Pearce & Conger, 2002) and this brings into question conventional approaches to evaluating identity, which presume that identity is trait-like and therefore capable of being captured with a single measurement. The fact that leadership identity was found to vary across events and time suggests that a multiple-
measurement paradigm may be best-suited to depicting the scope and extent of a person’s identification with a leadership self-concept. Knowing how much or how little someone varies across events appears to provide a valuable point of reference above and beyond someone’s level of comfort with assuming the role of leader in any one context.

Confirming the existence of event-level variability in leadership identity provided further clarity on three important controversies that continue to engender debate within the broader identity literature. The first pertains to the manner in which identities are organized, with some suggesting that self-concept is unitary and therefore incapable of being divided into finer-grained distinctions such as leadership identity (Baumesiter, 1998; Forgas & Williams, 2002) and others arguing that multiple identities exist as a means of ensuring the efficient retrieval and activation of relevant information (Greenwald et al., 2002; Kurzban & Aktipis, 2007; McConnell, 2011). Results of the identity activation experiment conducted in the pilot study lend support to the latter view in showing that a leadership identity is more likely to be activated in situations where contextual cues facilitate the retrieval of information relevant to being a leader.

Controversy two pertains to whether identity is best characterized in terms of exhibiting cross-situational stability (e.g., Farmer, 1997) or malleability (e.g., Freeman & Ambady, 2011). In both studies, support was found for variability in leadership identity, bolstering the claim that identity is best regarded as malleable, even over the course of relatively brief time periods. It remains to be seen whether individuals vary more or less in specific contexts or career stages, or even if a single person could be highly variable with regard to one self-aspect and minimally-variable with regard to another; additional research is needed to explore these distinctions.
A third controversy revolves around the criticality of context, with some contending that context is irrelevant to identity (see Stryker & Burke, 2000) and others claiming it is vital (Lord & Brown, 2001; Markus & Wurf, 1987). Scholars generally agree that both context-independent (e.g., male, female) and context-interdependent (e.g., student) identities exist (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Results from the current study suggest that leadership identity is best construed as context-interdependent, with some situations giving rise to individual claims of leadership while others do not. In particular, a variety of factors, such as event relevance and tense (i.e., past, present, future) were found to influence identification with a leadership self-concept. The social aspect of context (DeRue & Ashford, 2010) was also underscored by the event descriptions and reactions subjects wrote about, which frequently referred to the critical role others played in determining self-perceptions of leadership success or failure.

Identify Key Dimensions of Variability in Leadership Identity

Proceeding from the assumption that leadership identity would be likely to vary at the level of events, a second goal for this study was to identify key dimensions along which self-concept would be likely to fluctuate in different situations. On the basis of existing research, it was clear that identity activation constituted one such dimension (Kuhnen et al., 2003), with momentary contextual cues rendering some identities more readily accessible than others. Two additional dimensions emerged from the work of Cross and Markus (1994), who measured identity self-descriptiveness and importance in the realm of assessing individual’s “problem-solver” identities. In their study, the two dimensions were treated as stable and only measured once, but it was proposed and found in this research that leadership identity is likely perceived as (a) more self-descriptive and
(b) more important in some circumstances than it is in others. Activation variability was tested in a laboratory setting during the pilot study and initial support was found for the idea that leadership identity could be dormant or active in different scenarios. Meanwhile, scales were developed and tested for the purpose of assessing variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance. With two separate samples, results indicated that both dimensions existed and varied across events to a moderate degree. The developed scales provide a means for other scholars and practitioners to measure event-level variability in leadership identity, in a nuanced way with specific reference to self-descriptiveness or importance variability.

**Determine Whether Variability in Leadership Identity Is an Individual Difference**

A third objective of this study was to test the merits of variability in leadership identity as a meaningful individual difference. It was predicted and found that for some participants, a minimal amount of variability was observed over the brief course of events and time that were covered by this research. Self-ratings of leadership identity self-descriptiveness and importance of these individuals were found to be relatively stable and consistent across a variety of events they encountered, wrote about, and reflected upon over the course of several weeks. In contrast, other participants showed high amounts of variability in their identification with a leadership self-concept when it came to the events they chose to document and rate as part of this study. For some of their experiences, a leadership identity seemed to be highly self-descriptive and important while in other instances, the same individuals were far less likely to personally identify with a leadership role. Meanwhile, numerous people fell between the two extremes, reflecting a moderate degree of variability when their leadership self-ratings were aggregated across
the episodes they described. The fluctuation they exhibited was less drastic and pronounced than it was for those who fell at the high end of the spectrum, yet still significant enough to be attributable to varying experiences of leadership identity rather than rating error. It is indeterminable whether the size and scope of this study was sufficient to capture the full range of variability, or the lack thereof, that different leaders experienced. This issue notwithstanding, clear differences emerged and subsequent research can utilize alternative paradigms and timescales to ascertain whether cross-situational variability can be meaningfully distinguished amongst those electing to assume a leadership identity.

Features of context and social exchanges were discussed in Chapter II as key contributing factors to the differences observed between individuals with regard to variability. In particular, a number of social factors were identified as facilitating adaptive self-identification (e.g., an identity narrative that others affirm; Ibarra & Barbalescu, 2010) while other characteristics, such as salient minority status (Banaji & Prentice, 1994; Eagly, 2005), were established as potentially inhibiting and maladaptive. An exploratory analysis of stereotype vulnerability (Spencer, 1994) was conducted to provide a first step toward further unpacking the significance of context and others to the process of cross-situational leadership identity. Additional work remains to be done that identifies key social and contextual drivers of individual differences as they pertain to each of the four variability constructs. Existing knowledge regarding the way different types of leaders and leadership are defined, perceived, and responded can provide a solid conceptual foundation for subsequent research.
Explore the Manner in Which Regulation Strategies Are Used to Mitigate Variability in Leadership Identity

The experience of variability in leadership identity stands directly at odds with an innate preference people seem to have for stability (Greenwald, 1980; Markus, 1977; Swann & Read, 1981). Thus, a fourth guiding proposition of this research was that individuals engage in dynamic regulation of their leadership identity as a means of mitigating the negative impact of self-concept instability. Regulation of identity has not been widely studied, making it necessary to consult with literature pertaining to other forms of regulation in order to identify potentially-relevant strategies. Research on the regulation of emotions, which share many common features with identity structures (Baumeister & Vohs, 2003; Carver & Scheier, 2001), identify two broad categories of regulation techniques; antecedent-focused strategies, which are used to modify the way a situation is perceived, and response-focused strategies, which pertain to the manner in which situations are coped with (Gross & John, 2003). For this study, cognitive reappraisal and suppression were selected to represent those categories, given their previous success in reflecting antecedent and response-focused strategies within the emotions literature. Measurement scales were adapted from an existing measure (Gross & John, 2003) of emotional regulation to account for the modulation of (a) identity self-descriptiveness and (b) identity importance. Across two studies, strong support was found for the existence of cognitive reappraisal and suppression as separate means of controlling perceptions of leadership identity. However, these strategies were found to be more general and broad than hypothesized, in that they were not specifically nuanced to account for self-descriptiveness or importance.
It was also proposed that leadership identity regulation would be similar in nature to leadership identity, both in terms of its tendency to vary across events and in terms of being a meaningful individual difference. Emotional regulation has been found to vary as a function of varying affective states (Kuppens et al., 2010), making it reasonable to infer that the same dynamic is likely to exist in the realm of self-concept. In both studies, significant within-person variability in leadership identity regulation reappraisal and suppression was observed across events. The extent to which individuals varied appeared to be less pronounced than it was in reference to variability in leadership identity, and was more significant for suppression than it was for cognitive reappraisal. Some participants were found to vary more in their efforts to regulate across events than others, lending support to the notion that variability in leadership identity regulation constitutes an individual difference.

**Demonstrate the Value of Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation**

A fifth and final objective for this study was to position variability in leadership identity and regulation within a broader nomological framework. Accomplishing this would foster a better understanding of the nature of event-level variability in leadership identity and regulation while also beginning to demonstrate the value of these constructs, both within and beyond the leadership literature. The dimensional nature of these constructs made it most practical to explore antecedents and outcomes as they related to the four core constructs of variability in self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression.

An initial step in this process consisted of exploring how variability in leadership identity and regulation were related to each other. A sequential relationship was
hypothesized, whereby variability in leadership identity gives rise to subsequent efforts to regulate so that leadership identity is restored to a point of stability that represents an acceptable homeostasis to the individual leader. Support for this idea was found in three of four instances, with self-descriptiveness variability predicting the variable use of reappraisal and suppression strategies and importance variability giving rise to variable suppression efforts. Importance variability did not appear to predict reappraisal variability, perhaps suggesting that a reappraisal approach to regulating identity had more utility when the self-descriptiveness of a leadership identity was in question rather than importance. The cross-sectional nature of this study precluded a definitive confirmation that variability gave rise to regulation efforts. A cross-lagged design would be best-suited for determining the causal direction of this relationship. Nevertheless, the findings of this study established the inter-relatedness of these constructs.

Three person and event-level variables were proposed as antecedents to variability in leadership identity and regulation. At the person level, Core Self-Evaluations (CSEs: Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997) were not found to predict variability in self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, or suppression. A second person-level variable, Implicit Person Theories (IPTs: Dweck, 1996) functioned as hypothesized with regard to reappraisal and suppression variability, in that those expressing beliefs that people can change demonstrated greater variability in their use of regulation strategies across events. No association was found between IPTs and variability in leadership identity. The third antecedent was measured and tested at the level of events and consisted of various event features that previous research has shown to influence leadership behaviors and outcomes (see Hoffman & Lord, 2013, for an overview). Features of events and in particular, the
extent to which the episodes participants wrote about were perceived to vary relative to those features, had a notable impact on all four variability constructs. Unfortunately, the structure of the data was not conducive to determining whether specific types of events (e.g., negative events) gave rise to more variable self-assessments of identity and regulation in the manner proposed. The importance of attending to both situational and dispositional factors in accounting for identity dynamics appeared to receive strong support nonetheless. Overall, relevant antecedents were identified for all four constructs, providing a starting point for future research efforts targeted at defining the nature and causes of variability in leadership identity and regulation. An additional contribution of significance was the modeling of a synthesis of event and person-level predictors, which appeared to add value by uncovering cross-level interactions of CSEs and IPTs with variable perceptions of event features. Features of context and the manner in which they are perceived appeared to be notably powerful determinants of identification with, and regulation of, a leadership self-concept.

Two outcomes were also tested in an effort to demonstrate the impact of variability in leadership identity and regulation on development and perception-related leadership outcomes. An important research question underlying this examination pertained to whether an optimal or recommended level of variability in leadership identity or regulation could be ascertained. Developmental Readiness (Avolio & Hannah, 2008) reflects an individual’s ability and motivation to develop while other-source ratings of leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) capture the extent to which outside observers view someone in a leadership capacity. The influence of variability in leadership identity and regulation on both of these outcomes was predicted to be curvilinear in nature, with
too much or too little variability leading to less desirable outcomes than moderate variability. Unfortunately, none of the four variability constructs was found to be predictive of either developmental readiness or other-source ratings of leadership. Further exploration of these propositions is warranted, though. Developmental readiness could not be fully modeled on account of missing data. Regarding other-source ratings of leadership, subjects seemed to frequently write about leadership episodes that their external rater may not have been privy to. Limiting the events that were written about to a single context that leadership raters were privy to may have resulted in stronger effects.

Antecedents and outcomes were then synthesized in an attempt to position variability in leadership identity and regulation as explanatory mechanisms, or mediators, of relationships between the other variables measured in this study. The basis for these propositions was a parallel construct in the emotions literature known as core affect variability (Kuppens, Oravecz, & Tuerlinckx, 2010), which has been shown to mediate the link of stress with maladaptive outcomes (Kuppens et al., 2007). Mediation was tested for despite the absence of significant direct effects (MacKinnon, Krull, & Lockwood, 2000; Preacher & Hayes, 2004) but all results were non-significant. It could be that the four variability constructs are not best construed as mediating mechanisms in a manner akin to core affect variability. However, it seems premature to draw this conclusion without exploring these variables as they pertain to other established relationships in the leadership literature where identity dynamics are potentially at play as key drivers of observed phenomena.

Finally, features of events were proposed to influence the extent to which variability in leadership identity or regulation mediated other relationships. This was
based on research suggesting that certain types of events are more conducive to the type of fine-grained processing that would make variable levels of identification or regulation more likely and/or salient (see Hoffman & Lord, 2013, for a review). Two factors made these hypotheses untenable; (1) the absence of significant mediation as a prerequisite, and (2) the structure of the events data, which, as previously mentioned, did not lend itself to an analysis of events that were high and low with regard to the seven features examined. As a result, the hypotheses pertaining to these effects were neither tested nor supported. Nevertheless, it remains a possibility that this dynamic unfolds in reference to other known relationships in the leadership literature. The influence of context on leadership is well-documented (e.g., Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Porter & McLaughlin, 2006) and further exploration may be merited where variability in leadership identity or regulation is shown to be an underlying mechanism.

Figure 6.1 provides an illustration of a revised model based on the findings of this study. On the antecedent side, CSEs are replaced by leadership self-confidence, which was introduced as a control variable and found to be fairly consistent in terms of its positive association with reappraisal and suppression variability. Self-confidence assessments are traditionally regarded as one-time, cumulative evaluations of one’s ability to meet the challenges of leadership (see Hardy et al., 2010). In this study, they were measured as such, although the dynamic nature of leadership identity observed in this study makes it possible that such assessments are in reality far more momentary and subject to change as a function of internal cues and social feedback. Accounting for the
measurement framework that was used, confident leaders appeared to be more variable in their use of regulation strategies in a manner that likely coincided with the degree to which the events they wrote about posed a challenge or threat to their confidence. On the outcome side, little insight was gained regarding the influence of the four variability constructs. This could be due to the nature of the outcome measures selected for this study, for reasons discussed below with regard to study limitations. Another change to the revised model is reflected in terms of the way in which variability in leadership identity and regulation are represented. The four subscales are used rather than attempting to combine them to model variability in leadership identity (i.e., self-descriptiveness and importance) and regulation (i.e., reappraisal and suppression). Event-
level ratings of leadership self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression were found to aggregate in a meaningful way at the person level, yielding variability estimates for each individual. These estimates indicated that some were more stable in their ratings across events than others, supporting the notion that variability in leadership identity and regulation is an individual difference.

In summary, progress was made with regard to all five key objectives for this research. As the following sections will show, subsequent theory-building, research, and practice are also poised to benefit from the advancements and limitations reflected in this work.

**Theoretical and Practical Implications**

Several implications emerge from this work, informing existing treatments of self-concept in the leadership literature and beyond. Of particular note are theoretical and practical extensions pertaining to the four variability constructs that emerged.

**Studying Identity Dynamics at the Level of Events Is Important**

First and foremost, this research demonstrates the need to respect the fluid and dynamic nature of self-concept structures as they unfold and evolve at the level of events. Some of the earliest scholarship on identity alludes to this, such as Markus and Wurf’s (1987) introduction of the *working self-concept* (see also Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1986; Lord & Brown, 2003). Nevertheless, the preponderance of identity research has been limited in focus to the person level (e.g., Ibarra, 1999; Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2010; McConnell, 2010) or has aggregated even further to the level of groups (e.g., Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004; Hogg, 2001) or organizations (e.g., Bartel, 2001; Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). The study of leadership identity has been no exception (see
Ibarra et al., 2014, for an overview), with examinations of identity tending to focus on slow and gradual change that occur throughout the course of long-term career (Mumford, Campion, & Morgeson, 2007, group (Sluss & Ashforth, 2007), or organizational (Clark, Gioia, Ketchen, & Thomas, 2010) trajectories.

However, the tide appears to be shifting as modern leadership theories reflect a growing appreciation for situational complexity (e.g., Lord, Hannah, & Jennings, 2011; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2008), the role of context (e.g., Vroom & Jago, 2007), and process-based (e.g., Foti, Knee, & Backert, 2008) rather than fixed components of leadership. Such theories demand a more nuanced and flexible conceptualization of what it means for someone to identify themselves as a leader (see Mendoza-Denton et al., 2001 for one example), and this purpose appears to be best served by disaggregating self-concept to the level of events. One example of this is shared leadership theory (Pearce & Conger, 2003), which is predicated upon the notion that high-performing teams consist of informal leaders who step up to lead in some instances, while yielding to their colleagues in others. It stands to reason that participants in shared leadership settings are required to identify a leadership identity as self-descriptive and important under some circumstances but as just the opposite (i.e., non self-descriptive and not important) when factors exist that render someone else more capable of leading. Regulation strategies are also likely needed to a variable degree so that actors can modulate their efforts to claim or grant the authority to lead appropriately (DeRue & Ashford, 2010).

**Self-Concept Variability May Be Adaptive**

A second implication of related and equal importance is that self-concept variability could serve an adaptive function. Although significant links were not
established between the four variability constructs and leadership outcomes measured in this study, recognizing when to lead and when to follow has been identified as a critical leadership skill (Kark & Van Dijk, 2007). Adaptive leadership (see Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Marion, Seers, Orton, & Schreiber, 2006), for instance, is a function of one’s ability to effectively read and respond to contextual cues denoting who the leader ought to be amongst a set of interaction partners. Ascribing a positive aspect to self-concept variability is significant, because prior research has largely given fluctuation in identity the negative connotation of reflecting “instability.” The construct of self-concept clarity (Campbell et al., 1996), defined in terms of being confident and clear in one’s sense of self, is one example. Low self-concept clarity, which has even been labeled as “self-concept differentiation” (see Donahue, Robins, Roberts, & John, 1993), has been associated with low psychological adjustment (Bigler, Neimeyer, & Brown, 2001) as well as depression and anxiety (Butzer & Kuiper, 2006). In the self-complexity literature, varying self-appraisals are associated with low cognitive complexity and linked with inferior stress coping skills (Linville, 1985). Recent work has begun to challenge the foundation of these claims on conceptual as well as methodological grounds (Pilarska & Suchanska, 2014). In its place, the co-existence of two alternatives is explored in the form of competing hypotheses; (1) a fragmentation hypothesis whereby identity variability can be maladaptive by engendering lack of confidence and other negative side effects, and (2) a flexibility hypothesis whereby variability constitutes a nuanced and appropriately-complex understanding of who one is (Pilarska, 2015). Although these two separate facets do not align precisely with the curvilinear relationship of variability to outcomes proposed in the present study, Pilarska’s (2015) work lends support to a central
assertion of this project; that variability in identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression can be adaptive to a certain extent.

**An Optimal Range of Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation Exists**

Despite an innate preference people have for self-concept stability (Greenwald, 1980; Markus, 1977; Swann & Read, 1981), it appears that experiencing some variability has its benefits, too. Early work on self-concept stability and malleability regarded it as a within-person difference whereby people could become more malleable when necessary as a means of warding off identity threats (Markus & Kunda, 1986). For this study, similar terminology was used to model a between-person difference, with stable leaders showing consistency in the extent to which they endorsed a leadership identity and malleable leaders showing inconsistency.

Along those lines, one objective was to identify an optimal range of variability whereby leadership perceptions and outcomes would be maximized. Knowing such a range would assist those charged with developing leaders in constructing interventions that could target a desired amount of variability. A recent review of related constructs by Pierce and Aguinis (2013) was used to rationalize and propose a curvilinear effect, whereby moderate levels of fluctuation in leadership identity and regulation would be preferable to lower or higher amounts. This was not confirmed by the data, which means that the issue of identifying an optimal range of cross-situational variability has yet to be resolved.

Culture is a factor to consider when determining how much variability in identity or regulation is ideal, although it was not explored in this study. Extensive evidence alludes to the existence of a variety of leadership prototypes in different cultures.
(Gerstner & Day, 1994), making it possible, for instance, that minimal variability would be frowned upon in certain cultures yet respected in others. Social Identity Theory (Hogg, 2001) suggests that this could even be the case at the group level, with norms dictating how appropriate it is to claim a leadership identity consistently as opposed to periodically. If this is found to be the case, it implies that there is no universal target when it comes to the four variability constructs. Optimal levels would instead be defined by context and its many parameters (Lichtenstein et al., 2006), making it valuable to look within a context (e.g., a single department within an organization) rather than across settings, as was done in this case by utilizing MBA students representing a variety of organizations and industries. Such examinations have already been conducted with success at the level of organizations and shared leadership teams (e.g., Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Hannah, Balthazard, Waldman, Jennings, & Thatcher, 2013) but could also be further distilled to the level of individual leaders and events.

An interesting notion is the idea that different levels of stability or variability would be more adaptive, and better received by others, in specific circumstances. Extreme events, for instance, have been shown to render certain characteristics of leadership more effective than they would typically be under normal conditions (Hannah et al., 2009).

**Self-Assessment Is a Viable Means of Measuring Variability in Leadership Identity and Regulation**

Empirical research pertaining to leadership identity is incredibly scarce, despite the relatively large amount of theoretical treatment the construct has received. A key culprit in this is likely the numerous issues associated with attempting to operationalize
the measurement of a leadership self-concept (see Abdelal, 2009 for a discussion of these). Underscoring this problem is a phenomenon that Abdelal, Herrara, Johnston, and McDermott (2009) refer to as “undisciplined identity,” or the lack of a universal definition explaining self-concept and its fundamental components.

The present study reflects an attempt to move toward such a definition by relying on previous scholarship to identify three dimensions of significance to measuring leadership identity, which is understood as one of many “self-aspects” people possess (McConnell, 2010). The first dimension, activation (Kuhnen et al., 2001), was first confirmed with an experiment and then manipulated by priming subjects to think and write about experiences where they were operating in a leadership capacity. The second and third dimensions, self-descriptiveness and importance (Cross and Markus, 1994), were measured using a questionnaire developed specifically for this study.

A questionnaire for leadership identity regulation was also constructed on the basis of a well-respected measure in the emotional regulation literature (Gross & John, 2003). Important considerations surrounded the development and scrutiny of these measures, including the ability of subjects to explicitly assess their own identity (as opposed to implicitly doing so, see Greenwald et al., 2002; Johnson & Lord, 2010) and the extent to which a multiple-measurement paradigm would be subject to common method bias and related issues. These concerns notwithstanding, strong support was found for the existence of cross-situational variability in all four constructs tested. Further work is clearly needed to sufficiently mitigate the measurement concerns that scholars such as Abdelal (2009) have raised, but the findings of this study appear to
suggest that individuals are capable of making identity-related distinctions as they assess
themselves and their reactions to events.

Limitations and Future Research

Important ground can be gained by drawing attention to key limitations that provide opportunities for further exploration and insight. Attempting to highlight all the potential limitations and missteps that could be identified is beyond the scope of this section. Instead, the discussion below draws attention to overlooked or neglected areas that, if sufficiently addressed, are poised to significantly enhance the quality of research efforts and theory-building in this domain moving forward.

Conceptual Development of Framework Around Variability Constructs

Variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression were conceptually regarded from the outset as mediational mechanisms of leadership phenomena, based on research indicating that core affect variability (e.g., Kuppens, Oravecz, and Tuerlinckx, 2010), a similar construct, plays a mediator role within the emotional regulation literature. Given this assumption, a logical next step would have been to identify a well-documented relationship within the leadership literature that variability in leadership identity and regulation could potentially be leveraged to explain or clarify. Doing so would make the variability constructs “process variables” that are used to describe how or why a relationship unfolds, consistent with a mediation framework (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Preacher & Hayes, 2004) as well as a top-down approach to theory-building.

A bottom-up approach was taken instead, whereby Core Self-Evaluations (CSEs: Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997), Implicit Person Theories (IPTs: Dweck, 1996), and
event characteristics (Hoffman & Lord, 2013) were selected because of their proposed value in predicting the four variability constructs while Developmental Readiness (Avolio & Hannah, 2008) and other-source ratings of leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987) were chosen based on their conceptual links to stable versus variable leadership self-perceptions. It was inferred that CSEs, IPTs, and event characteristics would relate significantly with Developmental Readiness and other-source ratings of leadership because of their shared association with the variability constructs. Nevertheless, mediation was not confirmed, nor were any significant main effects observed linking antecedent and outcome variables in this study. Future research testing the notion that variability in leadership identity and regulation are best construed as mediating mechanisms would benefit from targeting relationships with strong pre-existing research support that these variables could assist in explicating.

**Obtaining an Adequate Sample of “Variability”**

An assumption of this research that is difficult to validate is the sufficiency of 4-6 sets of leadership episode ratings in establishing a variability index that adequately represents true variability in leadership identity and regulation for each participant. A few concerns pose significant challenges to this assumption that ought to be addressed in future studies. First, the existing paradigm had subjects retrospectively recall and rate leadership episodes, giving them time to reflect on the episodes and draw identity-relevant conclusions that may not have been reached in the moment as events were unfolding. It is difficult to determine whether this would have yielded deflation or inflation in terms of self-assessment variability, but upcoming studies could ameliorate this concern by having subjects respond to events in real time as they are unfolding using
event-based methodologies such as Experience Sampling Methodology (Scollon, Kim-Prieto, & Diener, 2003) or diary studies (Ohly, Sonnentag, Niessen, & Zapf, 2010).

Related to this issue is a second concern, the freedom subjects had to self-select the leadership scenarios they wrote about. Restriction of range emerged as a potential hindrance in the analysis section, and it is quite possible that the types of events subjects picked to write about were biased in terms of certain features, such as being positive, relevant, or past-oriented. Real-time data collection could assist in resolving this issue to the degree that data was collected at scheduling intervals conducive to catching subjects in the middle of a wide variety of different events.

A third limitation pertains to the number of different domains participants were able to draw their leadership examples from. Having subjects provide a description of the events they were rating revealed that a wide array of contexts were being drawn from for leadership scenarios, ranging from school to work to volunteering activities. In view of the possibility discussed above that culture may dictate acceptable levels of variability, a cleaner approach would consist of limiting self-assessments to events emerging from a limited domain such as work in one’s immediate work group.

One approach to limiting domains would be to simulate episodes of leadership in a controlled laboratory environment, where the experimenter could directly influence the types of events participants respond to and rate, as well as the extent of their involvement as leaders. Studies using an experimental paradigm to study dynamics of identity have yielded considerable insight by controlling for a variety of contextual factors that bias responses (see Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Cross & Markus, 1994; Mendoza-Denton et al., 2001 for examples).
Capturing the Reciprocal Nature of Leadership Identity

The definition of leadership that has guided this project refers to a dynamic process that is inherently social and reciprocal, whereby efforts to assert a leadership identity are met with acceptance or rejection by outside parties in a process that repeats itself over and over again (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; DeRue, Ashford, & Cotton, 2009). Examining the leadership claimer’s experience of identity at the level of events was a key focus of this study, but the granter’s perspective was neglected by relying on global perceptions of leadership that, in many cases, were not even tied to the specific events participants wrote about. For instance, instructors in some cases rated the leadership of a student who wrote about work-related experiences that occurred outside the classroom.

In order to properly examine the impact of variability in leadership identity and regulation on other-source perceptions of leadership, the outside observer needs to be privy to the events reflecting a subject’s cross-situational stability or variability.

Future efforts to study these constructs should ensure that outside raters are in a position to evaluate the leader’s performance in reference to the context they are sampling events from. Limiting data collection to a single organization or a laboratory setting would assist in accomplishing this objective. On the measurement side, the use of event-level outcome measures of leadership perceptions or performance could substantially enrich the quality of the data collected. This would be particularly true if the ratings could (a) directly correspond to the leadership episodes that focal participants are writing about and (b) get collected in the moment as events are transpiring and as the focal participant’s leadership is being assessed or reacted to. In shared leadership
contexts, multiple team members could assess an individual’s leadership performance to provide more robust measurement.

**Broadening the Scope and Reach of Identity and Regulation Variability**

This study has been limited in purview to variability in identity and regulation as they manifest themselves within the realm of organizational leadership. The concepts articulated here have broad applicability to other domains of identity as well as constructs in other fields that bear a resemblance to identity as it has been defined in this work. For instance, marketing research defines a product or corporation’s “brand” using similar parameters to those that have been established for defining identity (e.g., a cognitive framework for organizing information, socially-defined, multiple “brands”). Much like leadership identity, variability in brand identity is evidenced both in the long-term as organizations re-define themselves (Muzellec & Lambkin, 2006) and in the short-term as consumer word of mouth reflects varying perceptions of a brand’s reputation and appeal (Dellarocas, 2003). Marketing managers can also vary in the extent to which they attempt to actively regulate this variability as opposed to allowing it to run its natural course. Significant potential for future exploration exists within this realm and many others like it where identity dynamics function as critical drivers of key outcomes.

These limitations notwithstanding, the contribution of this research can be framed both in terms of the leadership literature as well as the broader study of identity. Within the realm of leadership, this study adds support to increasing recognition of the dynamic nature of leadership processes (e.g., Day, 2001; DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Hannah, Lord, & Pearce, 2011) as well as the implications such complexity has for developing effective methodology and measurement. The results begin to provide an empirical basis for
conceptual development around the idea that a leadership self-concept bears more resemblance to a work in progress than a finished product. Scholars and practitioners concerned with broader identity, or other specific domains of identity (e.g., student), are challenged by this work to consider the sufficiency of one-time measurement for capturing the influence of context and its impact on self-assessments. Examining self-concept variability at the level of events has implications that arguably extend to any and all facets of existing research on identity, creating significant potential for future exploration that builds upon the findings reported here.
CHAPTER VII
SUMMARY

The present study supported the oft-held assumption that self-concept is susceptible to ongoing change at the level of events. Questionnaires developed for this research provided a dimensional language for leadership identity and regulation as well as a means by which these dynamics could begin to be explored and understood in greater depth. The results of this study have broader implications for other research domains within and beyond the field of psychology where self-concept is a variable of interest. Other self-aspects (McConnell, 2010) are likely subject to similar dynamics as those explored in this research. Refining the measurement of variability in leadership identity and regulation and further exploring their relationship to leadership outcomes would increase their impact within the realm of organizational research and practice.

It bears mentioning that these findings do not imply that studying identity at the person-level is not worthwhile. Indeed, a core proposition that received confirmation is the idea that individual differences would be found to exist in the extent to which people vary in (a) identifying with a leadership identity and (b) engaging in strategies to regulate leadership self-concept across events. A more accurate way of interpreting the contribution of this project would be in terms of the value an event-level understanding of identity can add to existing theory and practice pertaining to leadership and self-concept.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION – PILOT STUDY

Age
Gender
Race
College Major
Are you currently employed?
   If you are currently employed,
   a) Does your position involve leadership, supervision, and/or management?
   b) How many hours per week do you work as a leader/supervisor/manager?
   c) How long have you been in your current leadership/supervisory/management position?
   d) How long have you worked in a leadership/supervisory/management capacity for this organization?
   e) How long have you worked for this organization?
   f) How many years of leadership/supervisory/managerial experience do you have?
      (Note: If you have less than one year of experience, indicate the number of months of experience you have).

On a scale from 1 to 9 (1 = no leadership experience at all, 9 = extensive leadership experience), rate the amount of leadership experience you have.

On a scale from 1 to 9 (1 = in no way whatsoever do I see myself as a leader, 9 = I see myself first and foremost as a leader), rate the extent to which you see yourself as a leader.

On a scale from 1 to 9 (1 = very consistent across situations, 9 = changes dramatically across situations), rate the extent to which your view of yourself as a leader tends to change across situations or time.
APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT-GENERATED EVENTS – PILOT STUDY

Set One: Non-Leader Identity-Related Events

Instructions: For the following questions, please take a moment to visualize a specific event someone else you know faced in the recent past. Take a few moments to visualize where they were, who was involved, when it happened, and what took place.

1) In the box below, please describe the event in 2-4 sentences.

2) Please describe in 2-4 sentences the attitudes, thoughts, and feelings you had when you heard about this event.

3) [subjects will rate the event they describe, using the event characteristics scale, which is outlined on a separate page]

NOTE – This task will be repeated 3 times, once for the past-related prompt above, and then for the following two instructional prompts:

1) PRESENT-RELATED PROMPT: For the following questions, please take a moment to visualize a specific event someone else you know is currently facing. Take a few moments to visualize where it is unfolding, who is involved, when it started happening, and what has taken place.

2) FUTURE-RELATED PROMPT: For the following questions, please take a moment to visualize a specific event someone else you know anticipates facing in the
near future. Take a few moments to visualize where it will take place, who will be involved, when it will happen, and what will take place.

Set Two: Leader Identity-Related Events

Participants will generate three events using the same sequence outlined above with two notable differences:
1) Once participants have rated event characteristics for the situation they describe (see #3 above), they will also complete the Identity Variability and Identity Regulation Scales, which are outlined on separate pages).

2) The Instructional prompts will be worded differently to prompt a focus on leader identity. Specifically, they will read as follows:

1) PAST-RELATED PROMPT: For the following questions, please take a moment to visualize a specific, work-related event you faced as a leader in the recent past. Take a few moments to visualize where you were, who was involved, when it happened, and what took place

2) PRESENT-RELATED PROMPT: For the following questions, please take a moment to visualize a specific, work-related event you are currently facing as a leader (not including this experiment). Take a few moments to visualize where it is unfolding, who is involved, when it started happening, and what has taken place.

3) FUTURE-RELATED PROMPT: For the following questions, please take a moment to visualize a specific, work-related event you anticipate facing as a leader in the near future. Take a few moments to visualize where it will take place, who will be involved, when it will happen, and what will take place.
APPENDIX C

LEADERSHIP IDENTITY ACTIVATION MEASURE – LEXICAL DECISION TASK

Instructions: In this experiment, you will be presented with a series of letter strings and must determine as quickly as possible whether they are words or non-words. Once you have made a decision:

Press “1” on the keypad to indicate that a letter string IS A WORD
Press “3” on the keypad to indicate that a letter string IS NOT A WORD

PHASE ONE (following completion of first set of 3 Participant-Generated Events)

Practice Trials (10 - presentation order of letter strings will be randomized)
  - Words
    - Soda
    - Walk
    - Building
    - Winter
    - Wildlife
  - Non-Words
    - Snoe
    - Werd
    - Sighdwalk
    - Expenzive
    - Gurage

Experimental Trials (20 – presentation order of letter strings will be randomized)
  - Words
    - Motivational
    - Compassionate
    - Ambitious
    - Dedicated
    - Sympathetic
PHASE TWO (following completion of second set of 3 Participant-Generated Events)

Practice Trials (10 - presentation order of letter strings will be randomized)
- Words
  - Play
  - Send
  - Market
  - Weekend
  - Message
- Non-Words
  - Rayt
  - Neckst
  - Laoder
  - Stimulcrate
  - Reservory

Experimental Trials (20 – presentation order of letter strings will be randomized)
- Words
  - Charismatic
  - Knowledgeable
  - Intelligent
  - Sensitive
• Caring
• Competitive
• Understanding
• Outgoing
• Strong
• Authoritarian

• Non-Words
  • Dicisive
  • Ferm
  • Maskerful
  • Aritculit
  • Custagious
  • Onederful
  • Talinted
  • Opinionated
  • Imparshal
  • Lykable
APPENDIX D

LEADERSHIP IDENTITY SCALE – PILOT STUDY VERSION

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which you agree with the items below in this situation, using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identity Self-Descriptiveness

1) I questioned my identity as a leader.

2) I was certain that I should take a leadership role.

3) I felt less like a leader than I usually do. (reverse-coded)

4) I was qualified to be a leader.

5) I had less confidence in being a leader than I usually have (reverse-coded)

6) My knowledge, skills, and abilities made me unfit to lead. (reverse-coded)

Identity Importance

1) Being a leader was important to me.

2) I felt motivated to lead.

3) I felt like someone else could have taken the lead. (reverse-coded)

4) No one was counting on me to lead. (reverse-coded)

5) Having me as the leader made a big difference.

6) Serving in a leadership capacity was a priority for me
APPENDIX E

LEADERSHIP IDENTITY REGULATION SCALE – PILOT STUDY VERSION

(ADAPTED FROM GROSS & JOHNS, 2003)

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which you agree with the items below in this situation, using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal

1. I control my view of myself as a leader by changing the way I think about the situation.
2. When I want to feel less doubt about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.
3. When I want to feel more confident about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.
4. In order to feel more confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about.
5. In order to avoid feeling less confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about.
6. When I’m faced with a threat to my identity as a leader, I make myself think about it in a way that helps me assert myself as a leader.

Self-Descriptiveness Suppression

1. I control my doubts about myself as a leader by not expressing them.
2. When I am questioning my identity as a leader, I make sure not to express it.
3. I keep my level of confidence as a leader to myself.
4. When I am confident in my abilities as a leader, I make sure not to express it.

Importance Reappraisal

1. I control the impact of an event on my identity as a leader by changing the way I think about the situation I’m in.
2. When I want to feel like an outcome is less important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.
3. When I want to feel like an outcome is more important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.
4. In order to feel like being a leader is important to me, I change what I’m thinking about.
5. In order to avoid feeling like being a leader is unimportant to me, I change what I’m thinking about.
6. When I’m faced with a stressful situation, thinking about the importance of being a leader helps me stay calm.

**Importance Suppression**
1. I control my doubts about the importance of being a leader by not expressing them.
2. When I am questioning the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it.
3. I keep my thoughts regarding the importance of personally being a leader to myself.
4. When I feel strongly about the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it.
APPENDIX F

EVENT CHARACTERISTICS SCALES

**Instructions:** Using the scales below, please rate the extent to which the event you describe above reflects the following characteristics. Please refer to the definitions provided below each scale as necessary:

1)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Past:** An event that already reached its conclusion  
**Present:** An event that has not yet reached its conclusion  
**Future:** An event that has not yet started

2)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Irrelevant:** An event that has little to do with personal goals and interests  
**Relevant:** An event that has a high amount of personal significance

3)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ordinary:** An event that falls within normal expectations  
**Extraordinary:** An event that poses a threat to normal expectations

4)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Micro-level:** An event that is more focused and time-restricted  
**Macro-level:** An event that is broader in terms of focus and time
5) Familiar: An event you are well-acquainted to dealing with  
Novel: An event you are not accustomed to dealing with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Static: Events perceived to be finished or complete  
Dynamic: Events that continue to change and unfold over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Negative: An event that is very unpleasant  
Positive: An event that is very pleasant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

TEMPORAL FOCUS SCALE

(SHIPP, EDWARDS, & LAMBERT, 2009)

Instructions: Please rate each of the following items as they reflect your thinking, using the scale below

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I think about things from my past.
2) I live my life in the present.
3) I think about what my future has in store.
4) I focus on what is currently happening in my life.
5) I focus on my future.
6) I replay memories of the past in my mind.
7) I imagine what tomorrow will bring for me.
8) My mind is on the here and now.
9) I reflect on what has happened in my life.
10) I think about where I am today.
11) I think back to my earlier days.
12) I think about times to come.
APPENDIX H

PARTICIPANT-GENERATED EVENTS – PRIMARY STUDY

Instructions: For the following questions, please take a moment to visualize a specific, work-related event you faced as a leader within the last week. Take a few moments to visualize where you were, who was involved, when it happened, and what took place.

1) In the box below, please describe the event in 2-4 sentences.

2) Please describe in 2-4 sentences the attitudes, thoughts, and feelings you had when you experienced this event.

3) [Subjects will rate the event they describe, using the event characteristics scale, which is outlined on a separate page]

NOTE: For the remaining five events, a sentence will be inserted into the instructions between the first and second sentence that reads; “It is important that this event is distinct from (or not directly related to) any other events you have written about for this study.”
APPENDIX I

LEADERSHIP IDENTITY SCALE – PRIMARY STUDY VERSION

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which you agree with the items below in this situation, using the following scale:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

Identity Self-Descriptiveness

1) I questioned my identity as a leader (reverse-coded).

2) I was certain that I should take a leadership role.

3) I felt less like a leader than I usually do (reverse-coded).

4) I had less confidence in being a leader than I usually have (reverse-coded).

Identity Importance

1) Being a leader was important to me.

2) I felt motivated to lead.

3) Having me as the leader made a big difference.

4) Serving in a leadership capacity was a priority for me.
APPENDIX J

LEADERSHIP IDENTITY REGULATION SCALE – PRIMARY STUDY VERSION

(ADAPTED FROM GROSS & JOHNS, 2003)

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which you agree with the items below in this situation, using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Descriptiveness Reappraisal

1) When I want to feel less doubt about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.

2) When I want to feel more confident about my identity as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.

3) In order to feel more confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about.

4) In order to avoid feeling less confident in my identity as a leader, I change what I’m thinking about.

Importance Reappraisal

1) When I want to feel like an outcome is less important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.

2) When I want to feel like an outcome is more important to who I am as a leader, I change the way I’m thinking about the situation.

3) In order to feel like being a leader is important to me, I change what I’m thinking about.
4) In order to avoid feeling like being a leader is unimportant to me, I change what I’m thinking about.

**Identity Suppression**

1) When I am questioning the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it.

2) I keep my thoughts regarding the importance of personally being a leader to myself.

3) When I feel strongly about the personal significance of being a leader, I make sure not to express it.

4) I control my doubts about myself as a leader by not expressing them.
APPENDIX K

CORE SELF-EVALUATION SCALE (CSES)

(JUDGE, EREZ, BONO, & THORESON, 2003)

**Instructions:** Below are several statements about you with which you may agree or disagree. Using the response scale below, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

1. I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.
2. Sometimes, I feel depressed. (reverse-coded)
3. When I try, I generally succeed.
4. Sometimes when I fail I feel worthless. (reverse-coded)
5. I complete tasks successfully.
6. Sometimes, I do not feel in control of my work. (reverse-coded)
7. Overall, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I am filled with doubts about my competence. (reverse-coded)
9. I determine what will happen in my life.
10. I do not feel in control of my success in my career. (reverse-coded)
11. I am capable of coping with most of my problems.
12. There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me. (reverse-coded)
APPENDIX L

IMPLICIT PERSON THEORY – KIND OF PERSON SCALE

(DWECK, 1999)

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the items below, using the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The kind of person someone is, is something very basic about them, and it can’t be changed very much.

2. People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can’t really be changed.

3. Everyone is a certain kind of person, and there is not much that they can do to really change that.

4. As much as I hate to admit it, you can’t teach an old dog new tricks. People can’t really change their deepest attributes.

5. Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics. (reverse-coded)

6. People can substantially change the kind of person they are. (reverse-coded)

7. No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much. (reverse-coded)

8. People can change even their most basic qualities. (reverse-coded)
APPENDIX M

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION – PRIMARY STUDY – ADDITIONS TO AND
SUBSTITUTIONS FROM PILOT STUDY

1) SUBSTITUTE (for College Major)

MBA Area of Focus (Check One):
   Business Analytics
   Direct Interactive Marketing
   Finance
   Global Technological Innovation
   Health Care Management
   Interdisciplinary
   International Business
   International Finance
   Leadership and Organizational Change
   Management
   Strategic Marketing
   Supply Chain Management
   Other

2) ADD

Total Score on GMAT (a “not sure” option will be included for each of these five items)
   Verbal score on GMAT
   Quantitative Score on GMAT
   Integrated Reasoning Score on GMAT
   Analytical Written Assessment score on GMAT

3) ADD

Graduate GPA

4) ADD

Instructor Demographics (Age, Gender, Length of time knowing the ratee, Years of teaching experience)
APPENDIX N

OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE – BIG FIVE MINI-MARKERS

(THOMPSON, 2008)

Instructions: Please use the below list of common human traits to describe yourself as accurately as possible. Describe yourself as you really are compared to other people you know of the same age and sex, not as you wish to be. Use the following 5-point scale.

1  2  3  4  5
Inaccurate  Accurate

1. Creative
2. Uncreative
3. Intellectual
4. Intelligent
5. Philosophical
6. Unimaginative
7. Deep
8. Artistic
APPENDIX O

ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT SCALE

(ADAPTED FROM DE VOS, DE HAUW, & VAN DER HEIJEN, 2011)

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements, using the scale below.


1. I get the necessary time and means to further develop my competencies.
2. I can make use of a personal development plan to know what competencies I need to develop and how I can develop them best.
3. My superiors regularly give me feedback about my performance.
4. This program provides new and creative training opportunities.
5. My boss makes sure that I can learn on the job by giving me challenging assignments.
6. My colleagues regularly give me feedback about my performance.
7. I can regularly change jobs within my company (without promotion) to develop new competencies.
8. This program ensures that I develop the competencies that I need for my career.
9. All information about career opportunities is readily available.
10. I have been given tasks that develop my competencies for the future.
11. I have been given a personal development plan to better understand my possibilities and the competencies I need to fully exploit them.
12. I have been given the possibility to develop the competencies I need to get a promotion and move to a function at a higher level of the organization.
APPENDIX P

WORK EXTRINSIC-INTRINSIC MOTIVATION SCALE

(TREMBLAY, BLANCHARD, TAYLOR, PELLETIER, & VILLENEUVE, 2009)

**Instructions:** Please indicate the extent to which each of the following items corresponds to the reasons why you are presently involved in an MBA program, using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not correspond at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds moderately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds exactly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Because this is the type of work I chose to do to attain a certain lifestyle.
2. For the income it provides me.
3. I ask myself this question, I don’t seem to be able to manage the important tasks related to this work.
4. Because I derive much pleasure from learning new things.
5. Because it has become a fundamental part of who I am.
6. Because I want to succeed at this job, if not I would be very ashamed of myself.
7. Because I chose this type of work to attain my career goals.
8. For the satisfaction I experience from taking on interesting challenges
9. Because it allows me to earn money.
10. Because it is part of the way in which I have chosen to live my life.
11. Because I want to be very good at this work, otherwise I would be very disappointed.
12. I don’t know why, we are provided with unrealistic working conditions.
13. Because I want to be a “winner” in life.
14. Because it is the type of work I have chosen to attain certain important objectives.
15. For the satisfaction I experience when I am successful at doing difficult tasks.
16. Because this type of work provides me with security.
17. I don’t know, too much is expected of us.
18. Because this program is a part of my life.
APPENDIX Q

ACHIEVEMENT GOALS QUESTIONNAIRE

(ELLIOTT & MCGREGOR, 2001)

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the items below, using the scale provided.

1. Not at all true of me
2. True of me

1. It is important for me to do better than other students.
2. It is important for me to do well compared to others in this class.
3. My goal in this class is to get a better grade than most of the other students.
4. I worry that I may not learn all that I possibly could in this class.
5. Sometimes, I’m afraid that I may not understand the content of this class as thoroughly as I’d like.
6. I am often concerned that I may not learn all that there is to learn in this class.
7. I want to learn as much as possible from this class.
8. It is important for me to understand the content of this course as thoroughly as possible.
9. I desire to completely master the material presented in this class.
10. I just want to avoid doing poorly in this class.
11. My goal in this class is to avoid performing poorly.
12. My fear of performing poorly in this class is often what motivates me.
APPENDIX R

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENTAL SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

(ADAPTED FROM CHEN, GULLY, & EDEN, 2001)

Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the items below, using the scale provided.

1. Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree
   Strongly Disagree

1. I will be able to achieve most of the developmental goals I have set for myself as a leader.
2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will develop from them.
3. In general, I think that I can develop in ways that are important to me.
4. I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind.
5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.
6. I am confident that I can develop my skills effectively for many different tasks.
7. Compared to other leaders, I can develop my abilities very well.
8. Even when things are tough, I can develop as a leader.
APPENDIX S

CONGER-KANUNGO LEADERSHIP SCALE

(CONGER & KANUNGO, 1994)

Instructions: Indicate the extent to which each of the following items is characteristic of the person you are rating, using the following scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6
Very uncharacteristic Very characteristic

Vision and articulation
1. Exciting public speaker
2. Appears to be a skillful performer when presenting to a group
3. Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing.
4. Has vision, often brings up ideas about possibilities for the future.
5. Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals.
6. Consistently generates new ideas for the future of the organization.

Environmental sensitivity
7. Readily recognizes constraints in the organization’s social and cultural environment (cultural norms, lack of grass roots support, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives.
8. Readily recognizes constraints in the physical environment (technological limitations, lack of resources, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives.
9. Readily recognizes barriers/forces within the organization that may block or hinder achievement of his/her goals.
10. Recognizes the abilities and skills of other members in the organization.
11. Recognizes the limitations of other members in the organization.
12. Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement of organizational objectives.
13. Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals.

Unconventional behavior
14. Engages in unconventional behavior to achieve organizational goals.
15. Uses non-traditional means to achieve organizational goals.
16. Often exhibits very unique behavior that surprises other members of the organization.

Personal risk
17. In pursuing organizational objectives, engages in activities involving considerable personal risk.
18. In pursuing organizational objectives, engages in activities involving considerable self-sacrifice.
19. Takes high personal risk for the sake of the organization.
20. Often incurs high personal costs for the good of the organization.

Sensitivity to member needs
21. Shows sensitivity for the needs and feelings of other members in the organization.
22. Influences others by developing mutual liking and respect.
23. Often expresses personal concern for the needs and feelings of other members of the organization.

Does not maintain status quo
24. Tries to maintain the status quo or the normal way of doing things.
25. Advocates following non-risky well-established courses of action to achieve organizational goals.
APPENDIX T

STEREOTYPE VULNERABILITY SCALE (SVS)

(ADAPTED FROM SPENCER, 1994)

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements, using the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5
Never Almost Always

Because of your age/gender/ethnicity:

1) Some people believe that you have less ability.

2) If you’re not better than average, people assume you are limited.

3) Professors expect you to do poorly.

4) Professors are less likely to encourage you.

5) You are not fully accepted or included into your program.

6) If you ask a simple question, people will think it is because of your age/gender/ethnicity.

7) If you do poorly on a test, people will assume that it is because of your ethnicity.

8) People of your age/gender/ethnicity face unfair evaluations because of their age/gender/ethnicity.
APPENDIX U

LEADERSHIP SELF-CONFIDENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

(HARDY, ARTHUR, JONES, SHARIFF, MUNNOCH, ISAACS, & ALLSOPP, 2010)

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements, using the scale below.

1 2 3 4 5
Low Medium High

Compared to the most confident leader you know, how would you rate your confidence in your ability to:

Self-confidence
1. Meet the challenges of leadership.
2. Perform the tasks necessary to be a successful leader.
3. Perform under pressure.
4. Concentrate well enough to be successful.
5. Think and respond successfully in leadership situations.

Resilience
1. Bounce back from performing poorly and succeed.
2. Bounce back from a major leadership setback and succeed.
3. Adapt to different leadership situations and be successful.
4. Be consistently successful as a leader, week after week.
5. Be successful even when the odds are against you.
APPENDIX V

HISTOGRAMS FOR VARIABILITY IN LEADERSHIP IDENTITY SELF-DESCRIPTIVENESS AND IMPORTANCE

A) Variability in leadership identity self-descriptiveness (3 items)
B) Variability in leadership identity importance (4 items)

Mean = .92
Std. Dev. = .715
N = 113
APPENDIX W

HISTOGRAMS FOR VARIABILITY IN LEADERSHIP IDENTITY REGULATION REAPPRAISAL AND SUPPRESSION

A) Variability in leadership identity reappraisal regulation (7 items)
B) Variability in leadership identity suppression regulation (3 items)
APPENDIX X

HISTOGRAMS FOR VARIABILITY IN SEVEN EVENT CHARACTERISTICS

A) Variability in past/present/future events
B) Variability in irrelevant/relevant events

C) Variability in ordinary/extraordinary events
D) Variability in micro/macro-level events

E) Variability in familiar/novel events

F) Variability in static/dynamic events
G) Variability in negative/positive events
APPENDIX Y

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF VARIABILITY IN SEVEN EVENT CHARACTERISTICS

A high amount of inter-correlation was observed amongst the seven event characteristics measured in this study when they were modeled in terms of person-level variability (see Table 4.16). This raises the possibility that event features cluster together under higher-order dimensions that could lend to more parsimonious analyses. To test this notion, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the seven variability estimates. Results of this analysis are reported in Tables Y.1 and Y.2. A two-factor solution fit the data best ($\chi^2 = 4.61***$, $p = 0.80$, RMSEA = .00, CFI = 1.00, SRMR = .02) and was the most interpretable based on eigenvalues. Factor one, which had an eigenvalue of 2.63, consisted of three event features; ordinary/extraordinary, familiar/novel, and negative/positive. Loadings for this dimension ranged from .468 to .695. Factor two, which had an eigenvalue of 1.314, consisted of four characteristics; past/present/future, irrelevant/relevant, micro/macro, and static/dynamic. Loadings for this dimension ranged from .363 to .811. The two factors were moderately correlated ($r = .252$) and reliability estimates ranged from .648 for Factor 1 to .665 for factor 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.61***</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** **$p > .05$, suggesting that the data align with a 2-factor solution
Table Y.2. Factor loadings for a two-dimension scale of event characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Characteristic</th>
<th>Extracted Factor 1</th>
<th>Extracted Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Past/Present/Future</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ordinary/Extraordinary</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Micro/Macro-Level</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Familiar/Novel</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Static/Dynamic</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negative/Positive</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 113. Factor loadings < .30 are not reported.*

Although these results appear to be encouraging from a statistical perspective, a conceptual interpretation of the two dimensions is difficult to ascertain. In the absence of a reasonable link amongst the items representing each factor, it makes more sense to proceed with the seven event dimensions as independent predictors, as was done in Chapter IV.
APPENDIX Z

INTERACTIONS OF EVENT VARIABILITY WITH CORE SELF EVALUATIONS
AND IMPLICIT PERSON THEORIES

Hypotheses 11 and 12 proposed interactions between specific features of events and (a) Core Self Evaluations (CSEs) and (b) Implicit Person Theories (IPTs) in predicting variability in self-descriptiveness, importance, reappraisal, and suppression judgments. The hypotheses could not be tested as proposed for reasons reviewed in Chapter IV, but the introduction of variability in event features makes it possible, and potentially meaningful, to model the interactions of variability for each of the seven event features with CSEs and IPTs. In particular, these analyses would shed light on whether the relationship between antecedents (i.e., CSEs and IPTs) and the four variability constructs differ when participants provide homogenous events representing minimal variability with regard to event characteristics as opposed to heterogeneous events that reflect a wide spectrum of event features.

Results of these analyses are presented in Tables Z.1-Z.4. They build upon the stepwise regressions reported in Table 4.16 in that moderation is only tested for with regard to the select event features that emerged as unique predictors of each of the variability constructs. Significant interactions were not observed for self-descriptiveness, importance, or suppression variability. However, a marginally-significant interaction was observed for variability in familiar/novel events as a moderator of the relationship
Table Z.1. Hierarchical regression results for the moderating influence of event features on CSEs and IPTs as predictors of self-descriptiveness variability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Self Evaluations (CSEs)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Person Theories (IPTs)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEs * Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPTs * Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 113. DV = dependent variable. β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete models. $R^2$ is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. Predictor variables are mean-centered. $F^a$ ratio for $R^2$ resulting from entry of variable(s) at each step. *p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.

Table Z.2. Hierarchical regression results for the moderating influence of event features on CSEs and IPTs as predictors of importance variability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Self Evaluations (CSEs)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Person Theories (IPTs)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative/Positive</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEs * Negative/Positive</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEs * Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPTs * Negative/Positive</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPTs * Irrelevant/Relevant</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 113. DV = dependent variable. β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete models. $R^2$ is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. Predictor variables are mean-centered. $F^a$ ratio for $R^2$ resulting from entry of variable(s) at each step.
*p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.

Table Z.3. Hierarchical regression results for the moderating influence of event features on CSEs and IPTs as predictors of regulation reappraisal variability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Self Evaluations (CSEs)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Person Theories (IPTs)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar/Novel</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEs * Familiar/Novel</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPTs * Familiar/Novel</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3.95**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 113. DV = dependent variable. β represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete models. $R^2$ is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. Predictor variables are mean-centered $F$ ratio for $R^2$ resulting from entry of variable(s) at each step.

Table Z.4. Hierarchical regression results for the moderating influence of event features on CSEs and IPTs as predictors of suppression variability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Self-Confidence</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Self Evaluations (CSEs)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Person Theories (IPTs)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary/Extraordinary</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative/Positive</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>5.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEs * Ordinary/Extraordinary</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEs * Negative/Positive</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPTs * Ordinary/Extraordinary</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPTs * Negative/Positive</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note.  $N = 113$. DV = dependent variable. $\beta$ represents standardized regression coefficients for variables in the complete models. $R^2$ is the change in variance accounted for by variable(s) entered at each step. Predictor variables are mean-centered $^aF$ ratio for $R^2$ resulting from entry of variable(s) at each step.

between implicit person theories and variability in leadership identity regulation reappraisal ($\beta = -0.18, p < .10$). Those subscribing to an incrementalist IPT, or the belief that people can change, engaged in more variable reappraisal efforts when they wrote about events reflecting a broader range of familiarity/novelty. In other words, they changed what they were thinking about to preserve their pre-existing notions about who they were as leaders. This may have been due in part to their belief that events are capable of changing one’s identity as a leader, although additional research would be necessary to test this hypothesis.

In summary, all seven event features were found to interact with either CSEs or IPTs in predicting one of the four variability constructs. This suggests that the types of events participants chose to write about and rate were a significant determinant of the relationship between implicit person theories and the variable usage of reappraisal regulation.
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INFORMED CONSENT FOR FOCAL PARTICIPANTS – PRIMARY STUDY

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT (PARTICIPANT)
TO APPEAR ON FIRST SCREEN OF COMPUTER-BASED SURVEY AT EACH PHASE

INVESTIGATORS’ NAMES: Ernest Hoffman & Dr. Paul Levy

RESEARCH PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES:

The purpose of this study is to examine the nature of leader identity and how it relates to developmental and performance-related outcomes. The following computer-based online survey will take approximately 60 minutes to complete. (Investigator’s Note to IRB: Phases 2 and 3 will indicate that the survey takes 15 minutes to complete)

INFORMED CONSENT

Exclusions: Participants must be 18 years of age or older. Participants must have work-related leadership experience.

Risks and Discomforts: Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or may discontinue participation at any time, without penalty. There are no expected risks associated with your participation. If you are uncomfortable answering any of the survey questions, you can choose to leave the question blank.

At the end of this survey, you will be taken to a separate web page that will ask you to provide the names and e-mails for up to three (3) faculty members that are capable of assessing your leadership. Their responses will be kept confidential. Having you provide this information on a separate web page ensures that your responses to the survey cannot be identified with your name. (Investigator’s Note to IRB: This clause is only applicable to Phase 1)

Benefits: Your participation may also help us better understand the nature of leader identity. In addition, you may learn more about the influence certain events have had on your identity as a leader.

Compensation: For each of the three phases you complete, you will receive one (1) entry into a raffle for five $50 gift cards.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. Refusal to participate will not affect your course grade.

If you have any questions about this study, you may contact Ernest Hoffman – email: elh2@zips.ualakron.edu in the Department of Psychology. This project has been reviewed and approved by The University of Akron Institutional Review Board. For questions about your rights as a research participant, contact the IRB at (330) 972-7666.

☐ I have read the information provided and all of my questions have been answered. By continuing with this survey, I am acknowledging my voluntary agreement to participate in this study. Please print a copy of this consent for future reference.
APPENDIX DD

INFORMED CONSENT FOR INSTRUCTORS RATING PARTICIPANTS – PRIMARY STUDY

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

INVESTIGATORS’ NAMES: Ernest Hoffman & Dr. Paul Levy

RESEARCH PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES:

The purpose of this study is to examine the nature of leader identity and how it relates to developmental and performance-related outcomes. You have been identified by one of our participants as someone who is capable of assessing their leadership ability. The following computer-based online survey will take approximately 5 minutes to complete.

INFORMED CONSENT

Exclusions: None.

Risks and Discomforts: Your participation in this research is voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or may discontinue participation at any time, without penalty. There are no expected risks associated with your participation. If you are uncomfortable answering any of the survey questions, you can choose to leave the question blank.

Your responses will be kept confidential and thus, will not be shared with the participant in question, nor anyone other than the investigators listed above.

Benefits: Your participation may help us better understand the nature of leader identity.

Your participation is entirely voluntary.

If you have any questions about this study, you may contact Ernest Hoffman – email: elh2@zips.uakron.edu in the Department of Psychology. This project has been reviewed and approved by The University of Akron Institutional Review Board. For questions about your rights as a research participant, contact the IRB at (330) 972-7666.

☐ I have read the information provided and all of my questions have been answered. By continuing with this survey, I am acknowledging my voluntary agreement to participate in this study. Please print a copy of this consent for future reference.