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ABSTRACT

Self-leadership is a process of self-influence to achieve an optimum state of motivation and self-direction needed to perform what one sees as necessary and unavoidable. The self-leadership process includes mental, cognitive and behavioral strategies that give strength, purpose, meaning and direction to the effort toward effectiveness in performing tasks one needs to perform.

The current work environment is increasingly requiring independent individuals, able to take initiatives and make responsible decisions in settings where they are not always supported by hierarchical superiors. In this context, the concept of self-leadership has been linked with professional and personal effectiveness. While the concepts of leader and of leadership have been explored extensively, there is still a gap in the definition of self-leadership. The most inclusive definition of a leader states that a leader is the individual who influences others. A question then arises regarding a further clarification of the self-leadership concept, as well as of the factors that impact individuals' self-leadership development.

The main purpose of this study was to investigate factors that impact individuals' self-leadership. Furthermore, this study investigated the impact that gender has on self-leadership development. For this purpose, this study investigated a population in
which members were equally or close to equally distributed among both genders, and have varied professions, educational levels, age, and overall background.

Other variables addressed in this study were family satisfaction, social support, internal locus of control, stress, and prior leadership experiences. Self-leadership was measured using the Self-Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) developed by Anderson and Prussia (1997). Other questionnaires were used to measure family satisfaction, social support, internal locus of control, and stress. Extraneous variables were analyzed such as age, race, education, marital status, marital status duration, parenthood, number of children, childhood residence, current residence, Ohio residency, service status with Americorps, service period with Americorps, allowance, and leadership training.

The variables that impacted the most on self-leadership were internal locus of control, age, marital status duration, and number of children. Internal locus of control was positively related with self-leadership, i.e., the higher individuals' internal locus of control, the higher individual's score on self-leadership. Age, marital status duration and number of children, were negatively correlated with self-leadership, i.e., the older one was, the longer one stayed in the same marital status, the more children one had, the lower one's self-leadership. Stepwise multiple regression was calculated. The main variables impacting self-leadership were marital status duration and number of children. Since those variables were highly correlated with age, one of the findings of this study was that age negatively impacts self-leadership. A second major finding of this study was that internal locus of control positively impacts self-leadership. This study also found that there were no significant differences between male and female self-leadership scores.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

We are living in an era of change; from a uniform society to a society in which efforts are being made to acknowledge diversity and respect it. Large corporations are becoming smaller and more agile to be internationally competitive (Servais and Bolle, 1996; Slack, 1997; Sellers, 1998). The solution of problems is moving from an inclusive and collective approach to a customized, individualized approach that takes into consideration individual's specific traits and abilities (Cutler, Erdem and Javalgi, 1997).

Organizations are encouraging employees' independence in decision-making, as well as supporting employees' empowerment and self-leadership, as a way to stimulate employees' ownership, possession of the corporation's destiny, authorship, identification with the organization, and its plans and goals (Senge, Roberts, Ross, Smith and Kleiner, 1994). Senge et al. (1994) also defended that without nurturing employees' free decision-making, individualism, and empowerment, corporations cannot trust that employees are really buying into the company's success, and are doing their best because they also own the organization. Decisions then become common property in the current workplace, increasing the individual's responsibility to participate in their jobs.
The empowering workplace encourages and supports employees' independence by providing infrastructure not only for trials and failures, but also for individual initiatives (Senge et al., 1994).

The theory, methods, and tools behind the empowered workforce are employees' education, training, and opportunities given for exploring personal traits and characteristics. In the end, organizations are a result/product of the thinking and interacting of all its components, the employees (Senge et al., 1994).

Envisioning the future, Barksdale (1998) theorized that in the communities of the future, communication media will allow employees to work from home at times appropriate for them. Reinforcing the trend for individualism, Barksdale (1998) suggested that working teams of the future will be composed of members scattered around the globe. People will not need to be in the same place, at the same time in order to discuss ideas or participate in meetings. Employees and members of teams will be encouraged more to express their opinions on a regular basis, therefore getting more involved in the organizations rather than being told what to do. The same is true for other communities such as families and related groups, whose ties will be strengthened through communication technologies such as e-mail (Barksdale, 1998).

Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers (1998) addressed the paradox of individualism and connectedness in the community of the future. At the same time that humans have the need for distinctiveness, they also need one another to survive. Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers (1998) described vibrant communities as those that welcome individualities and diversity, by encouraging members to explore their own uniqueness and to share their sense of significance of what is important for each of them. Also, vibrant communities
allow individual freedom and connectedness by focusing on the reasons for the existence of the community, rather than in policies and doctrines to structure community relations. At the heart of Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers’ vibrant community, there is still the need for self-determination, for individualism, and for uniqueness.

Machan (1998) explored individualism under the perspective of people’s ability to make choices and then sustain their commitment to these original choices by reference to certain objective standards of human excellence. Machan (1998) defended that human beings are identifiable as a distinct species in the natural world by having the capacity to be rational as one of their central attributes. Each human being has the ability to govern one’s own life using the processes of thought and conceptual consciousness. According to Machan (1998), the purpose of human beings’ life is to excel in this ability, and therefore a just community is the one that makes it possible for all human beings to excel in their individual processes of thought and conceptual consciousness. This point of view does not deny the value of community or the fact that human beings are essentially social, but regards each individual as having supreme importance for itself and for the community in which one lives. Machan (1998) defended that human beings’ major role is that of the ultimate decision-maker, the initiator of forces such as art, science, commerce and philosophy that guide society, and the initiator of rational thought which is human’s most basic behavior.

Machan (1998) proposed an ethical individualism, as opposed to the individualism that excludes community, fellowship, generosity, gregariousness and friendship. Instead, Machan (1998) suggested an individualism that values cooperation, sociability, fellowship, and generosity, provided that these are not imposed upon the
citizen. These values are as much a part of human life as individuality. Machan (1998) defined individualism as the right of each individual to pursue one's chosen goals. Individualism is composed of each individual's level of separateness from all the others. For example, the death of one individual does not imply the death of another individual. Self-directedness, self-determination, and free-will work the same way (Machan, 1998). An individual is someone whose initiative, choices, decisions, and actions are instrumental in who he or she is and will become. Furthermore, according to Machan (1998), individuality is the ability for self-generated rationality, i.e., engaging in creative reasoning, figuring things out, learning about the world, and understanding the world to some extent. Part of the individualism belief is that cognition cannot be imposed but instead is generated by the person. Another individualism belief, according to Machan (1998), is that the individual is the source of moral choice, not the environment, nor genetics. Individualism requires that the decision to do what is right or wrong must come from the individual, and cannot be explained by external or structural forces. Another idea associated with individualism is the political sovereignty of the human being, i.e., the individual members of any polity (a politically organized unit) are the actual sovereigns, not the leaders or the political representatives. A final idea related to individualism, as described by Machan (1998), is that individuals' rights to life, liberty, and property are by nature ascribed to every adult human being.

Hellsten (1997) argued that individualism, along with individuals' acceptance of their duties and responsibilities as independent and constitutive moral political agents, is a requirement for the legitimacy of liberal democracies. Hellsten (1997) suggested that in order to have a democracy that truly promotes the values of tolerance, equality, and
autonomy, it is necessary to move from an emphasis of material values to an emphasis of human dignity, or moral individualism. Moral individualism emphasizes that the development of individual morality is the acknowledgment of individuals' role in the improvement of social collective forces. Hellsten (1997) put forth the idea that modern welfare or liberal democracy can only maintain its legitimacy if it successfully promotes the development of truly morally autonomous individuals, who also are ready to use their moral judgment to improve not only their private lives but also their society as a whole.

Mulgan (1998) explored the paradox of the growth of individual freedom and the concurrent growing interdependence among human beings. In the same time that humans are attached to autonomy as a value, they see an increase in their need of association with others. In an excessively individualistic society, the only way to preserve human freedom and the institutions and agencies that guarantee individuals their security and continuance is by stimulating individuals' moral development. This means that individuals ought to be able to bear responsibilities, act in virtuous ways, and accept the consequences of their actions. It is the responsibility of the government, according to Mulgan (1998), to provide ways for their citizens to develop skills and habits such as discipline and flexibility, creativity and adaptability, and ability to understand universal sets of languages, cultures, and technologies. According to Mulgan (1998) this is the cost of individualistic societies: the government's responsibility in helping their citizens to become stronger, more responsible, more capable of making decisions, and more understanding of the world in which they live. Mulgan (1998) further defined these concepts by explaining that
more broadly, it means helping them to look after themselves, and to care for others, cultivating life skills and emotional intelligence rather than just the analytical intelligence. The moral dimension of it is the moral duty of considering the effects we have on others, and a need for moral fluency that goes beyond simply learning codes of right and wrong (p.11).

Mulgan (1998) also stated that individual's pursuit of self-interest contributes to the common good. The experience of individual freedom enables people to willingly join together in common activities, which in turn also will make them more able to exercise their freedom.

Handy (1997) stated that "true individuality is necessarily social .... We find ourselves through what we do and through the long struggle of living with and for others" (p.86). Proper selfishness is the knowledge that people are inevitably intertwined with others, and yet the acceptance that it is proper to be concerned with ourselves and with the search for who we really are, because that search should lead us to realize that self-respect, in the end, only comes from responsibility, responsibility for other people and other things. Proper selfishness is not escapism (p.86).

Proper selfishness, as Handy (1997) described, starts by reinterpreting self-interest, developing self-knowledge, and enhancing the best of oneself. In the current increasingly individualistic society, there is a call for people to make sound decisions alone that will impact other people’s lives. Supporting the emergence of this new individual, self-help literature has been generous in teaching self-control, self-love, self-assessment, and self-management among other topics. Consistent with present times, self-leadership emerges
self-leadership emerges as a phenomenon born in the field of business management to address organizational changes demanding self-oriented individuals. Self-leadership was first defined by Manz (1986) as the process of influencing oneself in order to establish self-direction and self-motivation necessary to perform. Further, self-leadership can be defined as a process of self-efficacy enhancement that improves decision-making skills, professional productivity, and personal effectiveness, positively impacting on the individual's self-perception and self-esteem. In an era of growing individualism and of need for skillful decision-makers, it appears that self-leadership is an important tool to be encouraged and developed.

As a theory, self-leadership has not been studied deeply yet. It is the purpose of this study to clarify some of the factors that may impact on self-leadership, and to suggest educational and training areas that target individuals' self-leadership development.

Background

As defined by Manz (1986), self-leadership draws from the theories of social learning, social cognition, motivation, and intrinsic motivation. From the social learning model, self-leadership draw its approach to human learning as a result of observation of role models, self-regulation and imagination. According to social learning theory, individuals learn through exposure to external evaluators, self-regulation, use of imagination, use of experiences of self and others for self-improvement, and the idea of symbolic processes as catalysts of learning (Bandura, 1971). Bandura (1971) argued that humans are neither driven by inner forces nor helplessly buffeted by environmental influences. Rather, people function in a continuous reciprocal interaction between
behavior and its controlling conditions. Some of these controlling conditions are, for example, expected and/or anticipated consequences, specific information on what is expected from the individual, modeling by others, opportunity for reproducing modeled processes and rehearsing, and positive reinforcement. One of the self-leadership strategies deals with anticipating events and rehearsing actions to address these events.

Later, Bandura (1986) expanded his studies of human learning to the social cognitive theory. Social cognitive theory contributed to self-leadership with its approach to the human ability to self-regulate, self-observe, reflect, and adapt in different circumstances (Bandura, 1986). Social cognitive theory was derived from social learning theory by Bandura (1986) expanding the studies about how individuals' behavior is affected by factors such as traits, needs, drives, impulses, instincts, genetics, and situations. Social cognitive theory explains human behavior in terms of a triadic interaction of behavioral, cognitive, and environmental factors.

Intrinsic motivation theory contributed to self-leadership by increasing the awareness of the important role played by self-concept, self-esteem, and complexity level on individuals' social and professional performance (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The main idea of intrinsic motivation, according to Deci and Ryan (1985), is that human motivation is based on innate psychological needs for self-determination, competence, and interpersonal relatedness. Intrinsic motivation is a consequence of the distinctive human ability of reflective self-consciousness, i.e., the ability to analyze our own experiences and our own thought processes to reach determined levels of self-determination, competence, and relatedness (Deci and Ryan, 1985).
Social learning theory, social cognitive theory, and intrinsic motivation theory are thus the tripod in which Manz (1986) based his self-leadership studies and strategies. Self-leadership is comprised by two basic sets of strategies designed to improve one's decision making skills, personal effectiveness, and professional productivity: behavior-focused strategies and cognitive-focused strategies. Behavior-focused strategies include self-observation, self-set goals, management of cues, rehearsal, self-reward, and self-punishment/criticism. Cognitive-focused strategies include building natural rewards into tasks, focusing thinking on natural rewards, and establishment of effective thought patterns (Manz and Sims, 1991). Figure 1.1 shows Manz (1986) self-leadership model. In that model Manz describes self-leadership as an interaction between the use of natural rewards, strategies to do undesirable tasks, and thought patterns, which combined with behavior will result in personal effectiveness.

As self-leadership emerges in a time of growing need for individual's effectiveness, one question arises on how self-leadership addresses the needs of an increasingly diverse workforce. The questioning is particularly appropriate in that it concerns to minorities facing discrimination to succeed in today's business environment. Looking specifically at gender, Harriman (1996) noticed that the male dominated corporate world values skills such as fast decision-making, self-confidence, self-reliance, and assertiveness. In such an environment, females come into the scene lacking those skills (Harriman, 1996). Instead, females are seen as contributing to the workplace with traits such as developing nurturing human relations (Helgesen, 1997), promoting open communication (Thorp and Thouend, 1997), and using a more democratic and participatory style (Eagly and Johnson, 1990). Yet, female values have not been
recognized as leadership values, nor reflected in equal salaries and positions (Harriman, 1996). Could self-leadership development be, then, the key for female’s empowerment in the workforce of the future?

The literature on women and leadership has explored the different upbringings that make women’s leadership style different than men’s style. Females’ upbringing within the family setting emphasizes care giving, emotionality, and passivity (Chodorow, 1974, 1978; Gerstel and Gross, 1989; Peplau and Campbell, 1989). During their school years, females are not encouraged to higher accomplishments as are males (Fox, 1989; Martin, 1998; Mickelson and Smith, 1998). Females’ socialization encourages proximity, collaborative problem solving, restricted exploration of the outside world, in the same time that it discourages active play (Gilligan, 1982; Lips, 1989; Walkerdine, 1998). Noble, Subotnik and Arnold (1996) suggested that only when forced to face difficult events in life or to take risks, if offered opportunities to participate in social initiatives, or yet if they have supportive families and special talents, do women develop leadership skills. Are these factors as well important in developing self-leadership skills?

Since the characteristics that females bring to the workplace do not emphasize individualism, competitiveness, self-reliance, and independent decision-making, it is not surprising that women still lag behind their male counterparts in terms of professional achievements. If self-leadership is the mastery of decision-making, professional and personal productivity, and self-esteem enhancement, it can be of benefit for females to develop self-leadership in order to increase their gender’s competitiveness in the new work environment. Also, it would be of interest to find if, actually, males and females differ in their self-leadership skills.
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Figure 1.1. Self Leadership Model by Manz (1986, p.114)
Anderson and Prussia (1997) developed the Self-Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), an instrument to assess self-leadership, in which the following dimensions of self-leadership were considered: behavioral-focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought pattern strategies. Anderson and Prussia (1997) used this questionnaire in three preliminary studies to refine it and assess its construct validity as a valid measurement of self-leadership behaviors, cognitions, and perceptions. The three studies supported the validity of Anderson and Prussia’s questionnaire (SLQ) as a measure of self-leadership.

**Purpose and Objectives of the Study**

None of the past studies on self-leadership has addressed the issue of gender and self-leadership. The self-leadership questionnaire was developed based on management literature (Manz, 1983; Manz, 1986; Latham & Frayne, 1989; Manz, 1990; and Manz and Sims, 1991). Since the management world is male dominated (Harriman, 1996) one question raises as to whether the self-leadership questionnaire effectively measures female self-leadership. To address this issue, one of the purposes of this study was to compare male and female scores in the SLQ and verify whether these scores are significantly different. Furthermore, the researcher wanted to identify variables that may impact self-leadership of males and females. Specifically, the researcher wanted to verify if factors such as stress, family satisfaction, social support, prior leadership opportunities, and internal locus of control impact self-leadership. To address these basic research objectives the researcher proposed to investigate a sample of Ohio Americorps members. Ohio Americorps members constitute a diverse population in terms of gender, race,
education, age, and marital status. Such characteristics served another purpose of this study, which was to verify the impact that demographic variables have on self-leadership scores. Specific research objectives were to:

1. Describe a sample of the Ohio Americorps members in terms of the following variables:
   a. demographic
   b. self-leadership
   c. stress level
   d. family satisfaction
   e. social support
   f. prior leadership experiences
   g. internal locus of control
2. Examine differences in self-leadership scores of males and females.
4. Determine if satisfaction with the family one grew up with impacts self-leadership.
5. Determine if social support during childhood impacts self-leadership.
6. Determine if having prior leadership experiences impact self-leadership.
7. Determine if internal locus of control is positively related to self-leadership.

Rationale for the study

Self-leadership is a field of study that has been investigated mainly under the managerial perspective. The current study aimed at further clarifying the self-leadership theory, at identifying what factors impact the most in its development, and at verifying if
there are gender differences in self-leadership scores as measured by Anderson and Prussia's SLQ. Furthermore, the understanding of the factors that promote self-leadership will allow the development of training and educational programs to improve individuals personal and professional efficacy and satisfaction.

The literature on self-leadership stated that individuals with high self-leadership tend to be more effective personally and professionally, and more able to make better decisions for their lives (Manz, 1986, 1990a, 1990b, 1991, 1992; Manz and Neck, 1991, 1992, 1999). The current study focused on specific factors thought to impact on self-leadership. By investigating the components of self-leadership, this study intended to contribute with the development of individuals’ personal and professional effectiveness.

**Definition of Terms**

**Self-Leadership**

Self-leadership is a process of personal improvement that aims at developing personal and professional effectiveness, through utilizing mental, cognitive and behavioral strategies (Manz, 1986). For the purposes of this study self-leadership was defined by the scores obtained on an instrument measuring ten dimensions of self-leadership: three constructive thought patterns strategies, six behavioral focused strategies, and one natural reward strategy. The Self-Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) developed by Anderson and Prussia (1997) was the instrument used to measure the dependent variable self-leadership.
Family Satisfaction

Family environment was defined in this study as family satisfaction, i.e., the degree to which subjects were satisfied with the family in which they grew up. Olson and Wilson (1982) described family satisfaction as the family's demonstrated adaptability to new situations and cohesion throughout long periods of life. For the purposes of this study family satisfaction was operationally defined as the scores obtained on the instrument Family Satisfaction developed by Olson and Wilson (1982). This questionnaire also measured two dimensions of family satisfaction: family cohesion and family adaptability. However, these sub-scales were not included in this study.

Social Support

Social support is an individual's access to others' help for personal adjustment and social behavior (Sarason, Sarason, Shearin, and Pierce, 1987). For the purposes of this study, social support was measured by the sum of values in a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (extremely satisfied) of the Social Support Questionnaire developed by Sarason et al. (1987). This instrument also measures the total number of people the individual counts on for social support, the social support one receives from family members, and the social support one receives from friends. However, these sub-scales were not included in this study.

Stress

Stress is the result of clusters of social events that require individuals to make significant changes and readjustments in their lives in order to cope with them (Holmes
and Rahe, 1967). Stress level can be measured through the assessment of stressful life events. For the purposes of this study stress was defined by the scores in the 43 items of the Social Readjustment Scale developed by Holmes and Rahe (1967). The Social Readjustment Scale is an instrument that measures the number of stressful events one had in life, weighting each one according to the amount of changes in an individual's usual life style resulting from these events. "Social readjustment measures the intensity and length of time necessary to accommodate to a life event, regardless of the desirability of the event" (Holmes and Rahe, 1967, p. 213). The items were assigned a magnitude based on the "psychological perception of the quality, quantity, magnitude, intensity of physical phenomena" (Holmes and Rahe, 1967, p. 217).

Locus of Control

Locus of control is the perception individuals have on who or what control their lives. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe that what one can achieve depends on one's own behavior and actions, and perceive life events as being controlled by their own actions and behaviors. Individuals with an external locus of control believes that what one can achieve depends on luck, chance or powerful others. They perceive life events as caused by external individuals or events beyond their control (Rotter, Chance, and Phares, 1972). "Locus of control concerns a person's expectancy for reinforcement" (Duttweiler, 1984, p. 210). For the purposes of this study, locus of control was defined as the scores obtained on the instrument Internal Control Index, developed by Duttweiler (1984). This instrument measures five dimensions of the
construct locus of control: cognitive processing, autonomy, resistance to influence attempts, delay of gratification, and self-confidence.

Prior leadership experiences

Prior leadership experiences were opportunities in which individuals had to exercise certain skills over time. For the purposes of this study prior leadership experiences were defined by the total number of items checked on a ten-item questionnaire.

Parenthood

Parenthood was defined in this study as respondents having or not having children. Parenthood was measured in this study by respondents answering yes or no to the question as to whether they have children.

Childhood residence

Respondents were asked where they lived during their childhood. The researcher named this variable childhood residency, which was operationally defined by respondents indicating if they lived their childhood in a rural area, small city, medium city, suburbs of a large city, or a large city.
Service status

Service status referred to the years of service respondents had with Ohio Americorps. Respondents indicated whether they were on their first or second year of service with Ohio Americorps.

Allowance

Allowance refers to whether or not respondents were receiving an Ohio Americorps allowance during the time of this study.

Service period

Service period referred to whether respondents were working full time (1700 hours/year), part-time (900 hours/year), part-time (450 hours/year), part-time (900 hours/2 years).

Limitations To This Study

Several limitations to this study were identified. The first limitation to this study was the length of the questionnaire. In order to measure the main five variables impacting self-leadership development according to the literature review, the questionnaire had a total of 170 questions distributed in 11 pages. The length of the questionnaire could have had an impact in the response rate of this study for taking too much time for respondents to answer it.

A second limitation to this study was the time constraint in which data was collected. Data for this study were collected during the month of July 1999. Because
about half of the accessible population for this study would finish their terms with Ohio Americorps in August and September, respondents were given less time to return the questionnaire than the recommended 15 days. The short deadline may have affected the accuracy of the responses because respondents would not be able to think enough about the questions. The short deadline may also have contributed to the low response rate by making some respondents give up completing the questionnaire in such a short time.

A third limitation to this study was the personal approach of some of the questions, particularly concerning the Social Readjustment Rating Scales (Holmes and Rahe, 1967). Due to the intimate and personal character of the questions, some subjects may have given socially desirable responses.

A fourth limitation to this study was gender bias. One of the objectives of this study was to identify gender differences as related with self-leadership scores. McIntosh (1998) and Frye (1998) acknowledged the unconscious centrality of male's perspectives and parameters present in curriculums, institutions and questionings. There is a concern that maybe non gender sensitive questionnaires are not accounting for gender differences when measuring whatever they are measuring. The questionnaires used in this study were developed by males with the exception of the Internal Control Index. Therefore, the researcher acknowledged that the questionnaires measuring self-leadership, stress, family support, and social support and social support satisfaction may not have measured female scores adequately. A fifth limitation to this study was the fact that the questionnaires yielded self-reported data, i.e., responses were based on the perception each subject had about oneself, in circumstances non-controlled by the researcher.
A sixth limitation to this study was related to the need to adapt some of the instruments used in the research. With the permission of the authors and/or the owners of the copyrights, the following instruments were adapted to ask respondents to refer to situations in their past, as opposed to current situations: Family Satisfaction (Olson and Wilson, 1982), Social Support (Sarason et al., 1987), and Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Holmes and Rahe, 1967). The limited permission to adapt the questionnaire did not allow the researcher to change all the statements to the past tense, which may have interfered with respondents' understanding the questions.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, the theoretical basis for this study is developed. Beyond the theories suggested by Manz (1986) as forming self-leadership, this chapter reviews the evolution of all the leadership theories, and suggests that social learning theory, social cognitive theory, cognitive therapy, motivation theory, intrinsic motivation theory, self-motivation theory, self-control studies, and self-monitoring studies are also part of the formation of self-leadership. The review of literature also addresses the variables hypothesized as having an impact on self-leadership development. These variables are stress, family satisfaction, social support, prior leadership experiences, and internal locus of control.

The Evolution of Leadership Theories

Throughout the history of human kind, one of the most salient aspects is the struggle to overcome a basically hostile environment, to control and dominate other human beings (enemies or partners), and to guarantee the continuity of the human race (Simon, 1995). So far, humans have accomplished this goal by focusing efforts on pursuing difficult tasks, appropriating and explaining the unknown, and facing challenges
and immense difficulties. Simon (1995) pointed out the crucial need of the human race for important challenges. As a species, humans have grown to believe that living means facing challenges to the point that we do not know how to live without difficult tasks ahead (Simon, 1995). The need for challenges and the pursuit of difficulties gave birth to the figure of the leader, the most skilled individual who, among all the others, is able to guide our hordes, organize our efforts, and show us the way to succeed in our endeavors (Bennis, 1989). As humans, we learned to count on our leaders to survive.

The Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (1995) defined leader as the guide, the conductor, the person who has commanding authority or influence. Stogdill (1974) stated that the concept of leadership as opposed to headship (power based on inheritance, usurpation and appointment) occurred in countries with Anglo-Saxon heritage. According to Bass (1981), the word leader first appeared in the English language in the 1300s, but leadership just appeared in the second half of the nineteenth century in writings about political influence and control in the British Parliament. In Old English, the verb to lead means "to guide or to show the way" (Rost, 1991, p. 38). The concept of leadership has been derived from the concept of leader, therefore leadership has been taken as the ability to manage (Rost, 1991). Although the quest for understanding leadership has always been of interest for researchers and scholars, it was not until the first quarter of the 20th century that leadership became the subject of academic investigation (Kreitner, 1989). Until the 1940s, leadership was mainly defined as the use of power and control.

The evolution of leadership thought can be traced back to the last century. Different theories of leadership overlap and mix to a certain extent, therefore one can
only define when one theory of leadership started to gain strength. It is not possible however to say when one school of thought ended, since they change, adapt and are revived in later years by other authors under different approaches.

The Great Man Theory

In the latter part of the 19th century, in 1869, Galton tried to explain leadership as certain hereditary characteristics possessed by some special individuals. This theory advocated that leadership was an inborn characteristic, which could only be transmitted genetically. The great man theory was reinforced by the study of leaders such as Napoleon, Alexander, and Caesar, and later Mussolini and Hitler.

Trait Theory

The great man theory evolved into the trait theory of leadership that dominated the beginning of the 20th century. According to this theory, leadership is a result of certain traits that some individuals have, whether gained through inheritance or development. Traits such as intelligence, alertness, insight, responsibility, initiative, persistence, self-confidence, and sociability were cited by authors such as Woods (1913), Bernard (1926) and Bird (1940), and more recently Bennis (1989) and Kirkpatrick & Locke (1991). Women were seldom cited as leaders within trait theory. Betty Friedan was the only woman cited by Bennis (1989) as having leadership traits along with males such as Ralph Nader and Freud.

In 1948, Stogdill analyzed 124 trait studies conducted between 1904 and 1947 and synthesized the average traits of individuals in leadership positions. These traits
included, again, intelligence, alertness, insight, responsibility, initiative, persistence, self-confidence, and sociability. In a second study in 1974, Stogdill further defined leadership traits as (a) drive for responsibility, (b) vigor and persistence in the pursuit of goals, (c) venturesomeness and originality in problem solving, (d) drive to exercise initiative in social situations, (e) self-confidence and sense of personal identity, (f) willingness to accept consequences of decisions and actions, (g) readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, (h) willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, (i) ability to influence other persons' behavior, and (j) capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand.

Mann (1959) conducted similar studies and suggested that certain traits would distinguish leaders from non-leaders. His results identified leaders as strong in the traits of intelligence, masculinity, adjustment, dominance, extroversion and conservatism.

Lord et al. (1986) reassessed Mann's findings using meta-analysis and suggested that traits such as intelligence, masculinity, and dominance were significantly related to how individuals perceived leaders. In 1989, Bennis identified four competencies of successful leaders based on a study with 90 successful managers. The four common traits were: (1) management of attention - a combination of vision and personal commitment that attract and inspire others; (2) management of meaning - exceptional communication skills to align others with their cause; (3) management of trust - clear focus and central purpose to build trust in others; and (4) management of self - ability to learn from mistakes and nurture own strengths, rejecting the idea of failure but accepting mistakes as learning opportunities (Bennis, 1989).

As late as 1991, Kirkpatrick and Locke contented that unequivocally, leaders were not like other people. They postulated that leaders differ from non-leaders in six
traits: (a) drive, (b) the desire to lead, (c) honesty and integrity, (d) self-confidence, (e) cognitive ability, and (f) knowledge of the business. According to Kirkpatrick and Locke, leaders can be born with these traits and/or can learn them.

The trait approach to leadership has four main strengths. The first strength is that it fits into the popular image of a leader as a gifted and stronger person, different from the common people. The leader always knows the way to go about decisions, dangers, and challenges. The second strength is that the trait theory was used longer than any other body of theory to explain leadership. Furthermore, the importance that individual characteristics play in leadership has not been completely eliminated by later research. The third strength is that by focusing on studying and defining the leader, the trait theory promotes an understanding of how leaders' personalities are related to the leadership process. A fourth strength is that trait theory provides aspirants to leadership with a set of characteristics to develop in order to improve their overall leadership effectiveness (Northouse, 1997).

Trait theory also has weaknesses. The first weakness is its inability to determine a specific and definitive list of leaders' traits. The second is its failure to take situations into account, since context affects emergent traits within individuals. A third weakness is related with the first two. Because of its failure in taking the context into account, leadership traits have been subjectively identified by authors, based in their own personal experiences. Another weakness is that trait theory failed to address the effect that leadership traits have on group members and on their work. A final criticism is that trait theory is not useful for training and development. One cannot teach people to increase their IQs, as well as introverted people cannot be taught to be extroverted. Traits are
relatively fixed psychological structures and this limits the value of teaching and training leadership (Northouse, 1997).

Behavioral Theories

Because trait theory could not explain leadership in its totality, during and after World War II researchers began to investigate how leaders behave rather than focusing on their characteristics. This current of thought was named "Behavioral Theories of Leadership" (Rost, 1993) or "Style Approach" (Northouse, 1997). This approach focused on what leaders do, or how they act, instead of on personal characteristics of leaders. The first studies were conducted at The Ohio State University (OSU) in the 1940s where Stogdill (1947), and later Hemphill (1954) and Stogdill & Coons (1957) researched performance of leaders as assessed by employees. They defined two independent behaviors that characterize leaders' behavior: initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure is a person's ability and efforts in organizing work, giving structure to work context, defining role responsibilities, and scheduling work activities. Consideration is the person's ability to bring a group together around the same goal through trust, friendship, respect, and warmth. OSU researchers then developed a matrix in which these two dimensions were plotted identifying four leadership styles: low structure and low consideration; low structure and high consideration; high structure and low consideration; and high structure and high consideration, with the latter combination being considered the most desirable leadership style (Kreitner, 1989; Northouse, 1997).

At the same time, researchers at the University of Michigan were exploring leadership behavior looking at the impact of leaders' behavior on the performance of
small groups. The results suggested that there were two types of leader behavior: employee orientation and production orientation. Employee orientation was defined as the leader's strong human relations emphasis. Production orientation was identified as a behavior that stressed technical and production aspects of the job. Michigan researchers placed those two behaviors on opposite sides of a continuum in such a way that leaders with high employee orientation would be less production oriented. Later on, Michigan researchers re-conceptualized those two behaviors as different and independent, reaching the same results as the OSU researchers (Northouse, 1997).

In 1964, Blake and Mouton plotted the two factors above in a leadership grid, naming them concern for production and concern for people. Concern for production is concern for achieving organizational tasks. Concern for people refers to how a leader attends to the people within the organization, building commitment and trust. Similar to OSU researchers, Blake and Mouton defined seven major behaviors of leaders. The first behavior is authority-compliance, where the leader places heavy emphasis on tasks and job requirements and less on people. The second behavior is country-club management, where the leader has low concern for task accomplishment and high concern for interpersonal relationships. The third behavior described by Blake and Mouton (1964) is impoverished management, where the leader is neither concerned with tasks nor with interpersonal relationships. The fourth behavior is the middle-of-the-road-management, where leaders compromise to reach balance, and prefer the middle ground between the tasks and the people who do the task. The fifth behavior is team-management, where leaders place strong emphasis on both tasks and interpersonal relationships, promoting a high degree of participation and teamwork in the organization. The sixth behavior is
paternalism/maternalism, where leaders are like benevolent dictators, doing anything in order for the task to be accomplished. Finally the seventh behavior described by Blake and Mouton (1964) is opportunism, where leaders use any combination of the styles for the purpose of personal advancement. Still exploring this idea, Blake and Mouton (1964) plotted concern for production and concern for people in a leadership grid, indicating that each leader has a dominant style (used in normal circumstances) and a recessive style (used under pressure).

Rost (1993) identified three main behaviors of leaders as authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire. In the authoritarian style, the leader retains all the authority and responsibility, assigning people clearly defined tasks. Communication in the authoritarian style follows a top-down fashion. In the democratic style, the leader delegates authority but retains responsibility using participatory decision-making. In this style, communication proceeds both upward and downward. In the laissez-faire style, the leader gives responsibility and authority to the group, whose members are supposed to do their best to accomplish their tasks. Communication proceeds in a horizontal flow (Rost, 1993).

The first main strength of behavioral theories of leadership is that they marked a shift in the focus from traits to actions. A second strength is that behavioral theories were validated by many additional leadership studies. A third strength is that the emphasis on tasks and relationships brings about the very core of the leadership process: the common goal of leaders and followers is the relationship that will emerge out of their interaction. A fourth strength is that behavioral theories of leadership allow leaders to assess their
actions, determining how they may wish to change, and improve their leadership style (Northouse, 1997).

The first criticism to behavioral theories is that they do not demonstrate how leaders' styles are associated with performance outcomes. A second criticism is that this approach failed in finding universal behaviors of leaders that could be associated with effective leadership. According to Northouse (1997), a final criticism is that behavioral theories failed in identifying one single, mostly preferred, style of effective leaders.

Situational Theories

In 1948, Stogdill suggested that some behaviors and characteristics of leaders could be enhanced in different conditions. An individual with certain characteristics would be a leader in one situation but would be a follower in another situation. It is the beginning of the tenant to explain leadership as situational rather than a result of traits and/or behaviors. The major assumption of situational theories of leadership was that circumstantial structures lead individuals with momentarily desirable traits to assume responsibility or take action with and within groups, for specific decisions or activities. Stogdill's studies also demonstrated that many of these skills would emerge in certain situations due to the relationships between members of a group.

By the end of the 1960s, this new approach to leadership suggested that leaders can emerge anywhere, whenever a given situation matches the individuals' best skills. Those were called situational theories of leadership (Rost, 1993). These theories basically rejected the notion of specific traits or behaviors to justify the emergence of leadership. Instead, situational theories relied on circumstantial structures that lead
individuals with momentarily desirable traits to assume responsibility or to take action with and within groups, for specific decisions or activities (Kreitner, 1989).

Hersey and Blanchard (1969) suggested that there are two major components in leadership: the leadership style of the leaders and the development level of subordinates. Regarding leadership styles, Hersey and Blanchard (1969) developed a grid with two main behaviors they identified as task orientation and relationship orientation. The combination of these two basic styles gave origin to the classification of leaders in task oriented leaders, and in relationship oriented leaders. Task oriented leaders assist group members in goal accomplishment. Relationship oriented leaders help group members to feel comfortable about themselves, their co-workers, and the situation. Leadership styles can be further classified into four distinctive categories: (1) high directive-low supportive style, or directing style; (2) coaching or high directive-high supportive; (3) supporting or high supportive-low directive style; and (4) low supportive-low directive style, or delegating style.

The second component of situational leadership according to the model of Hersey and Blanchard (1969) was the development level of the subordinates. Development level refers to the degree to which subordinates have the competence and commitment necessary to accomplish a given task and whether a person has developed a positive attitude regarding the task. Employees can be classified into four categories that combine low and high competence and commitment: (a) low in competence and high in commitment, (b) some competence but low commitment, (c) moderate to high competence but lack commitment, and (d) high in competence and high commitment (Northouse, 1997). Hersey and Blanchard's 1969 model stated that in order to be
effective, leaders have to diagnose employees development level and adapt their leadership style to match the development level of their employees.

The situational approach of leadership has several strengths. The first strength is that it has been approved and is used in many corporations as a credible model for training individuals to become effective leaders. The second strength is its practicality; it is easy to understand, it is intuitive, and it is easily applied to a variety of settings. The third strength is its prescriptive value, i.e., tells us what we should and should not do in various contexts. For example, if employees are low in confidence, situational leadership prescribes a directing style for the leader. These guidelines can facilitate and enhance leadership. A final strength is that it emphasizes the concept of leader flexibility (Northouse, 1997).

The first weakness of this model is that there were not many studies conducted to support its assumptions and propositions. A second criticism is the ambiguous conceptualization of subordinate development levels and commitment conceptualization. Earliest versions of Hersey and Blanchard's (1969) model defined the four levels of commitment as unwilling and able, willing and unable, unwilling and unable, and willing and able.

A fourth criticism is related to the prescription of leader's style to match with subordinate development level (Northouse, 1997). Research conducted by Vecchio (1987) did not support some of the indications of leader behavior to adapt to employees' level of commitment and development.

A fifth criticism of situational theories is that it does not address the issue of one-to-one versus group leadership. For example, it is questioned whether leaders should
match their style with the overall development level of a group or with the development level of individual members of the group (Northouse, 1997). Carew, Parisi-Carew and Blanchard (1990) suggested that groups go through development levels similar to individuals, and therefore, leaders should try to match their style to the overall group development level. However, a question still persists as to whether this decision will impact on individuals within the group whose development level is different. Researchers of situational theories of leadership did not address this question (Northouse, 1997).

**Humanistic Theories**

The major assumption of humanistic theories was that organizations are structured for people and by people, therefore they must aim at the fulfillment of humans in the same time that they fulfill organizational goals. Likert (1961, 1967) theorized that leadership is a relative process that has to take into account expectations, values, and skills of followers. Gergen (1969) explored the mutually rewarding nature of leadership in which leaders and followers needed to engage in a relationship of mutual gain and growth. Jacobs (1971) reinforced the idea that leadership implies an equitable exchange relationship between leaders and followers. The main emphasis of humanistic theories of leadership was on the relationship between leaders and followers within the workplace. Therefore, several schools of thought on leadership can be grouped under the umbrella of humanistic theories such as: (a) contingency theory, (b) path-goal theory, (c) leader-member exchange theory, and (d) team leadership (Northouse, 1997).
Contingency theory

Contingency theory is a leader-match theory, i.e., it tries to match leaders to appropriate situations. It is called contingency because it suggests that a leader's effectiveness depends on how well the leader's style fits the context. Effective leadership is contingent on matching a leader's style to the right setting (Northouse, 1997).

Fiedler (1967) and Fiedler and Chemers (1984) developed the contingency theory by studying styles and examining the effectiveness of many different leaders who worked in different contexts. Fiedler and Chemers (1984) studies lead to generalizations about which styles of leadership were best and which were worst for a given organizational context.

Fiedler (1967) described two different contingency leadership styles: concerned with reaching a goal, and concerned with developing close interpersonal relations. The situations could be described according to the following three factors: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. Leader-member relations refer to group atmosphere and degree of confidence, loyalty, and attraction that followers feel for their leaders. This factor can be positive or negative. To measure leadership style Fiedler and Chemmers (1984) developed the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) Scale. Leaders who score high on this scale are relationship-motivated whereas leaders who score low are task-motivated.

Task structure refers to the degree to which the requirements of a task are clear and spelled out. More structured tasks give the leader more control whereas, less structured tasks lessen the leader's control. A task is considered to be structured when (a) its requirements are clearly stated and known by the performers, (b) the path to
accomplishing the task has few alternatives, (c) the completion of the task can be clearly demonstrated, and (d) there is a limited number of correct solutions to the task completion (Fiedler and Chemers, 1984).

Position power, the third characteristic of a situation, refers to the amount of authority a leader has to reward or to punish followers. Position power can be strong or weak. Together, these three characteristics determine the favorableness of a situation. Most favorable situations are those having good leader-follower relations, defined tasks, and strong leader position power. Least favorable situations have poor leader-follower relations, unstructured tasks, and weak leader position power (Fiedler and Chemers, 1984).

Contingency theory espouses each leadership style will only be effective in certain situations. Individuals who are task-motivated will be effective in both favorable and unfavorable situations. Relationship-motivated individuals will be effective in moderately favorable situations in which there is some degree of certainty, but things are neither completely under their control nor out of their control (Northouse, 1997).

Contingency theory stresses that leaders will not be effective in all situations. If one’s style is a good match for the situation in which one works, one will be good at the job. If one’s style does not match the situation, one will most likely fail (Northouse, 1997).

The first strength of contingency theory is that it has been supported by empirical research. Secondly, it has broadened the understanding of leadership by forcing one to consider the impact of situations on leaders. Third, it is predictive therefore providing useful information regarding the type of leadership that will most likely be effective in
certain contexts. Fourth it does not require people to be effective in all situations. When a leader is not a good match for a specific situation, it is recommended that the work variables change or that the leader move to another context. Fifth, contingency theory provides data on leaders' styles that can be useful to organizations in developing leadership profiles (Northouse, 1997).

Contingency theory's first weakness is that it does not explain why some leadership styles are more effective in certain situations than in others. A second criticism relates to the LPC scale. The LPC scale does not correlate well with other standard leadership measures; it involves the respondent projecting his/her own style in analyzing others' styles; and the instructions are not clear. A third criticism is that contingency theory's measurement can break up the normal flow of the organizational communication and operations since it requires completion of three different assessments. A final criticism is that it fails to explain adequately what organizations should do when there is a mismatch between the leader and the situation. Contingency theory is a personality theory and does not advocate teaching leaders how to adapt their styles to various different situations; on the contrary, situations have to be changed to be adapted to the leader's style. Even though situations can be changed, Fiedler and Chemers (1984) did not explain how one engages in situational engineering (Northouse, 1997).

Path-goal theory

Path-goal theory is about how leaders motivate subordinates to accomplish designated goals. Its goal is to enhance employee performance and employee satisfaction.
by focusing on employee motivation. Path-goal theory suggests that a leader must adapt to the development level of subordinates. Unlike contingency theory, which emphasizes the match between leaders' styles and specific situational variables, path-goal theory emphasizes the relationship between the leader's style and the characteristics of the subordinates and the work setting. In path-goal theory, leaders need to select specific behaviors and styles that are best suited for subordinates to increase their expectation of success (Northouse, 1997).

Path-goal theory's underlying assumption is derived from expectancy theory. Path-goal theory suggests that subordinates will be motivated if they think they are able to perform their work, if they believe that their efforts will result in a certain outcome, and if they believe that the payoffs for doing their work are worthwhile (Northouse, 1997). For the leader, the challenge is to use a leadership style that best meets subordinates' motivational needs. This is done by choosing behaviors that supplement or complement what is missing in the work setting. Leadership generates motivation when it increases the number and kinds of payoffs that subordinates receive from their work, when it makes the path to goal clear and easy, when it removes obstacles, and when it makes the work more satisfying (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Leaders' behaviors can be directive (similar to the initiating structures of the OSU studies), supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented. Subordinate characteristics can be need for affiliation, preferences for structure, desire for control, and self-perceived level of task ability. Task characteristics can be a design of the subordinate's task, formal authority system of the organization, and the primary work group of subordinates (House & Mitchell, 1974).
Leadership styles interact with the subordinate style and with the task characteristics. For example, leaders should use a supportive style whenever the task is unstructured, and use the participative style when the task is ambiguous. Path-goal theory is pragmatic and states that an effective leader has to attend to the needs of subordinates (House & Mitchell, 1974).

A first strength of the path-goal theory is that it provides a good theoretical framework for understanding how various leadership behaviors affect the satisfaction and goal-directed activities of subordinates in differing work contexts. Secondly, it is unique in its attempt to integrate the motivation principles of expectancy into a leadership theory. Third, it provides a practical model of how leaders can help subordinates (Northouse, 1997).

A criticism to path-goal theory is that it is too complex and its interpretation can be confusing. Secondly, it only received partial support from empirical research. Third, it fails to explain adequately the relationship between leader behavior and employee motivation. Fourth, it promotes worker dependence on the leader, since it is the leader who is responsible for affecting the worker. Fifth, it fails in recognizing the full abilities of subordinates (Northouse, 1997).

Leader-member exchange theory

Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) conceptualizes leadership as a process that is centered on the interactions between leaders and followers. LMX was first described 25 years ago by Dansereau, Graen and Haga (1975), Graen and Cashman (1975), and Graen (1976). Before LMX leadership, theories treated leadership as
something leaders do toward all their followers as a group. In LMX, the leaders' attention is directed toward the differences that might exist between the leader and each follower (Northouse, 1997).

Early studies of LMX were called vertical dyad linkage theory (VDL) and focused on vertical relationships between leaders and followers. These relationships could be the in-group or the out-group type. In-group relationships are those in which role responsibilities are expandable and negotiable, can get closer, and incorporate more information and confidence. Out-group relationships are based only on formal employment contract, and are more distant and less compatible with the leader. Early LMX studies focused on the differences between in-groups and out-groups leader-followers relationship (Northouse, 1997).

Later, LMX theories focused on how leader-followers relationships are related with organizational effectiveness, specifically on how the quality of leader-member exchanges was related with positive outcomes for leaders, followers, groups, and the organization in general (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). High quality leader-member exchange is related with less employee turnover, more positive performance evaluation, higher frequency of promotions, greater organizational commitment, more desirable work assignments, better job attitudes, more attention and support from the leader, greater participation, and faster career progress over 25 years (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).

The findings of later studies were the impetus for the most current research on LMX theory, which focuses on how exchanges between leaders and followers can be used for leadership making (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). Leadership making is a prescriptive approach to leadership that emphasizes that a leader should develop high-
quality exchanges with all subordinates rather than just a few. The leader attempts to make every subordinate feel part of the in-group, avoiding inequities and negative implications of being out-group. The theory also suggests that leaders can create networks of partnerships throughout the organization, which will benefit the organization's goals as well as their career progress (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).

LMX theory works by describing and prescribing leadership. The central point is the dyadic relationships between the leader and each subordinate. Working with in-group allows more effectiveness and accomplishment (more connection, satisfaction, confidence, trust, and communication). Leaders should offer subordinates opportunities to take on new roles and responsibilities, nurture high-quality exchanges, look for ways to build trust and respect, and look for creating quality partnerships throughout the organization (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).

A first strength of LMX is that it is very detailed in describing relationships in the workplace. Second, it is unique in making dyadic relationships the centerpiece of the leadership process. Third, LMX notes the importance of communication in leadership as the vehicle through which leaders and subordinates create, nurture, and sustain useful exchanges. Fourth, it is substantiated by a large body of research (Northouse, 1997).

The first weakness of LMX is that on the surface it runs counter to the basic human values of fairness. Apparently, LMX supports discrimination of groups in the workplace. Second, its basic ideas are not fully developed, e.g., it fails to explain how high-quality relationships between leaders and followers are created. Third, LMX questions the measurement of leader-member exchange (Northouse, 1997).
Team leadership theory

Team leadership theory started with the first research on groups in the 1940s and 1950s focusing on developing social sciences theory. Current research focuses on more practical information. The interest in team leadership is due to changing workplace conditions in which teamwork is emphasized, and success and failure of teams have deep impact in the organizations. With the emphasis on teamwork, there is an increase in the need for understanding how teams work and how they can work better (Northouse, 1997).

In 1960, McGrath formulated the critical leadership functions necessary for group effectiveness, which would cross two dimensions of behavior: (1) monitoring versus taking action, and (2) focusing on internal group issues versus external group issues. These resulted in four types of group leadership functions: (a) diagnosing group deficiencies (monitoring/internal); (b) taking remedial action to correct deficiencies (executive action/internal); (c) forecasting impending environmental changes (monitoring/external); and (d) taking preventive action in response to environmental changes (executive action/external) (Hackman and Walton, 1986).

The functional perspective of group leadership aims at ensuring that productivity meets standards, maintaining the group, and contributing to individual growth (Hackman, 1990). Hackman's theory tried to assess the functions that a group leader has to perform to help a group being more effective.

Fisher (1985) stated that a good group leader is the medium through which information is processed and connected to match the particularities of each situation. The major role of leadership in groups is to mediate among the environment of the group, the
group's actions, and performance outcomes. Leadership occurs when actions are taken to adjust the group to overcome various obstacles in the environment, interpersonal relationships, or group procedures (Drecksel, 1991). Therefore leadership is not a role, but an ongoing process in which all the members of the group engage and collectively help to adapt to changing conditions. Thus, good leaders are those who are good receivers of information and know how to decode it effectively (Barge, 1989, 1994).

A good leader in team leadership is the one who optimizes the work of a team. Team effectiveness means (a) clear and engaging direction, (b) enabling performance situation (results driven structure, competent team members, unified commitment, collaborative climate, standards of excellence, external support and recognition, principled leadership, expert coaching), and (c) adequate material resources (Hackman and Walton, 1986).

Hughes, Ginnett & Curphey (1993) suggested a model of leadership and group effectiveness that integrates the critical functions of team leadership, the complexity involved in the process, and the focus on group effectiveness. This model is based on the claim that the leader's function is to determine the group's needs, to take care of these needs, and to ensure team effectiveness. This model has inputs (individuals, group and organizational), throughputs (processes), and outputs (accomplishments, results).

The first strength of the team leadership approach is that it answers many questions of early small group research by focusing on real-life organization work groups. A second strength is that it provides a cognitive guide for leaders to design and maintain effective groups. A third strength is that it takes into account the changing role of leaders and followers in organizations. Team leadership does not focus on position.
power but rather on the critical functions of leadership as diagnosis and actions taking. A fourth strength is that it helps in selecting team leaders who need to be perceptive, open, objective, analytical, a good listener, and have good diagnostic skills. A fifth strength is that it is heuristic, i.e., team leadership theory suggests ideas for future research and study (Northouse, 1997).

The first criticism to this model is that it is not completely supported or tested. Second, it is complicated to understand. Third, it does not offer on-the-spot answers to specific situations for the team leader. Finally, the directions that the team leadership theory offers are vague, complex and somewhat overwhelming (Northouse, 1997).

**Interaction-Expectation Theory**

Interaction-expectation theory emphasized the role of the interaction between leaders and followers for effective leadership to take place (Northouse, 1997). Interaction-expectation theory started with Hemphill (1954), who defined leader-follower common dependency and with Stogdill (1959), who emphasized leadership as the relationship between leaders and followers in which both sides will act upon mutually confirmed expectations. Bass (1960) addressed the role of members effort to effect change through reinforcing the attitude of other members of the group. In 1971, Yukl developed his two-stage model of leadership. In the first stage of this model, the leader's initiation increases subordinate skills and motivation; in the second stage, with his/her motivation heightened, the subordinate will have an increase in his/her effectiveness and skills.
The emphasis on relationships between leaders and followers, and the attention to the role model that leaders play with followers are the two main strengths of the interaction-expectation approach. The major weaknesses of this theory are that (a) it is not supported by extensive studies, (b) it fails in considering situational constraints, and (c) it fails in considering training and education of new leaders (Northouse, 1997).

**Psychoanalytic Theory**

Although the psychological approach to the study of human behavior started with Freud in 1922, leadership theories that used the psychoanalytic approach gained strength in the 1970s, with Levinson (1970), and Wolman (1971). They described the relationship between leaders and followers as a projection of the relationship with the father figure, a source of love and fear.

The first major strength of psychoanalytic theory is that it considers individual psychological aspects as influencing the leadership interaction. A second strength is that it considers the interaction that happens between leaders and followers’ personality. The third strength is that the psychoanalytic theory considers environmental conditions that can enhance certain individual characteristics.

The first major weakness of this approach is that it fails to consider how groups work within dominant psychological frameworks. The second weakness is that it fails to consider purposeful control of traits and characteristics for goals accomplishment. A third weakness of the psychoanalytic theory of leadership is that it is not supported by further research (Northouse, 1997).
Perceptual & Cognitive Theories

As with other leadership theories of the 1970s, the perceptual-cognitive approach was dedicated to analyzing leadership relations in organizational settings. Its major assumption is that leadership occurs in the perception of the followers, who are biased according to their own individual social relations (Northouse, 1997). In 1973, Vroom and Yetton designed the rational-deductive model, by which leadership can be directive or participative, depending on the perception that the leader has of his/her followers. Leaders can be directive when they are sure about their ability to solve a problem but they can be participative when they think that subordinates have skills to contribute to the decision making process.

A first strength of the perceptual-cognitive theory is that it considers relationships between leaders and followers as a pre-condition for leadership. A second strength is that it considers the role of the larger surrounding environment. A last strength is that the perceptual-cognitive theory considers leadership as a chain of interactions, inputs and outcomes (Northouse, 1997).

The perceptual-cognitive theory has four major weaknesses. The first is that it does not consider individual aspects in the leadership equation. The second weakness is that it does not consider the role of the inter-relationship between leaders and followers' styles. A third weakness of the perceptual-cognitive theory of leadership is that it does not consider appropriateness of leadership styles, followers and tasks. Finally, another weakness of this theory is that it has not been supported by further research (Northouse, 1997).
Transformational Theories

Beginning on the 1980s, a concern with individuals' well being started to rise above the managerial role of leadership, emphasizing values, ethics, and long-term goals that would provide individuals' self-fulfillment, and treat them as full human beings. It is a process that subsumes charismatic and visionary leadership, aimed at reaching the individual or the whole organization (Northouse, 1997).

Transformational leadership emerged with the work of Burns (1978) who attempted to link the roles of leadership and followership, stating that leadership is inseparable from followers' needs. Burns (1978) distinguished two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. Transactional describes exchanges of promises and promotions between leaders and their followers. Transformational refers to the process by which an individual engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. Mahatma Gandhi was considered a transformational leader (Burns, 1978).

Transformational leadership emerged also with the work of House (1971), who published the theory of charismatic leadership. Charisma was described as a special personality characteristic that few individuals have that gives them extraordinary power over others, and therefore the capacity to do extraordinary things and to be treated as leaders. House (1971) suggested that charismatic leaders act in unique ways that effect their followers. They are dominant, have a strong desire to influence others, are self-confident, and have a strong sense of one's own moral values. In addition, they are strong role models for the beliefs and values they want their followers to adopt, they appear competent to their followers, articulate ideological goals that have moral overtones, and
communicate high expectations for followers. Charismatic leaders also arise task-relevant motives in followers that may include affiliation, power or esteem.

According to House (1976), the effect of charismatic leaders on followers includes follower's trusting in the leader, similarity between followers' and leaders' beliefs, unquestioned acceptance of the leader, and the expression of warmth toward the leader. Other effects of charismatic leaders on followers include follower obedience, identification with the leader, emotional involvement with the leader's goals, heightened goals for followers, and follower's confidence in goal achievement. House (1976) contended that these charismatic effects are more likely to occur in contexts in which followers feel distress, because in stressful situations followers look to leaders to deliver them from difficulties.

In 1981, Bass extended Burns (1978) and House's (1976) work by giving more attention to the followers' rather than the leaders' needs. Bass argued that transformational leadership is part of a continuum with transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership. Bass (1981) also stated that transformational leadership motivates followers to do more than the expected by (a) raising followers level of consciousness about the importance of goals, (b) getting followers to transcend their own interest for the sake of the team/organization, and (c) moving followers to address high level needs. This model defined seven different factors incorporated from transformational and transactional leadership (Bass, 1981).

The factors composing transformational leadership are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. The factors that compose transactional leadership factors are contingent reward and
management by exception. The factor that composes the non-leadership factor is laissez-
faire, or the absence of leadership, or the abdication of responsibility by the leader
(Northouse, 1997).

Two other lines of research by Bennis and Nanus (1985), and Tichy and DeVanna
(1986, 1990) impacted the studies of transformational leadership. Bennis and Nanus
(1985) identified, through several studies, four common strategies utilized by leaders in
transforming organizations. The first strategy is the clear vision that leaders have about
the future sought for the organization. The second strategy is when leaders become
social architects for the organization, creating its shape, direction, and mobilizing
workers. A third strategy identified by Bennis and Nanus (1985) is when leaders create
trust by making their positions clear and standing by them. Finally a fourth strategy is
when leaders use creative deployment of self through positive self-regard, i.e., when
leaders use their strengths in working for the organization's goals.

Tichy and DeVanna (1986) were interested in how leaders carry out the change
process brought by rapid technological, social, and cultural changes. They found that
leaders manage change in a three-act process by recognizing the need for change,
creating a vision, and institutionalizing changes through breaking down old structures and
establishing new ones.

Transformational theory explains leadership as a process in which leaders initiate,
develop and carry out significant changes in organizations. Transformational leaders
empower followers (nurture) and raise their consciousness, become strong role models
for followers, create a vision, initiate and implement changes, and become social
architects, i.e., clarify new norms for the organization (Bennis and Nannus, 1985).
The main strength of this model is that it has been widely researched. Second, it has intuitive appeal. Third, the transformational model of leadership incorporates and makes both leaders and followers responsible for the leadership process. Fourth, it provides an expanded picture of leadership that includes the exchange of rewards and attention to followers' needs. Fifth, this model places a strong emphasis on followers' needs, values, and morals (Northouse, 1997).

The first criticism of this model is that it lacks conceptual clarity due to the large amount of concepts not thoroughly explained. Second, it is often interpreted simplistically in terms of either-or rather than a continuum. Third, it treats leadership as a personality trait or disposition rather than a behavior in which people can be instructed; leaders are the ones who will do the transformation. Fourth, it is elitist and anti-democratic, since leaders are the ones initiating processes, creating a vision, advocating new directions and making new rules, and suggesting that they put themselves above the followers. Fifth, it is based primarily on qualitative data from visible leaders of organizations and may not be able to be applied to lower-level leaders. Sixth, it has the potential to be abused because it does not determine which values are good and which trait is best for the situation (Northouse, 1997).

Spiritual Leadership in the 1990s

The 1990s arrived bringing a major split in the study of leadership. On one side, organizational leadership merges with management studies to address specific problems of organizations and work environments. On the other side, studies of leadership tend to be very spiritualized and emphasize personal inner harmony for a more fulfilling personal
and professional life. Rost (1993) proposed a post-industrial definition of leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (p. 102). Rost's definition covered the components of leadership as a multidirectional relationship, as a non-coercive influence among people within a group, as a multi-participatory process in which leaders and followers cooperate equally to attain a common purpose, and as a process in which real change is intended.

In 1994, Bennis & Goldsmith proposed leadership as a relationship of trust and caring, and vision and meaning. They brought to the definition of leadership the notion of an energizing relationship, in which leaders draw people into action by creating a compelling vision and translating this vision into action. Leaders would be those who inspire and empower people by building trust, creating a vision and a meaning for this vision, as well as caring for followers. According to Bennis and Goldsmith (1994), proper leadership empowers people, and empowered people are committed people. Committed people create a bond, a sense of community and meaning in which goals are shared, and everyone is an important component of the whole process.

In 1995, Blank proposed the use of physicist's quantum theory to explain the way leadership promotes relationships, with different interactions in several levels simultaneously, interdependently, and connected. Blank (1995) defined leadership as focusing on its relational aspect, the influential characteristic of the leader, the boundaries of the group in which leadership occurs, and also on the capability for leadership to exist in each person. Blank named his proposed theory as quantum leadership, as opposed to the past physicist models that defined leadership by its pieces such as traits, behaviors, and situations. According to Blank (1995), quantum theory leadership is a natural multi-
faceted phenomenon in which interactions in many different levels occur and cannot be understood in terms of separate parts. In quantum leadership, leaders and followers are always interdependently together and connected, and the whole environment plays a role in which the leadership phenomenon happens. Quantum leadership looks at leaders and followers, considering both the individual and the surrounding universal consciousness as interacting to make leaders and followers accomplish goals (Blank, 1995).

In the 1990s, several authors contributed to the spiritual vision of life and leadership. Wheatley (1992) proposed that the science of chaos should be incorporated into leadership studies. According to the chaos theory, order emerges spontaneously from the natural law of the universe - chaos - opening space for creativity and unpredictability in human relations and organizations. Dee Hock (1996) created the jargon chaordic to designate the order in which organizations of the future should function, a system in which order emerges from chaos. Jaworski (1996) shared his theory of synchronicity as a pathway for personal fulfillment and effective leadership in individuals lives. The 1970s writings of Greenleaf on servant leadership gained a new perspective in the 1990s, with its emphasis on practicing openness as a way to acquire knowledge, and deepen and grow relationships.

Jaworski (1996) suggested three necessary shifts of mind that people have to perform in order to follow the path of this new spiritual and creative leadership. The first shift of mind is to change the way one thinks about the world, from a clockwork image to an open, dynamic universe. The second shift of mind is one's understanding of relationships as just an intermediate state to a network of interactions. Finally, the third shift relates with one's commitment to a state of surrender, of only being, a certainty that whatever
one needs to fulfill one's destiny will be made available. Reinforcing the necessity of this inner trip, Riskas (1997) described how individuals need to attend to their soul's hidden agenda for wholeness, fulfillment, and deep spiritual healing.

Northouse (1997) confirmed the ideas spread by spiritual leadership theories by studying the role of influence and common goals in the definition of leadership. Northouse defined leadership as a process that occurs as a result of a transaction between the leader and followers. Northouse (1997) also defended the idea that the leader not only affects followers, but that the leader is affected also by followers.

Stech (1997) stated that the 1990s leadership theories have a psychodynamic approach, meaning that people need to understand their own and others' selves, ulterior motives and past histories to interact and produce effective leadership. McFarland and Senn (1997) brought the notion of a 21st century leader who empowers others, shares passion and expertise, but first re-examines his/her own self. Bennis (1997) defined the new leader as a person determined to change the world and have a good time in this process, emphasizing the need for the leader to find what it is that makes him/her feel good.

Approaching leadership in this spiritual way, one of the most complete explanations of leadership in the 1990s was developed by Wheatley (1992). Wheatley defined leadership as a process that emerges from within each one of us, i.e., an allowance for us letting order and creativity emerge from chaos, the law of nature, into our lives. Wheatley's idea is that order cannot be imposed from without, but emerges from within if it is not disturbed by people's desire to control events, people, or even one's life. All that one can control is to agree to an objective one may want to accomplish.
and have values by which to work toward these objectives, but then one must stand back
and let order emerge from chaos. Wheatley (1992) said that chaos works through the
exploration of our inner selves, through exchanges with others promoted by diverse
relationships, through the free sharing of information, through the acceptance of the
invisible field of a common vision, and that leadership will emerge from these
relationships.

People can only accomplish objectives as individuals and groups by changing
their ways of relating with people and with the environment around them (Wheatley,
1992). To overcome the challenges presented by today’s world, one can no longer expect
to find an external leader, but must look within oneself, within one’s relationships with
other human beings, and within the universe. Wheatley (1992) emphasized the need to
accept chaos as the creative force of life that creates new levels of order and
understanding. Wheatley (1992) argued that people need to commit with values of life
and change, think collaboratively, experiment with ideas together with other people, and
freely sharing information.

**Self-Leadership**

In early studies of leadership structure, Knowles and Knowles (1955) observed
that ideal leadership is not exerted by one member of a group over all the others, the
followers. Instead, the best group achievements were obtained when the distinction
between leaders and followers was not as sharp, and all members of the group shared
leadership functions cooperatively. Knowles and Knowles (1955) also theorized that
groups are dynamic organisms with different leadership needs at different stages of
development. Therefore, at one point in time one member of the group would be the leader while the others would be the followers; at another point in time, a different member would be the one performing the leadership function. The more widely leadership is shared, the more effectively the group will work together (Knowles and Knowles, 1955). Knowles and Knowles' findings were precursors of the theory that emerged several years later with Manz (1983).

Manz (1986) defined self-leadership as a journey to self-discovery and self-satisfaction, a method of self-influencing, a technique for self-efficacy, a source of behavioral control, and even a process of self-fulfillment. Self-leadership is different from self-management. Self-management occurs basically in the work environment, aiming at effectiveness (Markham and Markham, 1998). Self-leadership occurs within the individual, aiming at personal fulfillment. Self-management is externally motivated, i.e., self-management is motivated by the desire to perform better professionally. Self-leadership is internally motivated, i.e., it is motivated from the desire the individual has to feel more efficient and effective. Self-management looks for efficiency; self-leadership looks for efficacy (Manz and Sims, 1989) (See Table 2.1).
Table 2.1. Differences among self-motivation, self-management, and self-leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed toward anything - not specific target</th>
<th>Self-motivation</th>
<th>Self-management</th>
<th>Self-leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has specific and structured aim</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside initiated - external motivation/reward</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside initiated - internal motivation/reward</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned/purposeful action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior management to reduce discrepancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses short term deviations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses appropriateness of standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader self-influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages individual’s thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires individual’s active role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manz (1990) also distinguished self-leadership from self-regulation and self-management. Self-regulation is a process of reducing variations between one's behavior and established standards. The focus of self-regulation "is on sensing and then reducing discrepancies from a relatively steady state" (Manz, 1990a, p. 279). Self-management is a set of strategies for behavior management destined to reduce discrepancies from existing standards, determined by higher level controls. Self-management addresses short term deviations but does not work on the appropriateness or desirability of established standards (Manz, 1990a). Self-leadership is a broader self-influence, including self-management strategies and strategies for managing the natural motivational value of the task as well as the patterns of the individual's thinking. Self-leadership addresses behavior, cognition, the reduction of discrepancies from standards,
and the appropriateness of these standards. Self-leadership therefore requires a more active role of the individuals, since it is an advanced form of self-influence (Manz, 1990a).

Self-leadership has also been described as "the influence we exert on ourselves to achieve self-motivation and self-direction we need to perform" (Manz and Sims, 1991, p. 23). It consists in a series of behavioral and cognitive strategies to enhance individuals' personal effectiveness (Manz and Sims, 1991).

Evolving from studies on self-management (Manz and Sims, 1980) the first developed self-leadership theory was published in 1986. Manz' (1986) studies were based on the psychological theories of social learning (Bandura, 1971), self-monitoring studies (Snyder, 1974, 1979), and self-motivation research (Deci and Ryan, 1985; and Bandura, 1986). Later, Manz and Neck (1991) linked self-leadership with cognitive therapy (developed by Burns, 1980), by suggesting that part of self-leadership is challenging dysfunctional thinking through more rational thoughts, beliefs, and self-statements. Manz and Neck (1991) suggested that people should analyze current dysfunctional beliefs and substitute them for more positive ones.

The end sought of self-leadership as suggested by Manz (1986), is related to (a) self-knowledge, (b) maximizing personal and professional strengths and minimizing personal and professional weaknesses, (c) reaching personal and professional self-efficacy, and (d) living a purposeful life. Manz (1986) also proposed that self-leadership is the way for today's corporations to improve their workforce decision making skills through its multiplying effect.
Manz (1986) suggested that self-leadership promotes self-control stemming both from the individual’s interaction with external factors and self-imposed processes. Self-leaders can motivate subordinates to become self-leaders as well, therefore enhancing the ability of today’s corporations to respond to the challenges of the new work environment and international market competition (Manz, 1991).

**Self-Leadership Strategies**

Manz (1986) defined procedures leading to self-leadership that can be taught and learned. Manz’ main motto is “we do choose,” meaning that individuals can act and change themselves and their lives if they so want. The procedures that self-leadership encompass are called strategies and are divided in three areas: mental, cognitive (or natural rewards strategy), and behavioral (Manz, 1986).

**Mental strategies**

According to Manz (1990a), mental strategies deal with changing patterns of thinking. There are four mental strategies: (a) improving one’s belief system, (b) using our imagination to facilitate desirable performance, (c) using self-talk to one’s advantage, and (d) learning and using new improved scripts. The first mental strategy, improving belief system, is accomplished in five steps. The first step is identifying tasks in which beliefs mostly impact actions and feelings. The second step is analyzing the accuracy of one’s own beliefs. The third step is to question whether beliefs are positively or negatively affecting our actions and feelings. The fourth step is to isolate inaccurate,
dysfunctional beliefs and challenge them. Finally, the fifth step is to identify more positive functional beliefs to take the place of the dysfunctional ones (Manz, 1990a).

The second strategy of self-leadership, as defined by Manz (1990a) is to use one's own imagination to facilitate desirable performance. This strategy is accomplished in four steps. The first step is to analyze imagined experiences (mental images), verifying whether they focus on the positive or on the negative outcomes of difficult tasks, if these mental images facilitate or undermine one's confidence in the performance of tasks, and if they are realistic. The second step is identifying destructive imagined experience tendencies, such as the tendency to always anticipate negative outcomes of actions. The third step is to eliminate this negative thinking by actively choosing to think about other more positive images. A fourth step is to purposefully choose to think about a sequence of events that boost one's efforts, clarifying and motivating one's actions.

The third mental strategy deals with using self-talk, and has four steps. The first step is to analyze one's current self-talk tendencies, verifying whether it is destructive or if it facilitates the performance. The second step deals with identifying the negative self-talk that one would like to eliminate, as well as identifying constructive self-messages one would like to develop. Third step is to practice positive self-talk, aloud at first, and then internalizing it, using constructive, self-instructional, and self-motivational inner speech. The fourth step is to actually use the positive self-talk to prepare oneself for challenges, to cope with difficulties, and to reward oneself whenever dealing with difficulties.

The fourth mental strategy deals with learning and using new and improved scripts. There are six steps to accomplish this strategy. The first step is examining one's
own current scripts, i.e., the sequence of behaviors exhibited when facing important challenges, the images and self-talk one uses whenever in difficult situations. The second step is to identify undesirable scripts one has, both in the physical and in the mental aspect. The third step is to create new, more desirable scripts or acts to replace the undesirable ones. A fourth step is to rehearse the new scripts, i.e., mentally and physically practice the chosen new scripts, or the behavioral and thinking patterns one wants to implement henceforth. A fifth step is to use the new scripts when appropriate, practicing self-observation to measure one's progress, and make even further improvement. The sixth step is self-rewarding when successfully performing any new script.

**Behavioral strategies**

Manz (1990a) argued that more than changing thought patterns, one could alter one's behaviors as well, with the information one already possess about oneself, one's self-awareness. Through self-observation of personal behavior and its causes, it is possible to know the reasons one behaves in certain ways. With this information one can change oneself to more desirable ways of being. These compose the behavioral strategies as described by Manz (1990a). There are six behavioral strategies. The first one is self-observation, in which one observes when, why, and under what conditions does one present certain behaviors. Manz (1990a) suggested five steps to help the self-observation exercise. The first step is to identify behaviors one would like to increase, and behaviors one would like to reduce. The second step is to keep records of frequency and duration of desirable and undesirable behaviors. A third step would be to observe the conditions
in which all these behaviors happen. The fourth step is to keep a written record of all the information on the target behavior.

The second behavioral strategy is self-goal setting. Manz (1990a) defended that it is this strategy that provides direction to self-leadership. What one wants for one's life, not only in the long-term but also in a daily basis, influences one's behavior. Manz (1990a) suggested five steps to accomplish this strategy. The first step to self-goal setting is to conduct a self-analysis to help set long-term goals. The second step is to actually set these goals for one's life and career. The third step is to establish short term goals that fit one's immediate efforts. A fourth step is to keep goals specific and feasible. The fifth step is to make goals challenging, but reasonable. Finally, the sixth step is to let other people know about one's goals, so to keep the incentive.

The third behavioral strategy is self-reward. According to Manz (1990a), this is one of the most powerful methods to motivate toward new achievements. Self-reward can be both physical or mental. Manz (1990a) identified four steps to accomplish this strategy. The first step is to identify the most motivating objects, thoughts and images. A second step is to identify rewarding behaviors and attitudes. The third step is to actually reward oneself when performing or behaving the desired way. The fourth is to be always self-praising and self-rewarding whenever accomplishing what was planned.

The fourth behavioral strategy is self-punishment. This strategy has to be controlled in order to avoid that guilt and self-criticism may impair one's motivation and creativity. Manz (1990a) suggested that one follows five steps to accomplish this strategy. The first step is to identify behaviors that cause one to feel guilty. The second step is to identify one's actions that result in self-critical. The third step is to identify self
destructive tendencies that may lead to exaggerated self-punishment. The fourth step is to reduce or eliminate these habitual self-destructive patterns. The fifth step is to try alternative strategies; for example, removing rewards that support negative behaviors, and reserving punishment only for extremely negative behaviors.

A fifth behavioral strategy is cues management. Manz (1990a) described cues as reminders and attention focusers that help to identify important moments in tasks. Five steps were suggested by Manz (1990a) to successfully accomplish this strategy. The first step is to write down and post lists of priorities to guide one's daily activities. The second step is to set cues to focus attention to those prioritized behaviors and tasks, such as placing signs in work areas to help focus one's thoughts. The third step is to identify and reduce negative cues from the work area, such as undesirable sources of noises and distraction. The fourth step is to identify and increase positive cues in the working area. Finally, the fifth step is to associate with people who cue one's most desirable behavior.

**Cognitive or natural rewards strategies**

Manz (1990a) also identified what he would later call cognitive strategies, or natural rewards strategy, i.e., the identification and enhancement of natural rewards in tasks, in a way to make them more pleasant to be accomplished. Manz suggested that one should look at activities that make one feel competent, and give a sense of self-control and purpose. To build natural rewards into tasks, Manz (1990a) suggested that one should first identify places to perform the tasks in a more pleasant way. Second, identify activities that can be built into tasks that could make the work naturally rewarding. Third, Manz (1990a) suggested the redesigning of tasks to incorporate the
places (contexts) and activities that make these tasks more pleasant to be accomplished. Part of the cognitive strategy is maintaining the focus on the natural rewards of tasks. Five steps were suggested to help maintaining a positive focus. First, one should identify the pleasant, enjoyable aspects of the task. Second, focus one's thoughts on the pleasant rather than on the unpleasant aspects of the task. Third, distinguish rewards built into tasks from those separated from the work itself. Fourth, focus thoughts on rewards that are actually part of the task, instead of those that are separate from the task, as for obtaining satisfaction from the tasks in which one is working on. Fifth, one should develop the habit and ability of focusing on the natural rewards of the tasks. The idea "is not to avoid or ignore the difficult or distasteful aspects of our jobs, but rather to deal with them constructively" (Manz, 1990a, p. 8).

Holst (1990) supported the idea that self-knowledge and self-control enhance leadership development. Self-knowledge leads to a clearer image of one's own insights and therefore a better control of one's own reactions, as well as leads to deeper insights into all people. Holst (1990) defended that the essence of the effectiveness of leadership development lies in the process of self-discovery.

Manz (1992) suggested that the roots of self-leadership where in the fields of social learning theory and intrinsic motivation theory. Stewart, Carson and Cardy (1996) suggested otherwise, stating that the roots of self-leadership can be traced back not only to the social learning theory (Bandura, 1986), but also to behaviorism (Skinner, 1953). Neck and Manz (1996a) identified yet another root for self-leadership in the field of self-control theory, in addition to the field of social learning.
Other authors approached the topic of self-leadership in distinctive ways. Andrasik & Heimberg (1982) conceptualized self-leadership as learned behavior. Latham (1989) defined self-leadership as a set of behavioral skills that can be taught. Blanchard (1995) equated self-leadership with employee individual empowerment in the workplace. By developing their own sources of power, employees would be "less dependent on others for the leadership they need and thus be better able to take initiative and make a greater contribution to their jobs" (Blanchard, 1995, p. 12). Stewart, Carson & Cardy (1996) theorized that self-leadership is an environmental intervention that can effectively increase desirable behaviors. Steward, Carson & Cardy (1996) based their theory on behaviorism (Skinner, 1953) and in the social learning theory (Bandura, 1986). Based on Manz (1983), Klenke (1996) proposed self-leadership as a "leadership alternative designed to involve people in the development of their own leadership" (Klenke, 1996, p. 259). Napolitano and Henderson (1998) defined self-leadership as a set of core values that are critical for becoming an effective manager-leader. Based on the premise that what we can do as leaders "is inextricably tied to who we are" (Napolitano and Henderson, 1998, p. 4). Napolitano and Henderson (1998) spelled out the following values, pertaining to the sphere of leaders' self-development: vision, integrity, passion and courage, optimism and confidence, focus and discipline, flexibility, tenacity and resourcefulness, humanity, self-renewal, and balance. Napolitano and Henderson (1998) nominated self-leadership as the core of leadership.

Still, after defining self-leadership, Manz (1991) expanded its concept to what he called superleadership, i.e., the leader who can lead others to lead themselves (Manz and Sims, 1989). Neck and Manz (1996b) went even further by developing a training
program to teach self-leadership in organizational settings, called thought self-leadership. Neck and Manz (1996b) also applied the concept of self-leadership to total quality management. Under the conditions of self-leadership, workers have the possibility to influence higher level management decisions. By being more involved in the organization and its self-set high standards, employees will interact to make the whole organizational system be in continuous improvement, rather than maintaining the status quo. Continuous improvement is one of the cornerstones of total quality management (Neck and Manz, 1996b). More recently, Manz and Neck (1999) developed a training program to help people self-teach self-leadership.

The idea of superleadership encompasses a multiplying leadership practiced by leaders that empowers followers, making them able to cope with environmental pressures and find opportunities for growth and development. The main point of Manz' (1991) superleadership, however, is that of self-leadership development of the leader and the followers. "Self-leadership is a set of behavioral and cognitive strategies designed to provide personal direction and self-motivation" (Shelton, 1997, p. 47). Some of the behavioral strategies are self-set goals, self-observation, self-reward, constructive self-criticism, and practice or rehearsal. Cognitive strategies include self-job redesign to meet responsibilities in ways that are more personally motivating. The leader not only masters self-leadership, but also models it for followers, encouraging them to self-set goals, have positive though patterns, practice constructive self-criticism, coordinate common efforts, and emphasize the contribution of every individual, as a unique source of ideas and talent (Manz, 1997).
Manz (1997) emphasized that leadership is not the domination of others to do what one wants them to do, but rather is a process of unleashing the vast talents of followers who become self-leaders. Becoming a super-leader means having super-followers and just getting out of their way to help them accomplish their goals. Another important component of self-leadership is self-reward any time one successfully completes an activity or engage in desirable behavior. Rewards can be through objects, actions, or self-praising. To effectively practice self-leadership one needs to find out inside oneself what one really likes to do and build those moments into one's daily life. Self-leadership requires an exploration inside one's inner self and a connection with one's highest values (Manz, 1997).

**Self Control Theory**

Behavioral control was first studied by Freud (1938) who stated that human behavior is determined by the unconscious, whereas conscious, or willful action, is relegated to a secondary position. Rapaport (1960) suggested that Freud later revised his theory, postulating that a secondary thought process would also impact an individuals' behavior and connect the person to the surrounding environment, i.e., realizing a "broad access to reality, over which it exercises selective judgment and choices" (Rapaport, 1960, p. 59). Skinner (1953) acknowledged that individuals have choices between behaviors, and that self-control impacts in the process of choosing courses of action. Individuals' choices are determined by the possibility the choices offer for individuals to hold their positions in society. Hartmann (1958) explored the notion that it is the ego, the portion of the unconscious that balances affective expression and external reality, which
functions as controller of individuals' behavior. Bandura (1969) conceptualized self-control as a result of an interaction between individual's internalized standards of conduct and present environmental behavior contingencies. Bandura (1971) also stated that in all cultures, social demands, customs, and taboos require members to exert self-control, delaying gratification or substituting biological gratification for other rewarding activities. Kanfer and Phillips (1970) further detailed Skinner's earlier view of self-control by suggesting a heavier role of the environment in providing motives for self-control, as well as in providing feedback to the individuals, so self-corrective measures can be taken. Godfried and Merbaum (1973) defined self-control as "a process through which an individual becomes the principal agent in guiding, directing, and regulating those features of his own behavior that might eventually lead to desired positive consequences" (p. 11).

Heckhausen (1967, 1991) and Heckhausen and Schulz (1998) theorized that the control of the environment, or the control of one's own action, is in the root of motivation. Control has been defined as an ability to cause influence in an intended direction (Rodin, 1986; Rothbaum & Weisz, 1989). Shapiro and Astin (1998) suggested that losing control is one of human's greatest fears.

Heckhausen and Schulz (1998) also proposed that humans strive primarily for controlling the environment, and secondarily to control oneself or to be self-controlling. Later, Bandura (1992a) linked the notion of self-control with self-efficacy and motivation. Self-beliefs of efficacy determine human motivation, affect, thought and action. Bandura (1992a) believed that human motivation is cognitively generated, i.e., people anticipate actions and motivate themselves through fore thinking. Bandura
(1992a) believed that people form beliefs about what they can do, anticipate likely outcomes of possible actions, self-set goals, and plan action to reach these goals. In this scenario, self-control is exercised to disrupt perturbing thought patterns that may negatively affect the course of action the individual need to accomplish in order to reach prior set goals (Bandura, 1992a).

According to Bandura (1997), "had humans been ruled solely by instant consequences, they would have long become museum pieces among the extinct species" (p. 156). People choices of action are made, largely, by anticipatory control, i.e., expected future outcomes of actions exert an important role in helping individuals defining current actions, and exercising self-control (Bandura, 1997). People do not function in isolation, but learn from observing others and from this evaluation reinforce or stop certain behaviors and courses of action. In other words, the environment, i.e., family environment, social environment, and work-related environment, affects people's actions, self-control, and behavior as a whole. (Bandura, 1971, 1997).

The role of the external environment in affecting human behavior was also reviewed by Skinner (1997). Skinner stated that "the problems we currently face are not to be found in men and women but in the world in which they live, especially in those social environments we call culture" (p. 185). The interaction between humans and the environment in which learning and behavioral changes are reflected, has been further explored by Bandura's (1971) social learning theory.
Social Learning Theory

Bandura (1971) explored the way humans learn, theorizing that people are not only driven by inner forces or inevitably affected by environmental influences, but rather function in a continuous reciprocal interaction between their behavior and its controlling conditions. These controlling conditions are personal experiences, other people's behaviors, symbolic representations of experiences, self-regulative influences and reinforcement. Bandura (1971) stated that behavior is controlled by its predicted consequences, i.e., in order to function effectively, one needs to be able to anticipate probable consequences of different events and courses of action. Information about consequences of behavior (cues) can reinforce or disengage people from certain behaviors and courses of action. Furthermore, people tend to attend closely to stimuli that predict reinforcement, while ignoring those that do not predict reinforcement. Responses that cause unrewarding or punishing effects tend to be discarded, whereas those producing rewarding outcomes are retained and strengthened (Bandura (1971).

Bandura (1971) stated that our behavior is not only controlled by the consequences of our actions, but also by the consequences of others' actions that we can observe. Therefore, people learn from observing the social environment and its responses to stimuli. Furthermore, people's behavior is self-regulated, i.e., people set performance standards and respond to their own behavior in self-satisfied or self-critical ways, in accordance to their self-imposed demands. Bandura (1971) advocated that after individuals develop their personal self-monitoring reinforcement system, each action produces two sets of consequences: a self-evaluative reaction and an external outcome. Anticipation of self-reproach motivates people to keep their behavior in line with adopted
standards, in face of opposing influences. According to Bandura (1971), there is no more devastating punishment than one's own self-contempt.

Bandura's (1971) social learning theory also explored the role that imagery or cognitive control plays in the human's self-monitoring system, being responsible for improvement in performance. In other words, by using verbal or other symbols of thought processes to represent the actions people want to take in order to fulfill their performance standards, people can actually improve their performance avoiding the anticipated negative consequences.

In 1986 Bandura suggested a triadic model of reciprocality (See Figure 2.1) to explain human functioning, which includes behavioral, cognitive and environmental variables.

![Figure 2.1. - Bandura's Triadic Model of Human Functioning (Bandura, 1986)](image)

Bandura's (1986) model explains that human functioning is a consequence of the interaction of these three variables: behavioral, cognitive and environmental factors, all operating in reciprocality and as determinants of each other. Bandura (1986) called this new expansion of social learning theory, social cognitive theory.
Social cognitive theory emphasizes the role of self-referent thinking in guiding human motivation and behavior. Adding to Bandura's 1986 theory, Lent, Brown and Hackett (1994) noticed that in the context of social learning, gender and ethnicity represent personal factors interacting with the social/cultural environment, and therefore can mediate the process of individual learning and performing tasks. Lent, Brown and Hackett (1994) suggested that contextual influences shape individual's perception, learning experiences, as well as personal interests and choices.

Many other authors confirmed Bandura's social learning theory. Studying human motivation, McClelland (1978) observed the role played by personal factors (behavioral and cognitive) and environment responses in predicting people's action toward achievement. Edic (1997) explored the building blocks of motivation, suggesting that self-motivation can be developed through the establishment of daily habits and systems, building a useful scenario, setting goals, anticipating results of goals, and keeping a focus on the responses from the environment. Petri (1996) added the biological component to Bandura's triadic model, but acknowledged the behavioral, cognitive and environmental components of people's motivation for functioning.

**Motivation Theory**

Motivation has been defined as the forces acting on an organism to initiate action (Petri, 1981). Petri (1981) stated that the concept of motivation can also explain differences in behavior. More intense behaviors may be the result of higher levels of motivation; and explain direction of action. For example, when people are hungry, they direct their behavior to eat. Arkes and Garske (1982) defined motivation as the processes
that "influence the arousal, strength or direction of behavior" (p. 3). Deci and Ryan (1985) defined motivation as the exploration of the energization and direction of behavior, and the study of the reasons for behaviors. The study of motivation is concerned with answering why questions (Deci and Ryan, 1985).

Aspects of motivation have been discussed since the early 1800s. William James, in 1890, asserted that interest plays an important role in directing attention and behavior. In 1918, Woodworth proposed that any activity could be initiated by an extrinsic motive, but that only when it was running by its own drive, would it be effective. In 1937, Allport called this independent running of behaviors, functional autonomy. In 1943, Hull published his drive theory, which states that all behaviors are based in four primary drives: hunger, thirst, sex, and avoidance of pain. According to Hull (1943), drives provide energy and direction for behavior.

Later studies however contradicted Hull. In 1950 and 1955, Berlyne demonstrated that novel stimulation can override the drives suggested by Hull. Harlow, Harlow and Meyer (1950), the first researchers to use the term intrinsic motivation, demonstrated that monkeys learned to solve puzzles without any reward other than the joy of doing it, persisting at it for long periods of time. Furthermore, Harlow, Halow and Meyer (1950) demonstrated that monkeys performed certain activities better when they were not externally rewarded, but only intrinsically motivated.

Deci and Ryan (1985) described the many motivation theories as following a path from mechanistic to organismic theories. Mechanistic theories view the human organism as passive, subject to physiological and environmental stimuli. Organismic theories view
the organism as an active participant in the stimuli, with volitional and initiating behaviors.

Under the psychoanalytic view, based on clinical interviews, the explanation for motivation began with Freud in 1914 and 1915 and his drive theories (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Drive theories of motivation state that any behavior can be reduced to a small number of physiological drives such as sex and aggression. Using the empirical tradition, derived from laboratory experiments with rats, motivation studies began in 1943 with Hull's drive theories, such as hunger, thirst, sex, and the avoidance of pain (Deci and Ryan, 1985).

In 1959, White argued that instead of being carried by drives, people were motivated by an innate tendency to be effective in dealing with their environment. This propensity was named effectance motivation. The feeling of acceptance that follows effective interactions is itself the reward for behaviors, and could sustain behaviors independently of any drive-based reinforcements. This theory was called intrinsic motivation theory. Later, Deci (1975) suggested that if some sort of reward follows intrinsically motivated behaviors, they can become extrinsically motivated behaviors, i.e., behaviors motivated for external rewards rather than driven solely by the human innate need for competency and self-determination.

**Intrinsic Motivation Theory**

Deci and Ryan (1985) advocated the organismic approach to motivation, i.e., the belief that humans actively try to master not only the forces in the environment but forces of drives and emotions within themselves, developing an internal, unified structure which
is called intrinsic motivation. Deci and Ryan (1985) proved that manipulation and exploration are not only derived from primary drives, but are a result of the innate human need for novel stimulation to function effectively. Intrinsic motivation is innate in humans and it is different from drive-based motivation. Still according to Deci and Ryan (1985) learning, socialization, and maturation affect intrinsic motivation because these factors impact the end sought of intrinsic motivation, which is to prove one's effectiveness in dealing with one's environment. Furthermore, development is intrinsically motivated, and environments that provide optimal challenge, promote competence-feedback, and support autonomous activity are more likely to facilitate intrinsic motivation, therefore facilitating development.

Intrinsic motivation theory supports the idea that the human organism is inherently active, and the rewards for this activity are the spontaneous, internal experiences that accompany the behavior. "Intrinsic motivation is the energy source that is central to the active nature of the organism" (Deci and Ryan, 1985, p. 11). Humans are intrinsically motivated to be self determined, regulated by choices based on one's awareness of one's needs and goals.

Studying human needs, Maslow (1970) developed a hierarchy of human needs, from physiological needs (the lowest human needs) to self-actualization needs (the highest of human needs). Maslow (1970) theorized the existence of five classes of basic needs: physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization. Physiological needs are the strongest needs, and self-actualization needs are the weakest; physiological needs are, as well, innate, whereas esteem needs and self-actualization needs are more psychological, learned needs, and may vary in each individual according
to what fulfills individuals' distinctive nature (Maslow, 1970). Along with Rogers (1959), Maslow (1970) believed that the primary mechanism of motivation is tension reduction. Rogers (1959) formulated a theory of motivation, according to which organisms move progressively toward psychological growth and fulfillment. Later, Rogers (1963) confirmed his theory by arguing that the basic principle of life is actualization, and a movement toward autonomy.

Maslow (1965) also hypothesized that work experience has a major impact on need satisfaction and personal growth. Managers should create a climate for employee development, in which they would be able to attain their highest potential, i.e., becoming self-actualized in their jobs.

Deci and Ryan (1992) suggested that humans are active and strive to be effective and autonomous. Activity is inherent to organisms, therefore intrinsic motivation is innate, is related with abilities, with the availability of personal experiences, and to the degree of support in the social context.

Ryan, Connell and Grolnick (1992) defined intrinsic motivation as innate rather than derivative, and as the propensity to explore and master one's internal and external world. Intrinsic motivation is manifested as curiosity and interest, which motivate task engagement even in the absence of outside reinforcement or support. Intrinsically motivated behavior is autotelic, i.e., done for its own sake, for the satisfaction inherent in the process of the activity (Ryan, Connell and Grolnick, 1992). However, intrinsic motivation can be externally regulated (when people do something due to external reward or to avoid punishment); introjected (to gain real or projected approval from parents and teachers); or regulated by identification (when the activity's value resides in its sole
performance). Intrinsic motivation studies gave rise to a similar, yet different theory: self-motivation theory.

**Self-Motivation Theory**

Self-motivation differs from intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation, as defined by Rogers (1959, 1963); Deci and Ryan (1985); Ryan et al. (1992), is the innate human need for novel stimulation to function effectively. Self-motivation, in contrast, is the active and voluntary mobilization of our internal resources to act toward desired goals (Spitzer, 1995).

Edic (1997) defined self-motivation as the ability to stay focused, enthused, and motivated about one's own goals. Spitzer (1995) defined self-motivation as the real motivation, i.e., the motivation that is internally born, which has more power than external motivation, and is moved by strong internal desires. Spitzer (1995) argued that desires release motivational energy that drive people to tremendous accomplishments. There are eight basic human desires that impact on self-motivation: desire for activity, desire for ownership, desire for power, desire for affiliation, desire for competence, desire for achievement, desire for recognition, and desire for meaning. Desire for activity is the innate human orientation toward stimulation. Desire for ownership reflects people's innate propensity for possessing things. Desire for power reflects the need to control one's own destiny. Desire for affiliation is a consequence of the human need to interact and socialize with others. Desire for competence reflects the most fundamental human need for survival in a primarily hostile natural environment. Desire for achievement is related to the need for efficacy, for succeeding within the social group. Desire for
recognition is rooted on people's need to be positively recognized by their own peers. Finally, desire for meaning has been described as one of the primary forces in life (Frankl, 1963), which every human needs to feel, i.e., that their life matters (Spitzer, 1995).

Brodie (1996) approached human self-motivation by reassessing the drives theory. Humans are motivated by four main drives or memes. Memes are basic units of genetic information developed by humans and imprinted in our DNA, which allowed the human species to survive. Brodie (1996) suggested that memes functioned as a code for selection of the most apt individuals to survive and continue the evolution of our species, i.e., individuals who have successfully developed were also successful in transmitting those memes to their offsprings. Memes developed to increase individuals chances to survive through the age of reproduction and beyond, to increase their number of children, and to increase their chances of successful mating. The four basic memes are fighting, fleeing, feeding and finding a mate. Humans are basically motivated by these four memes. All other drives are derived from these four basic ones (Brodie, 1996).

Like intrinsic motivation, self-motivation aims at individual's competence and self-determination. The primary reward for an individual reaching competence and self-determination is the experience of effectance and autonomy (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Shapiro (1981) suggested that drives or impulses impact on the tendency to act. However, drives and impulses do not adequately explain actions. In order for action to occur, there has to be a concept of self-direction, including conscious processes and imagined future outcomes. Deci and Ryan (1985) called this concept self-determination and included this area in their motivational studies. Self-determination, along with
competence, is among human beings' basic needs (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Self-determination and competence needs give rise to intrinsic motivation, since it channels and elaborates individual's innate skills to successfully interact with the environment. It is self-determination that guarantees individuals' action when not in the presence of pressures such as rewards and contingencies. Self-determination and freedom from control is necessary for intrinsic motivation to be operative (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The basis for self-determination theory is DeChanns studies of 1968, in which he postulated that the basic desire to be in control of one's own fate is an important factor for all motivated behavior, and it is the central force for intrinsic motivated behavior. The notion of self-determination is rooted in the concept of perceived locus of causality. The perception that one is the sole responsible and cause for one's own behavior is in the root of intrinsic motivation. In the other hand, individuals that perceive the causes of their behavior as being externally generated will be externally motivated (DeCharms, 1968). The notion of self-determination is also linked with the need for effectance, or to exert control over one's environment or one action's outcomes. Maslow (1943, 1955) called this self-actualization.

The positive correlation between people's belief in having control over their environment and actual effective performance has been demonstrated by Glass and Singer (1972) and Miller (1980). Self-determination means the exercise of choice, and the experience of internal locus of causality (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Internal locus of causality is related to the concept of self-control. Ryan (1993) defended that increased self-regulation, organization, actualization, and wholeness is a movement toward
development. Through enhancing inner motivational resources and exercising self-control, individuals promote their own personal development.

Heckhausen (1967, 1991) explored the notion that control of one's investment of time, effort, and skills is fundamental for the maintenance of individuals' motivation for action. Human development is reached through the optimized investment of human inner resources and personal protection against failure experiences. Later, Heckhausen and Schulz (1998) stated that the root of motivation is control and has two levels. The first level is primary control, i.e., the control individuals exert over the external world, or the tentative individuals make to change the environment accordingly to one's goals. Secondary control addresses internal processes to minimize losses and maintain primary control. Heckhausen and Schulz (1998) defended that the major aim of individuals over their life span is primary control (i.e., over the environment), which is reached through secondary control, i.e., self-control. Self-control is strongly affected by age and the social-economic environment. Self-control is, therefore, not only in the root of motivation but also in the genealogy of self-leadership.

Social Cognitive Theory

Social cognitive theory was defined by Bandura (1986) as the mediation of self-referent thoughts between individuals' knowledge and action. Knowledge, skills, or abilities are not the sole determinants of human action; individuals’ actions and behaviors are influenced by the beliefs they hold true about their own abilities, and about the outcome of their efforts. The power of beliefs in regulating actions has been target of several studies prior to Bandura's. Individuals interpret events and phenomena they
perceive, as well as decide about their subsequent action, through the filter of their beliefs about themselves, not only through the knowledge and past experiences they may have had (Dewey, 1933; Rokeach, 1960, 1968; Abelson, 1979; and Nisbett and Ross, 1980). Social cognitive theory implies that "people make causal contributions to their lives through mechanisms of personal agency" (Bandura, 1998, p. 52). Among these mechanisms, the most central is people's judgments of their own efficacy. "Unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their actions they have little incentive to act. Efficacy belief is, therefore, the foundation of action" (Bandura, 1998, p. 52). Bandura's 1998 diagram represents the conditional relations between efficacy beliefs and outcome expectancies (Fig. 2.2).

**Figure. 2.2: Diagrammatic representation of the conditional relations between efficacy beliefs and outcome expectancies (Bandura, 1998, p. 53).**

Bandura (1998) defined efficacy as the belief in one's capacity to organize and execute a course of action necessary to produce goal attainment. Outcome expectation is the effect that people expect their actions will produce.
Cognitive Therapy

Manz and Neck (1991) linked self-leadership with cognitive therapy. Manz and Neck (1991) suggested that part of self-leadership is challenging what they called dysfunctional thoughts, by using rational thoughts, beliefs, and self-statements. Cognitive therapy is a technique for mood modification that emphasizes control of thoughts. The first principle of cognitive therapy is that moods are controlled by cognitions or thoughts, referring to the way that one looks at things, individual perceptions, mental attitudes, and beliefs (Burns, 1980). The second principle of cognitive therapy is that when one is feeling depressed one’s thoughts are dominated by negativity, which blurs one’s vision toward the past, present and future. The negativity that pervades thoughts has the effect of causing feelings of hopelessness, which are illogical. The third principle of cognitive therapy is that negative thoughts carry distortions, and that this twisted thinking is the only cause of suffering. The implication of these three principles is that depression is not caused by reality, but instead by false mental images created by distorted thinking. Depression, therefore, according to the cognitive therapy theory, is not a genuine human experience but just a product of distorted thinking (Burns, 1980).

Cognitive therapy ideas were first described by Ellis (1962), and later developed by Beck (1979). Beck (1979) found a profound difference between depressed individuals' self-evaluation, expectations, and aspirations as compared to their actual achievements, which often were very high achievements. Beck (1979) concluded that depression involves a disturbance in thinking, and that this pessimistic mental set affects people's moods, motivation, and relationships, leading to an altered negative self-concept.
The method of cognitive therapy involves diagnosing moods, defining the cognitive distortions one is using, correcting the self-distortion, and building self-esteem (Burns, 1980). One of the main ideas of cognitive therapy is to use rational and cognitive contra-arguments to undermine irrational thoughts that lead to depression. Cognitive therapy contributes to self-leadership with its method of cognitive self-talk to correct distorted thinking and promote effective personal and social functioning.

Self-Monitoring Studies

Self-monitoring is the observation and recording of one's own behavior (Shapiro and Cole, 1997). Gardner and Cole (1988) observed that the process of focusing attentions on one's own behavior and recording these observations may result in the improvement of the behavior that is being monitored. The methodology of self-monitoring involves recording the occurrence of the behavior being observed. Shapiro and Cole (1997) reported a study involving self-monitoring of students in a classroom, in which self-monitoring was triggered by a cueing mechanism. Students were instructed to record their current behavior or thought at the sound of a tone. Cues can be audio or visual devices, such as tones, beep, drawings, images, or lights that remind individuals to pay attention to one's own behavior at specific times.

The self-monitoring technique was first described by Snyder (1974, 1979). Snyder (1974) theorized that individuals can and do exercise control over their self-presentation, but to different extents. High self-monitoring individuals are very "sensitive to the expression and presentation of relevant others in social situations, and use these cues as guidelines for monitoring his or her own verbal and nonverbal self-
presentation" (Snyder, 1974, p. 89). Low self-monitoring individuals are not as vigilant of social information about appropriate self-presentation, nor have repertoires of self-presentation skills. Low monitoring individuals seem to be more "controlled from within by their affective states and attitude rather than molded and tailored to fit the situation" (Snyder, 1974, p. 89). Snyder (1979) specifically defined self-monitoring as self-observation and self-control guided by situational cues to social appropriateness. Fowler (1986) and Gardner and Cole (1988) theorized that self-monitoring can improve the targeted behavior, increase individuals' responsibility for changing the monitored behavior, and promote generalization to other settings, besides being an inexpensive technique for self-improvement.

**Gender and Leadership**

All the studies previously mentioned did not specifically addressed the differences that gender may have regarding leadership styles. Self-monitoring studies, cognitive therapy, social cognitive theory, self-motivation theory, intrinsic motivation theory, motivation theory, social learning theory, and self-control theory lacked a more extensive approach to the issue placed by gender differences. Some authors, however, dedicated their studies to the issues faced by women in leadership.

Gaitley (1996) found that support from work environment groups and from family has a higher positive effect on the female's ability to deal with stress and to reach a status of well-being, as well as to deal with conflict, than on males. Emotional support received at work was found to make a difference in the satisfaction of women's family life. The
ability to positively deal with conflict and to reduce stress is positively related to self-leadership development (Manz, 1992b).

Silverman (1996) identified the following factors as fundamental for women to succeed in leadership positions: education, opportunity, supportive family/parents with a vision, support groups, counseling, supportive social environment, family social-economic standing, ethnicity, school values, and family values. Harris (1992) conceptualized that success for women is measured through their children and personal satisfaction, along with feelings of peace, happiness, and creativity both in relation with professional experiences and family life. Belenky, Clichy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) hypothesized that whenever giftedness is equated with recognized achievement, many truly gifted women are missed from the evaluation. Belenky et al. (1986) defended that remarkable women occur in many unrecognized spheres, and that only a small fraction of gifted women attain eminence in a man's world. The great majority of gifted women are nameless and fought for selfhood not only for their generation but for the generations to come in their own environments.

Reis (1996) contributed four factors that bring about talent development and leadership for women: (1) above average intelligence; (2) personality traits such as determination, motivation, creativity, patience, ability to take risks; (3) environmental contributions; and (4) perceived social importance of the use or manifestation of talent. Supportive parents were also found to be decisive for women's leadership development in McGrayne's 1993 study of Nobel prize women. Subotnik and Arnold (1996) found that teachers have also an important role in helping women develop their leadership potentials by supporting their initiatives during critical periods.
Supporting the emphasis on the role of family and social groups in the development of leadership for women, Vantassel-Baska (1996) suggested that family members, other significant individuals, the community-environment context, schooling and educational context, and social context such as history and social-political milieu, play important roles in women's talent development. Vantassel-Baska (1996) also emphasized some desirable inner characteristics that women may have in order to succeed as leaders in their professions: commitment to ideas, ego strength, intellectual courage and risk taking, curiosity, rage to grow, persistence, capacity to work alone and self-discipline, emotional overexcitability, intensity of feelings, creative insight, and perceptual talent.

Bartley (1998) found that men and women differ on motivational processes, suggesting that men have a greater tendency toward behaviors that are extrinsically motivated, whereas women tend to be more intrinsically motivated. Women also tend to take more advantage of external help as motivators than men. Women who have active and intentional engagement in behaviors related with personal growth initiative are more likely to explore the environment for different opportunities. Bartley (1998) also suggested that women may lack self-efficacious feelings regarding the probable success of their efforts related to career advancements and initiatives, and may fear success and perceive more barriers or discrimination on their pursuit of personal and professional satisfaction. These findings imply that men are more prone to explore the environment for new careers than women, and that this search is more likely to result in obtaining career goals for men.
Chronology

After occupying an important position in colonial times in the maintenance of the households and then losing their importance during the industrial revolution, women saw their importance as a workforce rise again during World War II when they made up the workforce in the industries (Northouse, 1997). In the 1950s right after WWI ended, the baby boom brought women back to the nurseries. The use of the birth control pill in the 1960s, along with high divorce rates put women back in the job market. Women found themselves ill prepared to face the competition, the low salaries, and still singly support their families. By the end of the 1960s, the women’s movement started to raise the voices of women for equality, equal payments, end of discrimination based on gender, and access to better positions (Northouse, 1997).

Difficult economic situations of the 1970s and 1980s and the need for the families to have dual income caused the number of women in the workforce to gradually increase. In the 1990s, women represented 50% of the workforce, and according to the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics for Workforce 2000, in the year 2000 women will make up 80% of the new entrants in the job market (Northouse, 1997).

These evolving paradigms were accompanied by economic changes. During the 1950s and 1960s, women were seen as basically different than men, and making different contributions to society. In the 1970s, women struggled for equality in opportunities and payment. In the 1980s, women struggled to emphasize their unique contributions to society and the work environment in a tentative to bring about the need for their higher participation as professionals. Finally in the 1990s, the equality perspective came with a trend for androgyny. Male and female characteristics were merging to compose what
was seen as the ideal style for the leaders and managers of the future: androgyny (Maier, 1992).

Existing Barriers

Even though women may have already developed some of the androgynous leadership styles desirable in today's workplace, some barriers appear to be still in their way to high managerial positions. Northouse (1997) described five barriers that women still face today. The first barrier is the good old boy network, or the network of connections maintained by men that guarantee their occupancy of the majority of high paid jobs worldwide. The second barrier is the lack of support for diversity, i.e., hiring initiatives do not give the same opportunity for women to be admitted to opened positions as it does for men. The third barrier as defined by Northouse (1997) is the lack of corporational support, i.e., corporations and organizations do not take the initiative to hire more women nor allow women to ascend in the managerial ranks. The fourth barrier is in skewed appraisals that favor white male performance while forgetting female contributions to the work environment. The fifth barrier is the glass ceiling, one of the most frequent complaints of women who are already working in the corporate world. The glass ceiling is an invisible barrier that prevents women from reaching high leadership and management positions. They reach the limit in low managerial positions and cannot go further.

Lyday (1985) found that women in managerial positions in the Extension system may be unfavorably perceived by Extension professionals, specifically those who were older and married and those who had received management training and managerial
experiences. The level of instruction positively impacted the way Extension employees perceived having women as administrators. Lyday (1985) stated that "if covert behavior is different between males and females, then the overt behavior could also be expected to be different. Men and women employees may have different training needs and may, therefore require varied training experiences" (pp. 62-63).

Pheterson (1990) described two important barriers to women's advancement in the job market: internalized oppression and internalized domination. Internalized oppression is the acceptance by a dominated group of the prejudice held against them by the dominant group. It usually takes the form of self-hatred, self-concealment, fear of violence, feelings of inferiority and powerlessness, and thankfulness for being allowed to survive. Internalized domination is the belief accepted by the dominant group that they are superior, self-righteous, and normal as compared to the dominated group. Internalized domination can be gender, class, age, and race related. These two mechanisms perpetuate domination of one group (males) over the other (female), and form another barrier to women's advancement (Pheterson, 1990).

Rosener (1990) mentioned another barrier that still exists today for women is the traditional female leadership style. Traditionally playing the role of teachers, nurses, and mothers, women bring this nurturing and caring style to their roles as professionals. Rosener (1990) defined traditional styles as supportive, collaborative, understanding, gentle, and providing services to others, as compared to the feminist style that emphasized assertiveness, objectivity, decision making and risk-taking.

Pheterson (1990) suggested that women and men have to overcome internalized oppression and internalized domination to promote mutual growth. Maier (1992) stated
that only through active participation of men, corporate support, and the building of alliances among women will these barriers likely be broken. Finally, Carr-Ruffino (1993) suggested that to break the glass ceiling women need to develop some masculine traits and at the same time strengthen some of their desirable feminine traits. Carr-Ruffino (1993) defined as masculine traits focus on tasks, objectivity, assertiveness, risk-taking, and a systems-approach to conflict. Feminine traits that needed to be maintained and strengthened were ability to express feelings, empathetic listening, respect for others imperfections, and a participatory decision-making style.

**Impact of Stressful Events in Leadership Development**

Holmes and Rahe (1967) defined stress as any emotion in its extreme form. Life stress was defined as an external change that occurs in people's lives, requiring them to make major internal and psychological adjustments (Holmes and Rahe, 1967). The emphasis of Holmes and Rahe (1967) was on the change that events cause in people's lives from an existing steady state, not on the psychological meaning, emotion or social desirability of the change. For Holmes and Rahe (1967), stressful events may also be seen as positive events such as vacations, marriage or the birth of a child. Kobasa (1979) defined stressful life events as the events that create changes or demand adjustment in an average person's normal routine. Stressful events were further defined as events external to individuals, i.e., what happen outside the individual's sphere of control.

Holmes and Rahe (1967) theorized that not only the number of stressful events in a person's life, but also the passage of time impacts an individual's level of stress. Casey, Masuda, and Holmes (1967) also hypothesized that passage of time influences stress
magnitude. Suls and Mullen (1981) considered that another dimension, the perceived control over the occurrence of a life event, would negatively impact on stress levels. Both frequency and closeness of life stressful events are positively correlated with high stress levels. Morse and Furst (1982) hypothesized that individuals with external locus of control would, therefore, be more susceptible of being affected by stressful events, than individuals with internal locus of control.

Individuals however are affected differently by life events. Byrne (1989) found evidence that "the emotional impact of life events is modulated by factors unique to the individual, [...] whether these factors are learned, dynamic, or otherwise determined" (Byrne, 1989, p. 227). Williams (1985) investigated gender differences in family life, perceived stress, and social support utilized. Women reported more life events and perceived a higher level of stress than men. Events that happened to the family were also perceived by women as more stressful than they were perceived by men. Furthermore, Williams (1985) found that women utilized more social support than men during periods of stress. In terms of coping with stress, Williams (1985) found that women rely more on family and social networks for support, while men rely more on support received in the workplace. Social support was found to lessen the effects of stress for both genders, although impacting more on women. It was found also that women are more likely to cope with stress by using adaptive behaviors or by ignoring it, i.e., using avoidance or rationalization. On the other hand, men were mostly found to cope with stress by facing the situation directly (Williams, 1985). Lester, Nebel, and Baum (1994) mentioned that women are more susceptible to stress than men and that women are twice as likely to develop depression than are men.
Stressful events are events external to the individual, i.e., they happen outside the individual's sphere of control. Morse and Furst (1982) hypothesized that individuals with an external locus of control would, therefore, be more susceptible to being affected by stressful events than individuals with an internal locus of control. Cellini and Kantorowski (1982) challenged earlier findings that women would have a higher internal locus of control than men. Cellini and Kantorowski (1982) also found that women were moving from an internal locus of control to an external locus of control. External stressful events appeared to be related with increased perceived control and anxiety in women.

Noble, Subotnik and Arnold (1996) noticed that the presence of stressful events in life is particularly relevant for women in the field of leadership development. The struggle for overcoming diversity enhances self-confidence, self-esteem and tenacity in women. Williams (1985) found that the perception of stress is more accentuated the higher the age, social-economic level, and level of education of both men and women. Also, women perceive their lives as being more stressful than men's.

Santiago-Rivera and Bernstein (1996) found that distressful events in life are not associated with increased negative achievement in life. Women reported more affiliation and relationship-related stressful events as compared to men, who reported more achievement-related stressful events.

Vantassel-Baska (1996) specifically addressed the role of adversity and the exorcism of family trauma in women's talent development. Experiences of unusual adversity in critical stages of development, along with loneliness and extreme mental distress throughout life are of great importance in women's development of self-
sufficiency. Women's search for a mother figure, which makes women look for support, admiration, and attention throughout their lives may, as well, positively impact on strengthening women's talent development.

These findings were supported by Noble, Subotnik and Arnold (1996), who discussed that women's struggle to overcome adversity and maintain self-confidence and self-esteem promotes their advancement toward leadership development. Noble, Subotnik, and Arnold (1996) confirmed that gifted women, i.e., women prone to develop leadership ability, are usually relatively distant from the mainstream of their societies' achievement centers. Nevertheless, talent is not enough for women to rise to the top. Instead, women need a combination of internal and external factors such as demographic and individual traits, filters such as opportunities and talent domains, and spheres of influence in the personal and in the public domain (Noble, Subotnik and Arnold, 1996) (See Figure 2.3).
Mikulincer and Florian (1998) suggested that the ability to perceive stressful events as manageable, even though painful, helps people to positively cope with stressful life events. The ability to perceive stressful events as manageable is related to an individual's trust in the world and in oneself, a confidence developed in the early childhood years through a positive relationship with a nurturing adult. Positive attachment with others thus may help individuals to cope better with life's stressful events, and even positively appraise them, gaining in experience and wisdom (Mikulincer and Florian, 1998).

Amirkhan (1998) confirmed that individuals who attribute stressful events in life to internal, unstable, and controllable factors will have effective reactions to solve the
problems or obtain social support, which will in turn reduce their distress. On the other hand, individuals who attribute failure to external, stable, and uncontrollable forces had avoidant and escapist reactions, exacerbating personal distress and even illnesses.

These prior studies seem to confirm that the trust in one's own ability to control oneself and to impact one's own world positively affects how one reacts to stressful events in life. An internal locus of control approach seems to reduce the negative effects of stressful events in life, whereas an external locus of control may result in poorly coping with distress. These results confirm that an internal locus of control, plus a controllable and cognitive approach to problem-solving and stress reduction is advantageous for self-improvement and effectiveness (Burns, 1980; Seligman, 1991).

The ability to positively interpret life experiences, learn about their utility and the constraints they may represent, has been equated with human personal development and identity achievement (Ho, 1998). Orlofsky, Marcia and Lessor (1973) defended that identity achievers experience and solve crises as they come, make realistic commitments, set realistic goals and cope with shifts in the environment. These two characteristics, personal development and identity achievement, are two concepts related to the definition of self-leadership (Manz, 1990a).

The Role of Community and Social Support in Leadership Development

Sarason, Levine, Basham, and Sarason (1983) defined social support as "the existence or availability of people on whom we can rely, people who let us know that they care about, value and love us" (p.127). Further, Sarason et al. (1983) believed that when social support is available early in life in the form of an attachment figure,
"children become self-reliant, learn to function as support for others, and have a decreased likelihood of psychopathology in later life" (p. 127).

Gaitley (1996) found that social support had positive effects on people's well-being, quality of life, and enhanced people's skills in conflict resolution. Specifically, support from work groups attenuated conflicts in the areas of work and family. Today, since individuals spend the majority of their waking hours at work, the group of colleagues takes the role of a community in people's life. Gaitley (1996) found that support from working environment and homophilous groups, i.e., "like me" relationships, relationships among persons with similarities such as same age, same occupation, same education, positively impact on both genders in dealing with family conflicts. Gaitley (1996) also found that the opposite was true, i.e., that support from family also impacted positively in helping people resolve conflicts in the work environment. These findings demonstrated that emotional support from work and from family lowered psychological distress and increased individuals levels of self-esteem. Furthermore, emotional support from community was even more effective for females than for males in terms of decreasing behavior-based conflict. The major finding of Gaitley's (1996) study was that "the work domain is the most effective source from which resources can be drawn to relive work-family conflict emanating from either direction" (p. 120). Since one of the components of self-leadership is self-awareness and a balanced pursue of personal goals (Manz, 1992), community support may have a positive impact on self-leadership development.
The Role of Family in Leadership Development

Olson (1982) investigated family attributes, concluding that pride (attributes related with loyalty, trust and respect within the family) and accord (attributes related to a family's sense of mastery and competence) are the most strong factors in defining family strength. Family strengths are resources that contribute to successful relationships among the members of the same family.

Van Velsor and Musselwhite (1986) defended that family events impact on individuals' motivation for leadership development. Particularly related to women's leadership development, Fitzgerald (1986) demonstrated that women who grew up in a strong, supportive family unit, were more likely to develop as effective leaders.

Kovach (1988) argued that leaders were more likely to come from families that provided considerable adult attention and support for them while they were children. Furthermore, families more likely to produce leaders were those smaller or moderate in size, those that provided mentors or role models for its members, and those that provided a sense of success for their children.

In a study about the role of the family on leadership development, Karnes and D'Ilio (1989) found that family environments with an intellectual-cultural orientation, in which independence and expressiveness were encouraged, were more likely to stimulate children and youth's effective leadership development. It was further suggested that readings, trips to social, cultural, political and intellectual places and events, as well as interaction with representative community leaders should be provided to foster the development of leaders in the family (Karnes and D'Ilio, 1989).
Gauvain and Huard (1998) suggested that competence for planning life may start during the early years of childhood, during interactions between children, their families and communities. Parents particularly play an important role in teaching children planning skills, since parents identify for the children culturally valued goals, as well as the ways to meet these goals.

Silverman (1996) suggested that family support, particularly parents with a vision, was essential for female's leadership development. Vantassel-Baska (1996) confirmed that the presence of a supporting family and other close significant others were some of the outer forces playing a very important role in the development of female leadership.

Gauvain and Huard (1996) pointed out that adult's mature cognitive functioning may be forged, in part, during early childhood years, in experiences within the family, and in the community. Families supportive of learning and growth, which extends to their children participating in family decision making activities, were crucial to the development of competent and self-fulfilled individuals.

The Role of Prior Leadership Experiences

In studying the effect of intelligence versus experience in people's skill acquisition, Kanfer and Ackerman (1989) theorized that experience responded for better skills acquisition under stressful conditions, whereas intelligence played a more important role under regular, non-stressful conditions. Fiedler (1995) used the same framework to define leaders' decision-making processes; under stressful conditions, leaders' experience was more useful than intelligence. Fiedler also speculated that in situations with low stress, the performance of experienced leaders was lower because
they become bored and lost interest. In low stress situations, the leaders' intelligence factor played a major role. Fiedler (1995) suggested that in order to improve leadership performance, work environments should create conditions for employees to make the most effective use of their cognitive resources. Fiedler (1995) also suggested that leaders should be trained to cope more effectively with stress, as well as to capitalize on their cognitive resources in stressful situations.

Hacker (1995) suggested that experience enhanced leaders' cognitive skills, and Sternberg (1995) emphasized that it was the interrelationship between experience and intelligence that positively impacted the most, on leaders' performance. Bandura (1996) believed that self-efficacy is more a product-result of people's beliefs in their own ability to perform and their ability to act on their own future. When people believe in their own ability to impact on their own life, they are enhancing their personal agency, i.e., their effectiveness to produce their own future. The belief in one's own efficacy is reached through living experiences that increase personal knowledge and personal ability to control one's own life (Bandura, 1996).

**The Effect of Internal Locus of Control on Leadership Development**

Locus of control, or source of control, was defined by Rotter (1966) as the perception individuals have about their lives as being controllable or controlled. When individuals perceive their lives as being controlled by themselves and their actions, they have an internal locus of control. When individuals perceive their lives as controlled by other people and external events, they have an external locus of control. In other words,
locus of control relates to what controls an individual’s life. Locus of control affects the
initiation and regulation of many behaviors (Rotter, 1966).

Seligman (1975) pointed out that robbing control from individuals results in
apathy, helplessness, and even death. Weinberg & Levine (1980) defended that the lack
of control was a major cause for stress in humans. Nolen-Hoeksema, Girgus, and
Seligman (1986) found that children with low perceived control became unhappy,
anxious, and eventually depressed.

Lefcourt, Martin and Saleh (1984) found that locus of control influenced
perceived effectiveness of social support. Individuals may reject social support when
they perceive support as a loss of personal control over one’s life. Lefcourt, Miller, Ware
and Sherk (1981) conceptualized that individuals with internal locus of control may
perceive greater stress when facing difficult challenges, but will experience greater
wellbeing in the long-term. Deci and Ryan (1985) defended that humans have a basic
psychological need to be effective in interacting with the world and called this human
feature the need for effectance or for competence.

Duttweiller (1984) described locus of control as concerning individuals’
expectancy for reinforcement. "An individual with an internal control orientation
believes that reinforcement is contingent on his or her own behavior whereas an
individual with an external control orientation believes that reinforcement is contingent
on luck, chance, or powerful others" (Duttweiler, 1984, p. 210).

Holst (1990) pointed out that leadership effectiveness was related with the leader’s
personal control over his/her own personal motives as part of fulfilling the needs of the
position. Furthermore, studies of locus of control demonstrated their relevance to the
concepts of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation (Petri, 1981) and even to Bandura's (1977) social learning theory. Bandura (1977) believed that thoughts regulate actions, and particularly emphasized the role of expectancies (expected outcomes) in social learning.

For being in the very core of motivation, which moves individuals toward action, locus of control theory is considered to impact leadership (Skinner, 1992). Along with self-awareness, locus of control explains individuals' differences in beliefs of efficacy, effectiveness, effort and ability, which impacts people's leadership skills (Skinner, 1992).

**Summary**

The study of self-leadership encompasses several disciplines. Manz (1992) cited the two major areas from which the concept of self-leadership was derived from the social learning theory and the intrinsic motivation theory. In the process of building the theoretical framework for this study, the researcher encountered other disciplines that contributed to a better understanding of self-leadership. These disciplines were (a) social cognitive theory, (b) motivation theory, (c) self-motivation theory, (d) self-control theory, (e) self-monitoring studies, and (f) cognitive therapy.

To fulfill the specific purpose of this study, other aspects impacting self-leadership development were addressed. These aspects were (a) gender, (b) stress, (c) family support, (d) community support, (e) prior leadership experiences, and (f) internal locus of control. The theoretical fields pertaining to the areas of gender, stress, family support, community support, prior leadership experiences, and internal locus of control were investigated in this chapter. All of these areas were thought to impact on self-
leadership development based on this extensive literature review. The purpose of this study was then to investigate the extent to which (a) gender, (b) stress, (c) family satisfaction, (d) social support, (e) prior leadership experiences, and (f) internal locus of control impact self-leadership scores.

Figure 2.4 shows the model proposed by the researcher of the disciplines composing self-leadership and the demographic variables impacting on its development. Eight theoretical fields were investigated in the current study as impacting on self-leadership: social learning theory, intrinsic motivation theory, motivation theory, self-motivation theory, self-control theory, self-monitoring theory, cognitive therapy theory, and social cognitive theory. Social learning theory contributed to the model with the variables community and friends, and experiences/stressful events in life. Intrinsic motivation contributed to the model with the variables personal standards, family circumstances, and personal attitudes and beliefs. Motivation theory contributed to the model with the variables drives, arousal, strength, and direction of behavior. Self-motivation theory contributed to the model with the variable of mobilization of internal resources to act. Self-control theory contributed to the model with the variables choices and courses of action. Self-monitoring theory contributed to the model with the self-observation variable. Cognitive therapy theory contributed to the model with the variables self-talk and personal effectiveness. Finally, social cognitive theory contributed to the model with the variables self-knowledge, observation, reflectiveness and adaptation, and decision-making and prior leadership opportunities. All the variables above may interact with extraneous variables such as gender, education, age, socio-economic conditions, race, and the residential environment to impact self-leadership.
This study investigated specifically the variables (a) community environment (community support), (b) the presence of stressful events in life (stress) from social learning theory, (c) family circumstances (family satisfaction) from intrinsic motivation theory, (d) prior leadership opportunities, from social cognitive theory, and (e) locus of control (internal locus of control), from self-motivation theory, self-control theory, and cognitive therapy theory. Figure 2.5 shows a pictorial representation of the model this study proposed to investigate. In this model, the researcher used the analogy of a river to explain the concept of self-leadership. The river of self-leadership is composed of tributaries, the theories of self-monitoring, self-control, social learning, social cognitive, cognitive therapy, motivation, intrinsic motivation, and self-motivation. On its way to the ocean of personal effectiveness, the river of self-leadership is affected also by gender, family environment, community environment, stressful events, internal locus of control, and prior leadership experiences. The current study aimed at exploring how the waters of the river of self-leadership were affected by all the elements described above.
Figure 2.4. Factors impacting self-leadership
Figure 2.5: Pictorial representation of the self-leadership model as investigated in this study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This chapter describes the research design, the instrument selection and development process, the population and sample, the data collection procedures, and the analysis of the data. This study was a descriptive-correlational research which investigated the relationship between self-leadership and (a) gender, (b) stress, (c) family satisfaction, (d) social support, (e) prior leadership experiences, and (f) internal locus of control. Furthermore, this study investigated the relationship between self-leadership and extraneous demographic variables of (a) race, (b) age, (c) education, (d) marital status, (e) marital status duration, (f) parenthood, (g) number of children, (h) childhood residence, (i) current residence, (j) Ohio residency, (k) service status, (l) leadership training, (m) allowance, and (n) service period. Figure 3.1 shows a conceptual scheme of the study.
Fig. 3.1. Conceptual Scheme of the Study
Population

This study investigated the members of Ohio Americorps. Americorps is a nationwide domestic version of Peace Corps, an organization that involves Americans age 17 and older in services in urban and rural areas. It was created as one of the three national service initiatives administered by the Corporation for National Service. The Corporation for National Service is a public-private partnership created through bipartisan support by Congress, the President and community groups in 1993.

"Americorps members spend one or two-year service-term working in community-based organizations to address needs in four key areas: education, public safety, human services, and environment. Americorps members receive a small living allowance and health insurance while in the program. After completing a year of service members receive an education award of $4,725.00 (less for part-time members) that may be applied to education expenses incurred before or after their service term" (Governor's Community Service Council, 1998).

In short, Americorps is a national service program that provides education awards in exchange for one or two years of community service. Americorps involves 25,000 members nationally with 613 members in 29 active programs in Ohio. Americorps programs are sponsored by national, state, and local nonprofit organizations.

Ohio Americorps includes 33 programs spread throughout the state which are administered by program directors and program coordinators. Americorps program directors are directly responsible for the operation of the programs and usually are those individuals who submitted grants to the State Commissions or a national parent
organization for funding. Americorps program coordinators are those who manage daily operations of Americorps programs and work under the supervision of Americorps program directors (Wykle, 1999).

The target and accessible population for the study was all Ohio Americorps members. The frame for this study was obtained in a two-fold way. A list of the 33 Ohio Americorps programs (Appendix A) was provided by Ohio Governor's Community Service Council with the help of Kitty Burcsu, executive director, Judy Overly, program director, and Chad Wykle, program officer. Ohio program directors and program coordinators were contacted and asked to provide a list of all the individual Americorps members working in their programs. Two of the programs, the Catholic Social Services Americorps Project and the Centralized Family Plan did not have any members at the time of this study. The membership of a third program, Southern Ohio Americorps YouthBuild, consisted of high school students and had to be excluded from the frame since the study only was approved by the Ohio State University Research Foundation to be conducted among participants 18 years or older. A fourth program out of the initial 33, the Urban Education Service Corps, was inactive at the time of this study and had to be dropped from the frame. The final number of Americorps programs in Ohio in this study's frame was 29 and the total number of Americorps members obtained for the frame was 613 members. All the program directors and program coordinators received a thank you gift with the thank you letter for their support and assistance. In addition, Ohio Americorps program directors and program coordinators were offered the opportunity to receive the findings of the study.
Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population suggested a sample size of 234 for a population of N = 600. The sample was determined by using the simple random sampling method with the table of random numbers (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1996). After the sample for the study was randomly drawn using the table of random numbers, those names were taken out of the frame. Using the same method of random sampling with the table of random numbers (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1996) another 30 names were then randomly drawn for the pilot test. Permission to conduct the study was obtained with the Ohio State University Research Foundation, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (Appendix B).

Instrumentation

This study utilized five different instruments combined into one (Appendix C). The five instruments were the Self-leadership Questionnaire (Anderson and Prussia, 1997), the Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Holmes and Rahe, 1967), the Family Satisfaction Questionnaire (Olson and Wilson, 1982), the Social Support Questionnaire (Sarason, Sarason, Shearin, and Pierce, 1987), and the Internal Control Index (Duttweiler, 1984). The Self-Leadership Questionnaire was utilized to measure the dependent variable, self-leadership. The Social Readjustment Rating Scale was utilized to measure the independent variable stress, while the Family Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to measure the independent variable family satisfaction. The Social Support Questionnaire was used to measure the independent variable social support, and the Internal Control Index was used to measure the independent variable internal locus of control. A set of questions designed by the researcher was used to measure the independent variable prior
leadership experiences. Another set of questions was designed by the researcher to assess demographic variables of interest. The researcher obtained permission from the authors and copyright managers to use the instruments in this study (Appendix D).

The instrument was checked for face and content validity by a panel of experts (Appendix E) from April 16 through April 23. A field test was conducted from May 15-30, 1999 to check for face and content validity, as well as to verify clarity, wording, thoroughness, ease of use, and appropriateness of the instrument. Seven doctoral students from The Ohio State University College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences' Department of Human and Community Resource Development were invited to serve as the field test panel (Appendix F).

The questionnaires used in the instrument had previous tests for reliability and factor analysis performed to determine construct validity. The information pertaining to each instrument's reliability and factor analysis is given in the following paragraphs.

The Self-Leadership Questionnaire, developed by Anderson and Prussia (1997) is a 50-item instrument measuring the theoretical constructs of behavioral focused, natural reward focused, and constructive thought pattern focused self-leadership skills. Cronbach alpha reliability measures averaged .80 for behavioral focused strategies, .83 for constructive thought pattern strategies, and .69 for natural reward strategies. Principle components analysis was conducted by Anderson and Prussia (1997) demonstrating that the self-leadership questionnaire corresponded to the theoretical structure of self-leadership. In the Self-Leadership Questionnaire respondents rate their thoughts from 1 (not at all accurate) to 5 (completely accurate).
The Social Readjustment Rating Scale, developed by Holmes and Rahe (1967), is a 42 item scale measuring life events that indicate or imply a significant change in the life pattern of an individual. Each item is assigned a numeric value that corresponds to the amount of changes and adjustment it requires in an individual's life. The highest value is 100 for the death of spouse, and the lowest value is 11 for minor violations of the law. According to Holmes and Rahe (1967), if an individual scored between 150 and 199 in one year, he/she would have a 37% chance of getting sick in the following year. A score between 200 and 199 would mean a 51% chance of getting sick, and a score over 300 would mean a 79% chance of getting sick during the following year. This questionnaire has been extensively used in research involving stress measurement (Ayers, 1986; Critelli and Ee, 1996; Holahan and Moos, 1994; McAndrew, 1993; and Miller, 1996). Casey, Masuda and Holmes (1967) measured the coefficient of stability of the Social Readjustment Rating Scale obtaining a Pearson's r of .669, .638, and .744, significant at an alpha level of .0005. The Holmes and Rahe’s Social Readjustment Scale was originally designed to measure respondents’ events that happened the year before in their lives. For the purposes of the current study and with the permission of Elsevier Science, the current owner of Holmes and Rahe’s questionnaire copyright, the questionnaire was adapted to query respondents about events that happened throughout their life span.

The Family Satisfaction Questionnaire was developed in 1982 by Olson and Wilson, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability of .92. The questionnaire measures two constructs: family cohesion and adaptability. The Cronbach’s alpha for family cohesion was .82, and .86 for family adaptability. Factor analysis was performed by the authors of the original instrument, retaining one factor after the first varimax
rotation, where all items loaded more than .50. This result indicated that the questionnaire is a one dimensional scale, “therefore, the total score is most empirically valid” (Olson and Wilson, 1982).

The Family Satisfaction questionnaire is designed as 14 statements, which the respondents rate from 1 (dissatisfied) to 5 (extremely satisfied). A total score can be obtained by summing the 14 items. A score of the satisfaction with family cohesion can be obtained by summing items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 14. A score of the satisfaction with the family adaptability can be obtained by summing the items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12. For the purpose of this study, only the total score family satisfaction will be used. The sub-scales of family cohesion and family adaptability will not be used.

The Family Satisfaction Questionnaire has been used in another study. Mathis and Tanner (1991) investigated cohesion, adaptability, and satisfaction of family systems in later life and reported a Cronbach's alpha of .92, and a test-retest correlation of .75. The Family Satisfaction questionnaire was designed by Olson and Wilson (1982) to assess respondents' current family environment. For the purposes of the current study, and with the permission of the authors Olson and Wilson (1982) represented by Life Innovations, Incorporated, the questionnaire was adapted to assess respondents' family environment in which they grew up.

The Social Support Questionnaire was developed by Sarason et al. (1987). The original questionnaire had 27 items. The questionnaire used in this study was a shorter version with six items. The Social Support Questionnaire measures the two factors of number of people providing social support and satisfaction with this support. Factor analysis was performed by Sarason et al. (1987) for number of social support and
satisfaction, obtaining Eigenvalues greater than 1 for each of the factors after rotation. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal reliability for the original six-item instrument was calculated at .97 to .98 for number of people providing social support in the three samples tested, and between .96 to .97 for satisfaction with this social support. The Social Support Questionnaire Six-question version (SSQ6) was designed as six questions with two parts each. The first part of each question asks about people who provide support for the respondent in different circumstances. Respondents have nine spaces to fill with initials of individuals they count on for social support, detailing in parenthesis their relationship (whether they are relatives or friends) with the individual cited. Respondents have also the option to circle “No one” if they cannot count on anyone for the particular circumstance stated in the question. The second part asks how satisfied the individual is with the support he/she receives. In this part, respondents have to rate their satisfaction from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied). The Social Support Questionnaire is scored in two steps. The first step is executed by counting the total number of people for each of the odd numbered items. The totals are added together (maximum of 54) and divided by six. The second step is to add the total satisfaction scores for the six even-numbered items (maximum of 36), and divide this number by six. The Social Support Questionnaire was originally designed to assess individuals’ current social support. For the purposes of this study and with the permission of the authors (Sarason et al., 1987) the Social Support Questionnaire was adapted to ask respondents to rate the social environment in which they grew up. Also, in this study only social support satisfaction scores will be utilized to measure social support.
The Internal Control Index developed by Duttweiler (1984) is a 28-item questionnaire measuring five basic constructs relevant for internal locus of control: cognitive processing, autonomy, resistance to influence attempts, delay of gratification, and self-confidence. Factor analysis was performed by Duttweiler (1984) resulting in initial eight factors emerging with eigenvalues of 1.00 or more. After a two-factor varimax rotation, two factors emerged accounting for all the variation. Self-confidence accounted for 68.7% of the variation and autonomous behavior accounted for 31.3% of the variation. The coefficient alpha of reliability for the instrument was calculated yielding results of .84 and .85 for the two tests that were performed. The Internal Control Index was designed as 28 statements with blank spaces that respondents have to fill with letters corresponding to their usual attitude or behavior in the situation described. The letters correspond to alternatives of a 5-point scale ranging from A (rarely) to E (usually). The response A is valued as 5 on items 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, and 27, as these items internal responses. The response E is valued as 5 on items 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 25, and 28. "A maximum high internal response pattern would result in a score of 28" (Duttweiler, 1984).

The Internal Control Index has been used in many studies. Goodman & Waters (1987) investigated convergent validity of five locus of control scales. The Internal Control Index had the highest internal consistency reliability (.83). Meyers and Wong (1988) study obtained an internal consistency Cronbach's alpha of .85. Ward (1995) used Duttweiler's Internal Control Index in a study of the correlation of motivation for competitive or cooperative strategy among employed adults. Ward (1995) obtained an internal consistency score Cronbach's alpha of .83 for the Internal Control Index.
The Cronbach's alpha measure of internal consistency, and reliability of the whole instrument for the current study was determined with data collected in the pilot test. The pilot test sample was a representative group of 30 individuals randomly drawn from the accessible population, after the sample for the study was randomly drawn. Henderson (1997) recommended a sample of 15-25 people.

The first test was sent to the pilot test sample on June 7, 1999 with a deadline of June 21, 1999. The package contained the questionnaire, a cover letter, a stamped, self-addressed envelope, two candies and an OSU pencil as incentives for the respondents. Reminder postcards were sent on June 14, 1999. A second package containing the survey, a revised cover letter and a self-addressed stamped envelope was sent on June 21 for non-respondents. Eighteen Americorps members returned the test, or 60% of the pilot-test sample. The retest was sent three weeks after the first test, on June 28 to the 18 individuals who completed the instrument. The retest package contained the instrument, a revised cover letter, a stamped self-addressed envelope, two candies and one OSU pencil as incentive to the respondents. The return date was set for July 13. A reminder postcard was sent to non-respondents on July 2. A second survey package containing the survey, a revised cover letter, and a self-addressed stamped envelope was sent on July 8. By July 13 only nine individuals had responded to the re-test. The researcher called the corresponding Americorps program directors and program coordinators to obtain telephone numbers of those who did not responded. Telephone calls were made to non-respondents but no other questionnaires were returned. By July 16, a decision was made by the research committee to calculate Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency with the respondents of the test, and to calculate Pearson's r correlation.
Pearson's r product moment correlation coefficient was calculated between test and retest with the available nine pairs of respondents. Cronbach's alpha is also known as coefficient of internal reliability. The Cronbach's alpha index for internal consistency, which measures the accuracy of the instrument, was calculated from data obtained with the pilot test. The Self-Leadership Questionnaire had an alpha of .95; the Holmes and Rahe Social Readjustment Scale had an alpha of .71. The Social Support Questionnaire had an alpha of .96 for total number of social support, .95 for satisfaction with social support, .94 for social support from family members, and .94 for social support from friends. The Family Satisfaction Questionnaire had an alpha of .95 for the whole questionnaire, .92 for family cohesion, and .88 for family adaptability. The Internal Control Index had an alpha of .46 and the set of questions designed to measure prior leadership experiences had an alpha of .47.

Therefore, the closer to 1 the coefficient of reliability, the smaller is the proportion of error variance in the test. The alpha-level was set a priori at .05. The test-retest reliability coefficient is also referred to as the coefficient of stability, which indicates that one can generalize over time from the scores obtained at a certain point of the data collection. The test-retest coefficient of reliability assumes that the characteristics being measured in the test are "stable over time, so any change in scores from one time to another is due to..."
random error" (Ary et al., p. 274). Another assumption of the test-retest coefficient of stability is that there is no practice effect of memory effect. The interval between the two measurements cannot be too short to allow participants to answer the same way they did in the first test because they remember, but also cannot be too long that may allow for differential learning to occur (Ary et al., 1990; Tuckman, 1999). Henderson (1997) recommended a one to three week interval between the test and retest.

The Pearson's r product moment correlation between test and retest with the Self Leadership Questionnaire was .95. The Holmes and Rahe Social Readjustment Rating Scale, used to measure stressful events in the life of respondents, had a test-retest Pearson's r of .93. The Family Satisfaction Scale had a Pearson's r between test and retest of .94. The Social Support Questionnaire had a Pearson's r of .96 for total number of social support, .96 for social support, .74 for social support from family, and .95 for social support from friends. The index of satisfaction with social support had a low non-significant Pearson's r of .150. The Internal Control Index had a low non-significant Pearson's r coefficient of reliability between test and retest of .168. The questions designed to measure prior experiences on leadership had also a low non-significant Pearson's r of .58.

The percentage of agreement was calculated with the nine individuals who returned the test and retest. The Self-Leadership Questionnaire had a total percentage of agreement of 88%, 56% as perfect matches and 32% as close matches. The Holmes and Rahe Social Readjustment Scale had a percentage of agreement of 84%. The Family Satisfaction Questionnaire had a total percentage of agreement of 79%, 58% perfect matches, and 21% close matches. The Social Support Questionnaire had 73% of
agreement in the total number of people counted for social support (42% perfect matches and 31% close matches); 60% of agreement in number of social support from family members (40% perfect matches, 20% close matches); 73% of agreement in number of social support from friends (55% perfect matches, 18% close matches); and 86% of agreement in satisfaction with community support (68% perfect matches, 18% close matches). The questions measuring past leadership experiences had a total percentage of agreement of 82%. The Internal Control Scale had a total percentage of agreement of 73% (52% perfect matches, 21% close matches).

Data Collection

The data of this study were collected using mail survey questionnaires. In order to maximize response rate, Dillman's (1978) total design method for survey research was used. The first survey packet was sent to all the subjects of the sample on July 19 with a requested return date of July 31. The survey packet included a cover letter (Appendix G), a questionnaire coded with the participants' identification number to allow for control of response rate, and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. As incentives, the researcher included in each package two Twizzlers and an OSU pencil. The participants who returned the questionnaires within the first deadline were offered the opportunity to participate in a random drawing for four OSU sweatshirts. In addition, subjects were offered the opportunity to have their questionnaires scored by the researcher and the results sent back to them with comments regarding their self-leadership scores, as well as their scores on family satisfaction, social support, internal locus of control and stress. A reminder postcard was mailed to non-respondents on July 26 (Appendix H). A second
packet including the survey instrument, a revised cover letter (Appendix I), and another self-addressed stamped envelope was mailed to the remaining non-respondents on August 4. A reminder postcard for the second mailing was sent on August 10 (Appendix J). The final deadline for the data collection of this current study was August 16.

Data Analysis

Data of the current study were analyzed using version 7.5 of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. The alpha level was set a priori at .05 for all significance tests. Descriptive statistics of frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency (mean) and measures of dispersion (standard deviation) were calculated to summarize and preview data. Nominal data of gender, educational level, race, marital status, parenthood, childhood residence, current residence, prior leadership experiences, and year of serving Americorps were described using percentages and frequencies. Interval data of participants’ scores in the self-leadership, family satisfaction, social support, internal locus of control, and stress were analyzed using means and standard deviations.

Pearson's r product-moment correlations were calculated among the interval variables of respondents' scores on self-leadership, stress, family satisfaction, social support, prior leadership experiences, age, marital status duration, and number of children. A stepwise multiple regression was conducted to calculate how the combination of independent variables impacted on the dependent variable self-leadership. Multiple regression weights the best combination of independent variables to predict the dependent variable (Ary et al., 1990). Finally, univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA)
was performed to estimate the variability between the scores of males and females in the dependent variable self-leadership. This study used Davis' (1971) conventions for describing measures of association (relationship), as seen in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very strong association (relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Conventions for Measures of Association (Davis, 1971).

**Threats to Internal Validity**

Internal validity refers to factors that directly affect the dependent variable, i.e., the effect on the dependent variable might be mistaken for the effect of the treatment (Gliem, 1996). The two potential threats to internal validity identified in the current study were mortality and attitude of subjects.

**Mortality**

Mortality or loss of subjects is the threat to internal validity that occurs when subjects drop out of the study (Gliem, 1996). During the period in which the data collection was conducted, some subjects in the sample were finishing their terms with Ohio Americorps, thus they may have not completed their questionnaires because they were no longer members of the organization. There is also the concern of the researcher
that the size of the questionnaire may have been a factor causing subjects to not complete
the questionnaire. This threat to internal validity was not controlled in the current study.

Attitude of Subjects

This threat to internal validity refers to the way in which subjects view a study. Subjects can feel motivated to perform well just because they are part of a study. In this case subjects would be reacting to the experimental condition rather than being really truthful to their personal positions about questions asked in the study (Gliem, 1996). The fact that self-leadership could be considered a desirable trait to have, some subjects in this study may have felt compelled to give ideal responses rather than responses reflecting their personal status. This threat to internal validity was not controlled in the current study.

Threats to External Validity

Threats to external validity refers to interactive effects from extraneous variables, not accounted for in the study, which can prevent the generalization of the results (Gliem, 1996). The four threats to external validity identified in the current study were non-response error, ecological validity - describing the independent variable explicitly, Hawthorne effect, and novelty and disruption effects.

Non-response Error

Non-response error relates to the fact that less responsive subjects are often different on some variables than those subjects who respond faster (Gliem, 1996). The
researcher made a tentative to control this threat to internal validity in the current study by comparing early and late respondents on demographic variables and on nominal and interval independent variables. Early and late respondents were compared on demographic variables and on the independent nominal variable gender using crosstab's Phi and Cramer's V statistics. Early and late respondents were compared on interval independent variables using analysis of variance (ANOVA)'s F statistics. The researcher also made two tentative telephone calls to non-respondents.

Ecological Validity - Describing the Independent Variable Explicitly

This threat to external validity refers to the failure in describing precisely the levels of the independent variables in sufficient detail so the results can be generalized (Gliem, 1996). The current study adapted instruments to measure family satisfaction and social support as related to the childhood of the respondents, as well as adapted the instrument to measure stress levels of respondents. Despite the researcher's efforts to make it clear to respondents that their responses should address conditions of their childhood, the extent to which respondents understood the statement could not be controlled.

Hawthorne Effect

Hawthorne effect is a threat to external validity that refers to the fact that subjects' knowledge of being part of a study may affect their responses (Gliem, 1996). The possibility of self-leadership being a desirable trait could affect the way respondents answered the survey. This threat was not controlled in the current study.
**Novelty and Disruption Effects**

This threat to external validity refers to the fact that the novelty of the treatment may impact subjects' responses (Gliem, 1996). Self-leadership is a new concept with which many of the respondents may not have been familiar. The novelty of self-leadership could have caused respondents to alter their responses to the situations addressed in the survey, impacting the generalizability of the current study. This threat was not controlled in the current study.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter contains information about the demographic characteristics of the population studied, i.e. the Ohio Americorps members, the relationship between the independent variables stress, family satisfaction, social support, internal locus of control and gender, and the dependent variable self-leadership. Following, this chapter provides information on a multiple regression analysis of the independent variables that are significantly correlated with self-leadership on the dependent variable. The objective was to see what percentage of the linear combination of the independent variables explained the variation in the self-leadership score. Test statistic F was performed to indicate if the variation explained by the full model was statistically significant. The standardized partial regression coefficient was examined to identify the relative contribution of each independent variable in the variance of the dependent variable self-leadership score. Durbin-Watson test statistic was examined to check for independence of residuals.

The findings are presented in the following order: sample information, dealing with non-respondents, description of the population, and self-leadership scores by demographic variables. Following, this chapter provides the correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variable. A stepwise multiple regression
analysis was performed with all the statistically significant independent variables on the dependent variable self-leadership.

Data Sample

Data were collected during the Spring and Summer of 1999. Mailing of the first surveys occurred July 19, 1999. Fifty-three subjects returned the questionnaires, approximately 23% of the sample. A reminder postcard was sent on July 26, 1999, generating an additional 44 responses or 19% of the sample. A second survey packet was sent on August 3, 1999 resulting in 14 usable questionnaires or 6% of the sample. A second reminder postcard was sent on August 10, 1999 resulting in an additional 16 surveys returned or 7% of the sample. A total of 127 of the possible 234 usable surveys were returned by the end of the data collection, resulting in a response rate of 54%.

Dealing With Low Response Rate

Several procedures were used to deal with the low response rate of the study. Miller and Smith (1983) defended that late respondents are similar to non-respondents. Therefore, 25% of the last respondents to the survey were statistically compared to 25% of the early respondents on all the variables. T-test between independent samples was used to perform the comparison between early and late respondents on dependent and independent interval variables. Table 4.1 shows that early and late respondents did not differ on the scores obtained for the interval dependent variable self-leadership, or on the interval independent variables of family satisfaction, social support, prior leadership experiences, and internal locus of control.
Table 4.2 shows the t-test between independent samples conducted with interval demographic variables of age, marital status duration, and number of children, between early and late respondents. Table 4.2 shows that early and late respondents were not statistically significantly different on these demographic interval variables. Table 4.3 shows that respondents were not statistically significantly different on independent nominal variable gender, nor on demographic nominal variables race, education, marital status, parenthood, childhood residence, current residence, Ohio residency, leadership training, allowance, and service period. Table 4.3 also shows that early and late respondents were significantly different only in service status (Phi = .31, p<.05). Due to the nature of the variables, measures related to nominal dichotomous variables used Phi coefficient, whereas measures related to nominal multichotomous variables used Cramer's V coefficient.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>181.50</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>190.03</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>593.47</td>
<td>277.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>568.31</td>
<td>234.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.89</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal locus of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>107.75</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$

Table 4.1: T-test Between Early and Late Respondents on Interval Dependent and Independent Variables
Table 4.2: T-test Between Early and Late Respondents on Demographic Interval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-.07 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>SHS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>D**</th>
<th>SHS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>D**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>married</th>
<th>separ</th>
<th>divor</th>
<th>widow</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>married</th>
<th>separ</th>
<th>divor</th>
<th>widow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenthood</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$

** SHS: Some high school
HS: High school
SC: Some college
AD: Associate degree
CB: Complete Bachelors
SG: Some graduate education
M: Masters degree
D: Doctoral degree

Table 4.3: Tests Between Early and Late Respondents in Nominal Variables
Table 4.3 (continued): Tests Between Early and Late Respondents in Nominal Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childhood residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>Rural: 5</td>
<td>Rural: 16.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.18 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small: 5</td>
<td>small: 16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medium: 11</td>
<td>medium: 35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suburb: 6</td>
<td>suburb: 19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large: 4</td>
<td>large: 12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>Rural: 6</td>
<td>Rural: 18.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.30 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small: 4</td>
<td>small: 12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medium: 8</td>
<td>medium: 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suburb: 6</td>
<td>suburb: 18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large: 8</td>
<td>large: 25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td>Rural: 4</td>
<td>Rural: 12.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.10 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small: 6</td>
<td>small: 19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medium: 11</td>
<td>medium: 35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suburb: 4</td>
<td>suburb: 12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large: 6</td>
<td>large: 19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td>Rural: 4</td>
<td>Rural: 12.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.31 a*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small: 2</td>
<td>small: 6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medium: 9</td>
<td>medium: 28.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suburb: 3</td>
<td>suburb: 9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large: 14</td>
<td>large: 43.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio residency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 29</td>
<td>Yes: 93.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>no: 2</td>
<td>no: 6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 28</td>
<td>Yes: 87.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no: 4</td>
<td>no: 12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>First: 24</td>
<td>First: 77.4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second: 7</td>
<td>Second: 22.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>First: 15</td>
<td>First: 46.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second: 17</td>
<td>Second: 53.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal: 8</td>
<td>Formal: 25.8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal: 12</td>
<td>Informal: 38.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None: 2</td>
<td>None: 6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Form &amp; Inf: 9</td>
<td>Form &amp; Inf: 29.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal: 6</td>
<td>Formal: 18.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal: 14</td>
<td>Informal: 43.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None: 1</td>
<td>None: 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Form &amp; Inf: 11</td>
<td>Form &amp; Inf: 34.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 26</td>
<td>Yes: 83.9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>no: 5</td>
<td>no: 16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 27</td>
<td>Yes: 90</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no: 3</td>
<td>no: 10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full: 25</td>
<td>Full: 80.6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>part(900): 4</td>
<td>part(900): 12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part(450): -</td>
<td>part(450): 6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part(900/2 yrs): 2</td>
<td>part(900/2 yrs): 26.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full: 18</td>
<td>Full: 69.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part(900): 7</td>
<td>part(900): 26.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part(450): 1</td>
<td>part(450): 3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>part(900/2 yrs): -</td>
<td>part(900/2 yrs): -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$

a = Phi coefficient

b = Cramer's V coefficient
The analysis between early and late respondents allowed the researcher to conclude that there was no significant difference between the two groups in any of the dependent and independent interval variables, as well as in any of the demographic interval and nominal variables, but in service status. Smith and Miller (1983) recommended to "double-dip" non-respondents, i.e., obtain a random sample (10 to 20%) of the non-respondents and use telephone or personal interviews to obtain data. Among 107 non-respondents, 20 subjects were selected among those whose telephone numbers were available. Two attempts were made to obtain their responses. First, the researcher called, and although respondents said they would send their questionnaires, none did. A second attempt to obtain data from non-respondents was made with the help of doctoral candidate John Soloninka, from the Department of Human and Community Resource Development. At this time, the objective of the call was just to try to obtain demographic data of non-respondents to compare with respondents. Mr. Soloninka was only able to reach four non-respondents after two attempts. Due to this limitation, results of this study can be only generalizable with caution to the target population of Americorps members in Ohio.

Description of Respondents

Gender, Race and Age

Table 4.4 shows that 74% of the respondents were female, and 26% were male; 31% of the respondents were African-Americans, 4% were Hispanic, 58% were Caucasians, 7% circled "other" and did not disclose their race. Thirteen percent of the
respondents were between the ages of 18 and 20, 50% were between 21 and 30 years of age, 21% were between 31 and 40, 10% were between 41 and 50, 3% were between 51 and 60, and 4% were between the ages of 61 to 68. The mean age of respondents was 30.22 years (sd = 11.51).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean$^a$ = 30.22  Sd$^a$ = 11.51

$^a$ = Summary statistics calculated using raw data.

Table 4.4: Gender, Race and Age of Respondents
Respondents’ Education, Marital Status and Marital Status Duration

Table 4.5 indicates that 4% of the respondents had some high school, 13% completed high school, 38% had some college, and 12% had an associate degree. Twenty-four percent of the respondents completed a bachelors degree, 4% had some graduate education, 2% held a masters degree, and 3% held a doctoral degree. Forty-six percent of the respondents had informal leadership training while 18% had formal leadership training. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents had both formal and informal leadership training, and 6% had no leadership training at all. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents were single, 30% were married or living with a partner, 2% were separated, 8% were divorced, and 2% were widowed. The mean of marital status duration for the sample was 19.11 years with a standard deviation of 12.45 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed bachelors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed masters degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed doctoral degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership training</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal training</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal training</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal and informal training</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or living with a partner</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status duration</th>
<th>Mean = 19.11</th>
<th>sd = 12.45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a = Summary statistics calculated using raw data.

Table 4.5: Education, Marital Status, and Marital Status Duration
Parenthood and Number of Children

Table 4.6 shows that 59% of respondents did not have children, whereas 41% had children. Twelve percent of the respondents had only one child, 15% had two children, 10% had three children, 2% had four children, 2% had five children, and 1% had seven children. Among those respondents with children, the average number of children was 2.27 (sd=1.25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenthood</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One child</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two children</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Mean}^a = 2.27 \quad \text{sd}^a = 1.25\]

\[a = \text{Summary statistics calculated using raw data.}\]
Childhood Residence, Current Residence, and Ohio residency

Table 4.7 demonstrates that 17% of the respondents lived in a rural environment or village (under 2,000 people) during their childhood. Fifteen percent of the respondents lived in small sized cities (2,000 – 19,999 people) and 26% lived in median sized cities (20,000 – 199,999 people). Eighteen percent of the respondents lived in the suburbs of a large city, and 24% lived in large cities (200,000 plus people). Regarding their current residence, 10% of the respondents lived in a rural area or village (under 2,000 people), and 15% lived in small sized cities (2,000 – 19,999). Twenty-seven percent of the respondents lived in medium sized cities (20,000 – 199,999 people), 12% lived in the suburbs of a large city, and 35% lived in large cities (200,000 plus people). Table 4.7 also shows that 90% of the respondents were residents in Ohio and 10% were not.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childhood residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/village</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium city</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs of a large city</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large city</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/village</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium city</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs of a large city</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large city</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio residency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio permanent resident</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an Ohio permanent resident</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Childhood Residence, Current Residence, and Ohio residency

**Respondents Status With Americorps**

Table 4.8 shows that 65% of the respondents were in the first year of service status with Americorps, while 35% are in the second year. Eighty-two percent of the respondents were receiving Americorps allowance, and 18% were not. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were working full time service period with Americorps (1700 hours/year), 17% were working part-time at 900 hours per year; 4% were working part-
time at 450 hours per year, and 2% were working part time at 900 hours per a two-year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service period</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time at 1700 hours/year</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time at 900 hours/year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time 450 hours/year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time at 900 hours/2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Respondents Status With Americorps

Respondents Scores on Selected Variables

Table 4.9 shows that respondents self-leadership mean score was 184.37, standard deviation of 26.54. The self-leadership scale ranges from 50 to 250, therefore the Americorps group scores were high, located on the second half of the scale, toward the upper end. Table 4.9 also shows that respondents stress mean score was 567.80 (sd=246.11). Respondents scored 30.95 (sd=6.62) in social support (scale ranged from 6
to 36). Respondents' score on family satisfaction was 44.94 (sd=13.18), and respondents' score on prior leadership experiences was 5.08 (sd=2.01). The mean score on internal locus of control was 108.83 (sd=10.41).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-leadership (scale 50-250)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress (scale 0-1,466)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>567.80</td>
<td>246.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family satisfaction (scale 15-70)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>13.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support (scale 6-36)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior leadership experiences (scale 0-10)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal locus of control (scale 83-138)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>108.83</td>
<td>10.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Respondents Scores on Selected Independent Variables

**Correlation Between Self-Leadership and Selected Nominal Variables**

Table 4.10 shows the correlations between self-leadership and demographic variables. Correlation coefficients vary according to the type of variables. Correlation between self-leadership (interval variable) and nominal dichotomous variables of gender, parenthood, Ohio residency, service status, and allowance, are indicated using the point...
bi-serial correlation coefficient. Correlation between self-leadership and nominal multichotomous variables of race, education, marital status, childhood residence, current residence, leadership training, and service period, are indicated using the Eta coefficient. None of the nominal variables had any significant correlation with self-leadership. Table 4.10 also shows that independent variable gender is positively correlated with leadership training (Cramer's V=.273, p<.05), and with allowance (Phi = -.257, p<.05). Nominal variable race was positively correlated with education (Cramer's V=.311, p<.05), and with parenthood (Cramer's V=.356, p<.01). Nominal variable marital status was positively related with parenthood (Cramer's V=.621, p<.05), and with current residence (Cramer's V=.260, p<.05). Nominal variable parenthood was negatively related with Ohio residency (Phi=-.215, p<.05). Nominal variable childhood residence was positively related with current residence (Cramer's V=.521, p<.01).
Table 4.10: Correlation Between Self-Leadership and Selected Nominal Variable

|                          | Y   | X1   | X2   | X3   | X4   | X5   | X6   | X7   | X8   | X9   | X10  | X11  | X12  |
|--------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Self-leadership (Y)     | 1.00|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Gender (X1)              | .119| a    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Race (X2)                | .134| b    | .238 | c    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Education (X3)           | .236| b    | .221 | c    | .311 | c*   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Marital status (X4)      | .133| b    | .127 | c    | .172 | c    | .279 | c    |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Parenthood (X5)          | -.133| a   | .000 | d    | .356 | c**  | .246 | c    | .621 | c*   |      |      |      |      |
| Childhood residence (X6) | .171| b    | .207 | c    | .222 | c    | .202 | c    | .206 | c    | .198 | c    |      |      |
| Current residence (X7)   | .208| b    | .238 | c    | .176 | c    | .252 | c    | .260 | c*   | .264 | c    | .521 | c**  |
| Ohio residency (X8)      | .076| a    | -.009| d    | .203 | c    | .245 | c    | .183 | c    | -.215| d*   | .151 | c    |
| Service status (X9)      | -.032| a  | .092 | d    | .108 | c    | .256 | c    | .148 | c    | .081 | d    | .164 | c    |
| Leadership training (X10)| .213| b    | .273 | c*   | .186 | c    | .251 | c    | .201 | c    | .167 | c    | .155 | c    |
| Allowance (X11)          | .025| a    | -.257| d*   | .188 | c    | .344 | c    | .099 | c    | -.040| d    | .102 | c    |
| Service period (X12)     | .118| b    | .114 | c    | .093 | c    | .257 | c    | .153 | c    | .175 | c    | .132 | c    |

* p < .05  ** p < .01

a = Point bi-serial correlation coefficient  
b = Eta coefficient  
c = Cramer's V coefficient  
d = Phi coefficient
Table 4.11 shows correlations between self-leadership and interval variables, indicated by Pearson's $r$ correlation coefficient. Self-leadership had a low statistically significant correlation with internal locus of control ($r = .175, p<.05$), with age ($r = -.244, p<.01$), with number of children ($r = -.272, p<.01$), and with duration of marital status ($r = -.272, p<.01$). Table 4.11 also shows that independent variables stress and prior leadership experiences were moderately correlated ($r=.368, p<.05$); family satisfaction was moderately correlated with social support ($r=.381, p<.05$), and low correlated with prior leadership experiences ($r=.197, p<.05$). Independent variable social support was moderately correlated with internal locus of control ($r=.213, p<.05$). Also, Table 4.11 shows that age was substantially correlated with number of children ($p=.652, p<.05$), and had a low positive correlation with duration of marital status ($p=.285, p<.05$).
Table 4.11: Correlation Between Self-Leadership and Selected Interval Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-leadership (Y)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (X1)</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family satisfaction (X2)</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support (X3)</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior leadership experiences (X4)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal locus of control (X5)</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.213*</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (X6)</td>
<td>-.244**</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (X7)</td>
<td>-.253**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.179*</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status duration (X8)</td>
<td>-.272**</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.214*</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at α=.05  ** Significant at α=.01
Multiple Regression of Internal Locus of Control

Age, Number of Children, and Marital Status Duration on Self-Leadership

The correlation matrix showed that the dependent variable self-leadership was correlated with independent variables internal locus of control ($r = .175$, $p < .05$), age ($r = .244$, $p < .01$), number of children ($r = .253$, $p < .01$), and marital status duration ($r = - .272$, $p < .01$). A stepwise multiple regression was then conducted with these four variables. Multiple regression aims at identifying which independent variables account for the variance in the dependent variable.

Table 4.12 shows that marital status duration and number of children were the most important variables in explaining variation in self-leadership. Both variables together explained 15% of the variance in the dependent variable self-leadership. Marital status duration alone explained 7% of the variance, and number of children alone explained 8% of the variance in the dependent variable self-leadership. Adjusted $R^2$ is the measure of goodness of fit of the model. Adjusted $R^2$ corrects the optimistic bias of the sample, i.e., it tells how much variance of the dependent variable would be explained if the regression equation had been derived in the population from which the sample was drawn (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black, 1995). The higher the value of Adjusted $R^2$ (closest to 1.00), the better the model is in explaining variance of the independent variable in the population. The Adjusted $R^2$ of the model indicated that only 13% of the variation in self-leadership in the population could be explained by the variables duration of marital status and number of children. Adjusted $R^2$ of the model indicated that this was not a good model to explain variance in self-leadership in the population of Ohio Americorps members.
Table 4.12: Stepwise Multiple Regression of Internal Control, Age, Number of Children, and Duration of Marital Status on Self-Leadership

The three assumptions about the residuals were not violated. Durbin-Watson statistics tested the independence (no auto-correlation) of the residuals. In the model of this study, the Durbin-Watson statistic was 2.103. Values near 2 indicate that residuals were not correlated with each other, i.e., they were independent. The second assumption regards that the mean of residuals distribution equals zero. This assumption was met and observed at the histogram of the regression standardized residuals. The third assumption, regarding the normal distribution of residuals was met, and observed in the histogram of regression standardized residuals. The fourth assumption regards the constant variance of residuals. When residuals of this study were plotted in the scatterplot of observed Y and predicted Y, the points scattered randomly along an horizontal line.
Collinearity

The correlation matrix (Table 4.10) raised a suspicion of multicollinearity, due to strong, moderate and low correlations between independent variables. Indeed, stress was correlated with prior leadership experiences (r= .368, p < .01), with age (r= .528, p< .01), and with number of children (r= .513, p < .01). Family satisfaction was correlated with social support (r= .381, p < .01), and with prior leadership opportunities (r= .197, p < .05). Social support was correlated with internal locus of control (r= .213, p < .05). Prior leadership experiences was correlated with age (r= .262, p < .01), and with number of children (r= .179, p < .05). Internal locus of control was correlated with marital status duration (r= -.214, p < .05) and age was correlated with number of children (r= .652, p < .01), and with marital status duration (r= .285, p < .01).

The Tolerance value of the model was .996, meaning that collinearity was not a problem. When Tolerance values are near 1, there is no concern for multicollinearity. Also, the VIF value was examined. VIF stands for Variance Inflation Factor, and it is "the measure of the effect of other predictor variables on a regression coefficient" (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black, 1995, p.152). Large VIF values, exceeding 10.0, show that there is a concern for multicollinearity. In the present model, VIF value was 1.004, indicating that there was no reason for concern with multicollinearity.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This was a descriptive-correlational study, with its main purpose being to explore the concept of self-leadership and identify variables that impacted self-leadership of Ohio Americorps members. Specific research objectives were to investigate how self-leadership was impacted by gender, stress, family satisfaction, social support, prior leadership experiences, and internal locus of control. Ohio Americorps was chosen as the target population due to the diversity of this group in terms of age, gender, social status and education, and also for their demonstrated leadership skills in taking the initiative to find ways to pursue additional education. Data were obtained through a survey questionnaire mailed to a representative random sample of 234 individuals of the target population. One hundred twenty-seven questionnaires were returned with usable data, representing 54% response rate. Low response rate was addressed by reminder postcards, second and third mailings and telephone calls. No extra data were obtained after the telephone calls. Early and late respondents were compared on demographic variables and no significant differences were found, except in service status, leading the researcher to suggest that despite the low response rate, results of this study can be generalized with caution to the target population.
Descriptive analysis of the data provided information of the main demographic characteristics of the population. Pearson's r was used to calculate correlations among interval independent variables and the dependent variable while point-biserial correlation coefficients were used to calculate correlations between nominal dichotomous demographic variables and the dependent interval variable self-leadership. Eta coefficients were used to calculate correlations between nominal multichotomous demographic variables and the dependent interval variable self-leadership. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify the unique variance explained by each independent variable significantly correlated with self-leadership.

Demographic Characteristics of the Population

The demographic variables addressed in this study were race, age, education, marital status, marital status duration, parenthood, number of children, childhood residence, current residence, Ohio residency, service status (with Ohio Americorps), leadership training, allowance, and service period (with Ohio Americorps). Of the 127 individuals who responded to the questionnaire, the majority were female (74%), and 26% were male. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents were Caucasians, 31% were African-Americans, 7% did not disclose their race by circling "Other," and 4% were Hispanic. The mean age of the respondents was 30.2 years, with the largest percentage (49%) of respondents being between 21 and 30 years of age, 21% being within 31 and 40 years old, and 13% were between 18 and 20 years of age. Ten percent of the respondents were between 41 and 50 years of age, 4% percent of the respondents were 61 years old or older, and 3% were between 51 to 60 years old. Almost 38% of the respondents had
some college while more than 24% completed their bachelors degrees. More than 12% completed high school and almost 12% had associate degrees. Almost 4% of the respondents had some graduate education, more than 2% held a masters degree, and over 3% held a doctoral degree.

The majority of the respondents (58%) were single, 30% were married or living with a partner, 8% were divorced, 2% were separated and 2% were widowed. The average duration of marital status was 19.11 years. Almost 60% did not have children, while those with children had an average of 2.27 children (sd=1.25). Over 15% had two children, 12% had only one child, almost 10% had three children while more than 2% had four children, almost 2% had five children, and less than 1% had seven children.

More than 26% of the respondents spent their youth in medium sized cities, 18% lived in the suburbs of a large sized city, and more than 17% lived in rural areas or small villages. More than 35% of respondents currently lived in large sized cities, more than 27% currently lived in medium sized cities, more than 15% lived in small sized cities, and over 12% were currently living in the suburbs of a large sized city. Almost 10% of the respondents were currently living in rural areas or small villages.

Over 90% of the respondents were permanent Ohio residents, 65% were in their first year of service status with Americorps, and 35% were in their second year. More than 46% of the respondents received informal leadership training, more than 28% received both formal and informal leadership training, over 18% received only formal leadership training, and more than 6% received no leadership training.

Eighty-two percent of the respondents were receiving an Americorps living allowance, more than 77% were working full time service period at 1,700 hours per year,
and more than 16% were working part-time at 900 hours per year. More than 4% were part-time service period at 450 hours per year and almost 2% were working part-time at 900 hours for a two-year period.

**Respondents' Scores on Variables Studied**

Self-leadership scores were calculated for the sample with a mean of 184.37 and a standard deviation of 26.54. Respondents' mean score on the independent variable stress was 567.80 (scale 0-1,466), standard deviation of 246.11. Respondents' score on family satisfaction was 44.94 (scale 14-70), standard deviation of 13.18. Respondents' mean score on social support was 30.95 (scale 6-36), standard deviation of 6.62. Mean score on prior leadership experiences was 5.08 (scale 0-10), standard deviation of 2.01. Finally, respondents' mean score on internal locus of control was 108.83 (scale 28-140), standard deviation of 10.41.

**Correlations and Multicollinearity**

Multiple correlation coefficients were calculated between the dependent variable, independent variables, and extraneous demographic variables. Demographic interval variables of age (Pearson's $r = -.244$, $p<.01$), marital status duration (Pearson's $r = -.272$, $p<.01$), and number of children (Pearson's $r = -.253$, $p<.01$) had a low negative correlation with self-leadership. No demographic nominal variable was correlated with self-leadership. Among the independent variables studied, only internal locus of control had a low positive significant correlation with self-leadership (Pearson $r = .175$, $p<.05$). Since the correlation matrix showed that some independent variables were highly...
correlated, the researcher analyzed collinearity statistics, and the results demonstrated that there was no concern for multicollinearity in this study.

**Differences Between Groups**

T-test was conducted to determine if there were significant differences in self-leadership related with gender, parenthood, Ohio residency, service status, or allowance. No significant differences were found. Analysis of variance was conducted to verify if there were differences in self-leadership among the different levels of demographic variables, and no differences were found in the self-leadership scores as related with race, education, marital status, childhood residency, current residency, leadership training, and service-period.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

A stepwise multiple regression analysis of the independent variable internal locus of control and the extraneous demographic interval variables of age, marital status duration, and number of children was calculated on the dependent variable self-leadership. The results showed that marital status duration and number of children were the most important variables in explaining the variation in the dependent variable self-leadership. Together they explained 15% of the variation in self-leadership. Duration of marital status alone explained 7% of the variance in self-leadership, whereas number of children alone explained 8% of the variance in self-leadership. The results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis demonstrated that for each year of marital status
duration respondents decreased 6 points in self-leadership score, and for each child respondents had their self-leadership score decreased 5 points.

Conclusions

Based on the literature review and the findings as related to the research objectives, the following conclusions are applicable to the population studied of Ohio Americorps members:

1. Male and female scored equally on the self-leadership questionnaire. There was no difference in self-leadership as related with gender.
2. Stress levels of respondents did not impact self-leadership.
3. The degree of respondents' family satisfaction did not impact their self-leadership.
4. Respondents' social support during childhood did not impact their self-leadership.
5. Respondents' prior leadership experiences did not impact their self-leadership.
6. Respondents with higher internal locus of control scored higher on self-leadership than respondents with lower internal locus of control. Internal locus of control positively impacted self-leadership.

Implications

One of the objectives of this study was to investigate factors that could impact self-leadership development. The researcher looked at factors that, according to the literature, impact leadership development, suggesting that these same factors could as well impact self-leadership development. This study demonstrated that the following factors that impact leadership did not impact self-leadership: stress, family satisfaction,
social support, and prior leadership experiences. This study confirmed, however, that internal locus of control impacts both leadership and self-leadership. Other variables that impacted self-leadership were the extraneous variables of age, marital status duration, and number of children. These three variables were negatively correlated with self-leadership, demonstrating that the older the individual, the more children one has, and the longer one stays in the same marital status, the lower one's self-leadership. Since these three factors were highly correlated, it is suggested that self-leadership is an inverse function of the passage of time, i.e., the older an individual, the less ability to make independent decisions, to trace individual plans for one's life, to follow one's own set of steps to reach one's individual goals, and the less self-observing one does. This has a major implication for educational programs for older adults. With the increase of the elderly population in the United States, there is an increasing need for them to maintain an independent life style. Through formal and informal education and training programs, the self-leadership skills of older adults can be improved.

Fiedler (1995) suggested that age and life experiences contribute to enhance individuals' leadership skills. This current study demonstrated that age and experience negatively impact self-leadership. Therefore, leadership and self-leadership are different regarding the role that age and life experience play. Older and more experienced individuals use their experience to make decisions in life (Fiedler, 1995). Self-leadership supports the use of observed and socially learned experiences to which one adds rehearsal of ideal behaviors to obtain optimal results in terms of personal and professional effectiveness (Manz, 1983). This study demonstrated that maybe rehearsal plays a more important role in self-leadership than do observed and socially learned experiences.
because older individuals, supposedly those who had more extensive life experiences, scored lower in self-leadership.

Older individuals may be more tolerant with their own mistakes, therefore self-reward and self-punishment may not play a decisive role in controlling one's behavior as suggested in the self-leadership theory (Manz and Neck, 1991). Also, older individuals may become aware of personal interdependence and tend to make less decisions alone, but rather incorporate others' priorities. The results of this study suggested that maybe self-leadership is more present in younger ages, when individuals are still establishing personal identity, building their careers, and developing professional and personal lives.

Locus of control relates to where individuals place the causality of events that happen in one's life. Individuals with an internal locus of control perceive their lives as being controlled by themselves and their actions. Individuals with external locus of control perceive their lives as being controlled by other people's actions and external events (Duttweiler, 1984). The score of the sample in this study was in the upper half of the scale suggesting that the sample has a high internal locus of control. According to Duttweiler (1984), author of the Internal Control Index, the higher one's score in the Internal Control Index, the higher one's internal locus of control. As Holst (1990) pointed out, leadership effectiveness is related with an individual's personal control on the outcomes of one's own actions. Skinner (1992) theorized that internal control, along with self-awareness, impacts on people's leadership skills. The results of this current study confirm Holst (1990) and Skinner (1992) theories that individuals with higher internal locus of control have higher scores in self-leadership. Leadership and self-leadership are therefore similar in that they relate with the belief that one can make choices and act upon
those choices, rather than believing that one's life is controlled by other people or external events.

The sample's stress level mean of 567.80 indicated that the stress level of this particular population was high. Holmes and Rahe (1967) indicated that stress levels over 300 imply a 79% risk of developing stress related illness within a one year period. Noble, Subotnik, and Arnold (1996) noticed that the presence of stressful events in life is particularly relevant for leadership development. Williams (1985) found that the perception of stress increases with age. In the current study, stress level was not significantly correlated with self-leadership. This study demonstrated that although stress may be highly correlated with leadership skills development, it does not affect self-leadership. The findings of the current study demonstrate, therefore, that even in the presence of stressful circumstances, experience does not play an important role in affecting self-leadership.

The negative correlation between self-leadership and duration of marital status, i.e., the longer one remains in the same marital status, whatever marital status it is, the lower one's self-leadership. In this study, since duration of marital status was also highly correlated with age, it is suggested that what really negatively affects self-leadership development is actually the passage of time rather than marital status duration itself.

The same observation is valid about the negative correlation between self-leadership and number of children. Since the number of children was highly correlated with age, it could be expected that the same relationship occurs between number of children and self-leadership as it occurs between age and self-leadership. Another consideration is that parenting itself may require individuals to seek collective support, as
opposed to self-leaders who tend to be self-sufficient decision-makers. Parenting
generally implies the presence of family in a nuclear basis or extended basis around the
individual. By providing the necessary support for childbearing, families also emphasize
a collaborative decision making process as opposed to individualistic decision making
initiatives.

The fact that family satisfaction and social support were not related to self-
leadership suggests that a difficult childhood in terms of family and social environment
may not be a factor impeding individuals to succeed in life. Even though Kovach (1988)
theorized that leaders were more likely to come from families who provided strong
attention and support, this does not seem to be a factor in this study of self-leadership.
Regarding social support, Gaitley (1996) argued that individuals with supportive social
environments had enhanced people skills and conflict resolution skills. As this study
demonstrated, social support does not play a role in developing an individual's self-
leadership skills.

This study found that gender does not impact self-leadership as opposed to what
the literature reports regarding leadership. Rosener (1990) described how women's
nurturing and caring style still do not fit in today's workplace leadership requirements.
Rosener (1990) argued that today's desirable leadership traits in the workplace are still
defined as objectivity, assertiveness, fast decision making, and high risk taking. Women
usually lack these traits (Carr-Ruffino, 1993; Pheterson, 1990). Thus, whereas gender
impacts leadership style and levels, this study demonstrated that it does not impact self-
leadership.
The stepwise multiple regression analysis demonstrated that among the variables discussed above, the most important in determining self-leadership were marital status duration followed by number of children. The findings of this study contributed to clarify that variables affecting leadership such as stress, family satisfaction, social support, and prior leadership experiences do not impact self-leadership. This study demonstrated, however, that internal locus of control as well as the passage of time in individuals' life impact self-leadership.

**Recommendations**

Based on the literature review and the findings of this study, the researcher recommends that Ohio Americorps coordinators:

- Provide stress reduction training for Ohio Americorps members.
- Give increased autonomy to Ohio Americorps members since they can work without constant supervision.
- Use a transformational leadership style that emphasizes ethics, long-term goals, and individual self-fulfillment.
- Assign equal responsibilities for men and women Americorps members.
- Provide more training for older members to improve their personal and professional effectiveness in decision making and controlling of one's personal tasks outcomes.
- Use an interaction-expectation leadership style, in which the interdependency between leaders and followers is emphasized.
- Place younger members in tasks that emphasize individual decision making, and place older members in tasks that require stronger group decision making skills or in which team participation is needed.
• Implement a team work approach to enhance productivity and effectiveness, since the current study demonstrated that people with high self-leadership positively influence themselves and each other when working in groups.

• Should not be influenced by the applicants being from an "at risk" population when selecting Americorps members.

Recommendations for Further Study

• To replicate this study with other populations for confirmation of findings.

• This study used a quantitative design approach, therefore it is recommended that other studies be conducted using a qualitative approach such as individual or small group interviews in order to further explore factors that may contribute to self-leadership development.

• It is recommended that a qualitative study addressing female self-leadership be conducted to verify factors that may exclusively impact women's self-leadership development.

• An unexpected response of citing a spiritual source for social support came from several respondents. Therefore, further research could investigate the impact that spirituality has on self-leadership.

• It is recommended that an adult educational organization such as Ohio State University Extension develop a training program to improve self-leadership of older adults; the impact of this program should be evaluated to determine its effect on self-leadership.
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- Myra Carpenter, LINCS - Linking Individuals in Community Service
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- Janet George, America Reads Literacy Corps
- Ann Higdon, Southern Ohio Americorps YouthBuild
- Cathy Johnston, Americorps Houses the Homeless
- Tim Katz, Children of the Future
- Renee Kolby, Americorps Serving Northwest Ohio
- Lynn Krause, Ohio AppalCORPS
- Virginia Leskanic, Ohio Reads Early - Youngstown
- Emmy Levine, City Year Cleveland
- David Weaver, Public Allies
- Thomas Meyer, Greater Cleveland Habitat for Humanity
- Joyce Quinlivan, Homelessness Prevention & Housing Opportunity Project
- Nancy Redding, Centralized Family Plan
- Ryan Schmiesing, Ohio Teen B.R.I.D.G.E.S. (Building Responsibility in Drivers Through Growth in Self Esteem and Safety)
- Nancy Shell, ComCorps
- Ralph Sinistro, National Farmworkers Training and Service Program
- Judy Tensing, Notre Dame Americorps
- Jody Tully, Youth and Communities in Partnership
- Heidi Turner, Americorps for Literacy and Math
- Sharon Wise, Ohio Reads Early
- Brother Ed Zamierowski, S.W.E.A.T - Serve With Energy and Talent
- Jose Estremera, West Side Ecumenical Ministry
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FOR THE RESEARCH PROJECT
April 19, 1999

Jo M. Jones
Associate Professor
Human and Community Resource Development
03 Agricultural Administration Bldg.
2120 Fyffe Rd.
Campus

99E0111 FACTORS IMPACTING ON SELF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT, Jo M. Jones, Ana L. Kazan, Human and Community Resource Development

Dear Professor Jones:

I am enclosing the approval letter for the research project to be conducted by you and Ms. Kazan.

Please note that subjects in this project must be 18 years of age or older. Also, please edit the questionnaire for minor grammatical and spelling errors before sending it to the subjects.

Good luck with your research!

Sincerely,

Jaye Kelsey
Office of Research Risks Protection
614/292-6950
APPENDIX C
INSTRUMENT
NAVIGATING THROUGH THE ROUGH AND CALM WATERS OF LIFE

Your heart is a boat with hoisted sails.
Its destiny is to navigate
Through rough and calm waters,
To meet pirates and adventurers,
To become adrift,
To risk through winds, fog, storms,
And to open its hold.

Brazilian composer Ivan Lins, in the music Velas Içadas (Hoisted Sails).
Section 1 – Choosing the Best Route

The first section of this questionnaire includes 50 statements. Each one describes a certain activity, behavior, or way of thinking. Read each statement carefully. Try to decide how true the statement is in describing you: Completely, Mostly, Somewhat, A Little, or Not At All. For each item please circle the number that corresponds to the appropriate description. For example, if you think that the statement is completely accurate in describing you, circle 5. Please fill out the questionnaire accurately and efficiently (usually your first reaction to the statement is the most accurate, so try not to agonize over individual statements).

Key
1. Not at all
2. Somewhat Accurate
3. A Little Accurate
4. Mostly Accurate
5. Completely Accurate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat Accurate</th>
<th>A Little Accurate</th>
<th>Mostly Accurate</th>
<th>Completely Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. I sometimes try to describe out loud my mental images of successfully performing tasks.

17. I openly articulate and evaluate my own assumptions when I have a disagreement with someone else.

18. Sometimes I find I am talking out loud to myself to help me deal with difficult problems I face.

19. I keep a record of my progress on tasks.

20. I establish specific goals for my own performance.

21. I try to surround myself with objects and people that bring out my desirable behaviors.

22. When I do an assignment especially well, I like to treat myself to something or activity I especially enjoy.

23. I restrain myself from doing things I enjoy when I am not satisfied with my performance.

24. I try to build activities into my work that I like doing.

25. I try to verbalize or write down my beliefs about difficult situations I face and evaluate whether they are valid.

26. When I am in difficult situations I will sometimes talk out loud to myself to help me get through it.

27. I usually am aware of how well I am doing as I perform an activity.

28. I think about the goals I intend to achieve in the future.

29. I feel guilt when I perform a task poorly.

30. Sometimes I picture in my mind a successful performance before I actually do a task.

31. I think about my own beliefs and assumptions whenever I encounter a difficult situation.

32. I consciously have goals in mind for my work efforts.

33. I use mental reminders to help me remember what I need to do.

34. After I perform well on an activity, I feel good about myself.

35. I tend to get down on myself in my mind when I have performed poorly.
36. I try to be aware of which activities in my work I especially enjoy.  

37. I purposefully visualize myself overcoming the challenges I face.  

38. I try to mentally evaluate the accuracy of my own beliefs about situations I am having problems with.  

39. I deliberately try to think about what I am saying to myself.  

40. I pay attention to how well I am doing in my work.  

41. I set specific goals in my mind for my immediate task efforts.  

42. I sometimes use mental tricks (e.g. forming a word from task's initials) to help me remember what I need to get done.  

43. I mentally congratulate myself for my success.  

44. I tend to be tough on myself in my thinking when I have not done well on a task.  

45. I focus my thinking on the pleasant rather than the unpleasant feelings I have about my job activities.  

46. I use my imagination to picture myself performing well on important tasks.  

47. I think about and evaluate the beliefs and assumptions I hold.  

48. I seek out alternatives for action that provide opportunities rather than dwelling on potential obstacles.  

49. I give myself pep-talks to convince myself I can do it.  

50. I like to act to solve problems by myself.  

Section II - Through Streams, Through Storms, Through Hot Sun

1. The Many Tides - THINK ABOUT EVERYTHING THAT HAS HAPPENED THROUGHOUT YOUR LIFE.  

Please circle the items that you have experienced during your life so far.  Circle as many as apply.  

1. Death of spouse  
2. Divorce  
3. Marital separation  
4. Jail term  
5. Death of close family member  
6. Personal injury or illness  
7. Marriage  
8. Fired at work  
9. Marital reconciliation  
10. Retirement  
11. Change in health of family member  
12. Pregnancy
13. Sexual difficulties
14. Gain of new family member
15. Business readjustment
16. Change in financial status
17. Death of a close friend
18. Change to a different line of work
19. Change in number of arguments with spouse
20. Mortgage over $80,000
21. Foreclosure of a mortgage/loan
22. Change in responsibilities at work
23. Son or daughter leaving home
24. Trouble with in-laws
25. Outstanding personal achievement
26. Spouse begin or stop working
27. Begin or end school
28. Change in living conditions
29. Revision of personal habits
30. Trouble with boss
31. Change in work hours or conditions
32. Change in residence
33. Change in schools
34. Change in recreation
35. Change in church
36. Change in social activities
37. Mortgage/loan less than $80,000
38. Change in sleeping habits
39. Change in number of family get-togethers
40. Change in eating habits
41. Vacations
42. Christmas
43. Minor violations of the law

2. Your Crew - THINK ABOUT THE FAMILY OF YOUR CHILDHOOD

Please rate HOW SATISFIED YOU WERE in the following items as they apply to the family you grew up with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 = Generally Satisfied</th>
<th>4 = Very Satisfied</th>
<th>5 = Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

HOW SATISFIED WERE YOU...

1. With how close you felt to the rest of your family?
2. With your ability to say what you wanted in your family?
3. With your family's ability to try new things?
4. With how often your parents made decisions in your family?
5. With how much your mother and father argued with each other?
6. With how fair the criticism was in your family?
7. With the amount of time you spent with your family?
8. With the way you talked together to solve family problems?
9. With your freedom to be alone when you wanted to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW SATISFIED WERE YOU...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>Generally satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. With how strictly you stayed with who did what chores in your family?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. With your family's acceptance of your friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. With how clear was it what your family expected of you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. With how often you made decisions as a family, rather than individually?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. With the number of fun things your family did together?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Sharing The Ocean - THINK ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT OF YOUR CHILDHOOD

The following questions ask about people who provided you with help or support in the environment you grew up. For the first part, list all the people you knew, excluding yourself, whom you could count for help or support in the manner described. Give the persons' initials, and their relationship to you (see example). Do not list more than one person next to each of the numbers beneath the question. For the second part, circle how satisfied you were with the overall support you had. If you had no support for a question, check the words "No one," but still rate your level of satisfaction. Do not list more than nine persons per question. Please answer all the questions as best as you can. All your responses will be kept confidential.

**EXAMPLE:**

| Who did you know whom you could trust with information that could get you in trouble? |
| No one | 1) T.N. (brother) | 4) T.N. (father) | 7) |
| 2) L.M. (friend) | 5) L.M. (employer) | 8) |
| 3) R.S. (friend) | 6) | 9) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied?</th>
<th>6 - very satisfied</th>
<th>5 - fairly satisfied</th>
<th>4 - a little satisfied</th>
<th>3 - a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 - fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>1 - very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Whom could you really count on to be dependable when you needed help?

| No one | 1) | 4) | 7) |
| 2) | 5) | 8) |
| 3) | 6) | 9) |

2. How satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 - very satisfied</th>
<th>5 - fairly satisfied</th>
<th>4 - a little satisfied</th>
<th>3 - a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 - fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>1 - very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Whom could you really count on to help you feel more relaxed when you were under pressure or tense?

| No one | 1) | 4) | 7) |
| 2) | 5) | 8) |
| 3) | 6) | 9) |
4. **How satisfied?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 - very satisfied</th>
<th>5 - fairly satisfied</th>
<th>4 - a little satisfied</th>
<th>3 - a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 - fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>1 - very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. **Who accepted you totally, including both your worst and your best points?**

   No one | 1) | 2) | 3) | 4) | 5) | 6) | 7) | 8) | 9) |

6. **How satisfied?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 - very satisfied</th>
<th>5 - fairly satisfied</th>
<th>4 - a little satisfied</th>
<th>3 - a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 - fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>1 - very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. **Whom could you really count on to care about you, regardless of what was happening to you?**

   No one | 1) | 2) | 3) | 4) | 5) | 6) | 7) | 8) | 9) |

8. **How satisfied?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 - very satisfied</th>
<th>5 - fairly satisfied</th>
<th>4 - a little satisfied</th>
<th>3 - a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 - fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>1 - very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. **Whom could you really count on to help you feel better when you were feeling generally down-in-the-dumps?**

   No one | 1) | 2) | 3) | 4) | 5) | 6) | 7) | 8) | 9) |

10. **How satisfied?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 - very satisfied</th>
<th>5 - fairly satisfied</th>
<th>4 - a little satisfied</th>
<th>3 - a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 - fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>1 - very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. **Whom could you count on to console you when you were very upset?**

   No one | 1) | 2) | 3) | 4) | 5) | 6) | 7) | 8) | 9) |

12. **How satisfied?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 - very satisfied</th>
<th>5 - fairly satisfied</th>
<th>4 - a little satisfied</th>
<th>3 - a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 - fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>1 - very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. **Winds of Opportunity - THINK ABOUT EVERYTHING YOU HAVE DONE IN YOUR LIFE:**

Check if you have been or are currently involved in providing leadership for activities, programs or committees with the following (please check all that apply):

- a. Volunteer work for your local community
- b. Volunteer work in a state organization
- c. Volunteer work in a national organization
- d. Parent/teacher (PTA) organization activities
- e. Volunteer work in schools
- f. Church/temple activities
- g. Leadership in workplace
- h. Leadership in social club or organization
- i. Consumer action group
- j. Other _____________________________
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5. Steering Your Boat

Instructions:
Please read each statement. Where there is a blank ____ decide what your normal or usual attitude, feeling or behavior would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) RARELY</th>
<th>(B) OCCASIONALLY</th>
<th>(C) SOMETIMES</th>
<th>(D) FREQUENTLY</th>
<th>(E) USUALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(less than 10% of the time)</td>
<td>(About 30% of the time)</td>
<td>(About half of the time)</td>
<td>(About 70% of the time)</td>
<td>(More than 90% of the time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course there are always unusual situations in which this would not be the case, but think of what you would do or feel in most normal situations. Then, write the equivalent letter of that feeling in the blank:

1. When faced with a problem I ____ try to forget it.
2. I ____ need frequent encouragement from others for me to keep working at a difficult task.
3. I ____ like jobs where I can make decisions and be responsible for my own work.
4. I ____ change my opinion when someone I admire disagrees with me.
5. If I want something I ____ work hard to get it.
6. I ____ prefer to learn the facts about something from someone else rather than have to dig them out for myself.
7. I will ____ accept jobs that require me to supervise others.
8. I ____ have a hard time saying "no" when someone try to sell me something I don't want.
9. I ____ like to have a say in any decisions made by any group I'm in.
10. I ____ consider the different sides of an issue before making any decisions.
11. What other people think ____ has a great influence on my behavior.
12. Whenever something good happens to me I ____ feel it is because I earned it.
13. I ____ enjoy being in a position of leadership.
14. I ____ need someone else to praise my work before I am satisfied with what I've done.
15. I am ____ sure enough of my opinions to try and influence others.
16. When something is going to affect me I ____ learn as much about it as I can.
17. I ____ decide to do things on the spur of the moment.
18. For me, knowing I've done something well is ____ more important than being praised by someone else.
19. I ____ let other people's demands keep me from doing things I want to do.
20. I ____ stick to my opinions when someone disagrees with me.
21. I ___do what I feel like doing not what other people think I ought to do.
22. I ___get discouraged when doing something that takes a long time to achieve results.
23. When part of a group I ___prefer to let other people make all the decisions.
24. When I have a problem I ___follow the advice of friends or relatives.
25. I ___enjoy trying to do difficult tasks more than I enjoy trying to do easy tasks.
26. I ___prefer situations where I can depend on someone else's ability rather than just my own.
27. Having someone important tell me I did a good job is ___more important to me than feeling I've done a good job.
28. When I'm involved in something I ___try to find out all I can about what is going on even when someone else is in charge.

Section III - Identify your Boat
Please circle the letter or place a check mark (✓) in the blank in front of the answer that most accurately describes you.

1. Gender (Please circle one)
   a. Male   b. Female

2. In which of the following groups do you place yourself? Circle the one that applies:
   a. African-American
   b. Asian-American
   c. Hispanic-American
   d. Native American
   e. White (Caucasian)
   f. Other (specify): __________________________

3. Your age? ______

4. Highest level of education completed (Circle only one).
   a. Some high school
   b. Completed high school
   c. Some college
   d. Associate Degree
   e. Completed Bachelor's Degree
   f. Some Graduate Education
   g. Completed Master's Degree
   h. Completed Doctoral Degree
5. Are you (Please, circle only one): For how long:
   a. Single (never married)
   b. Married or living with a partner
   c. Separated
   d. Divorced
   e. Widow

6. Do you have children? If "yes," how many?
   __No  __Yes (number of children)

7. Up to the age of 18, in what type of locale did you spend the majority of your youth?
   __ Rural/village/small town (under 2,000 people)
   __ Small city (2,000-19,999 people)
   __ Medium city (20,000-199,999 people)
   __ Suburbs of a large city
   __ Large city (200,000+ people)

8. In what type of locale do you live now?
   __ Rural/village/small town (under 2,000 people)
   __ Small city (2,000-19,999 people)
   __ Medium city (20,000-199,999 people)
   __ Suburbs of a large city
   __ Large city (200,000+ people)

9. Are you a permanent resident in Ohio?
   __Yes  __No

10. What year of service are you?
    __ First
        __ Second

11. Have you had? (check all that apply):
    __ formal training on leadership (classes in school)
    __ non-formal training (seminars, workshops, in-service)
    __ no training on leadership

12. Are you receiving an AmeriCorps living allowance?
    __Yes  __No
13. As an Ohio Americorps member, are you:

[_] Full-time (1700 hrs/year)
[_] Part-time (900 hrs/year)
[_] Part-time (450 hrs/year)
[_] Part-time (900 hrs/2 years)

A Gift For You

As a way to thank you, the researcher would like to offer your personal scores in this questionnaire. The scores will help you to identify your particular personal circumstances regarding self-leadership, stress, family and community support, locus of control, and past leadership experiences. By knowing yourself better you can develop self-awareness and become a better self-leader. Please mark with an X the square below to indicate your desire to receive your scores with a brief analysis and position in reference to the larger group.

Once again, thank you very much!

RETURN BY August 16, 1999 TO:
Ana Lucia Kazem
OSU Leadership Center
109 Agricultural Administration Bldg.
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210 (PLEASE USE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE)
Thank you!

Please, return by: AUGUST 16, 1999

To:
Ana Lucia Kazan
The Ohio State University Leadership Center
109 Agricultural Administration Building
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone #: 614/292-0991

Code: ___________
APPENDIX D
AUTHORIZATION LETTERS
CONGRATULATIONS ON YOUR CANDIDACY!
KEEP US INFORMED OF YOUR PROGRESS.

BEST OF SUCCESS,
JOE ANDERSON
Dear Ms Kazan,


Thank you for your letter of 30 April 1999. I hereby grant you permission to use and adapt the Holmes and Rahe Social Readjustment Scale in your instrument, as described in your letter for your doctoral dissertation research.

Unfortunately, I am unable to send you a copy of the above mentioned material for logistical reasons since we deal with permissions for over 1200 journals. However, you may purchase a copy of this journal issue by contacting the following address:

Elsevier Science
Regional Sales Office
Customer Support Department
PO Box 945
New York, NY 10159-0945
USA

Tel: (+1) 212 633 3730
Toll Free number for North-American customers:
1-888-4ES-INFO (437-4636)
Fax: (+1) 212 633 3680
E-mail: usinfo-Frances Rothwell (Mrs)-@elsevier.com

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Frances Rothwell (Mrs)
Subsidiary Rights Manager
May 3, 1999

Ana Kazan
Ohio State University
109 Agricultural Administration Bldg.
2120 Fyffe Rd.
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Ana,

I received your letter requesting permission to adapt the Family Satisfaction Scale for your Doctoral research. The scale will still be an effective tool for your research if you change it to be directed toward "the family you grew up with" and you have our permission to do so. We would greatly appreciate a copy of your dissertation once it is completed. Thank you and good luck with your project.

Sincerely,

Luke Knutson
Family Inventories Project
Life Innovations
May 25, 1999

Ms. Anna Kazan  
Doctoral Candidate  
The Ohio State University  
109 Agricultural Administration Bldg.  
2120 Fyffe Road  
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Ana,

You have my permission to modify the SSQ for your research and to use the instrument.

Good luck!

Sincerely,

Irwin G. Sarason  
Professor

bj
Dear Ana:

You may use the Internal Control Index in your doctoral studies. Good luck!

Pat

Patricia Cloud Duttweiler
Assistant Director
National Dropout Prevention Center, Clemson University
205 Martin Street, Clemson, SC 29634-5111
(864) 656-2599  email: DUTTWEP@CLEMSON.EDU
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PANEL OF EXPERTS
April 16, 1999

TO:  Dr. Dale Safrit
     Dr. Gail Gunderson
     Dr. Gwen Wolford
     Chad Wykle

     Judy Overly
     Kitty Burcesu
     Clair Young
     Chet Bowling

FR:   Dr. Jo Jones
       Associate Professor
       Department of Human and
       Community Resource Development

       Ana Lucia Kazan
       Doctoral candidate
       Department of Human and
       Community Resource Development

RE:   PANEL OF EXPERTS - SELF-LEADERSHIP STUDY

Self-leadership is a process of self-influence, with which individuals can direct and
strengthen efforts for personal and professional effectiveness. We are conducting a study
to identify the factors that impact on self-leadership, and wanted to ask you to please
review the attached instrument as part of the Panel of Experts. The dependent variable of
this study is individual rate in the self-leadership questionnaire. The independent
variables are family environment, community environment, stressful events in life, locus
of control, and prior experiences with leadership.

The population we will be studying are the members of Ohio Americorps. A field-test
and a pilot test will be conducted as soon as we receive your comments back.

Please feel free to write on the questionnaire. All your comments will be welcomed,
particularly those referring to face and content validity. Also, please make sure that you
comment on the length of the questionnaire, as well as how long it took for you to
complete it. We would appreciate if you return the instrument with your comments by
April 23. Please use the enclosed self-addressed envelope and the campus mail system to
return the package.

Your contribution to this study is very much appreciated. If you have any questions,
please do not hesitate in contacting Ana Kazan, at 292-0991, or in Room 109 Agricultural
Administration Bldg., 2120 Fyffe Road.

Thank you for your time.
May 21, 1999

TO: Cassandra Caldwell
Marjorie Moore
Jaime Castillo
Anna Mudukuti
Warren Flood
John Soloninka
Beth Flynn

FROM: Dr. Jo Jones
Ana Lucia Kazan
Associate Professor
Doctoral candidate
Department of Human and Community Resource Development
Department of Human and Community Resource Development

RE: FIELD TEST - SELF-LEADERSHIP STUDY

Self-leadership is a process of self-influence to achieve an optimal state of motivation and self-direction. The goal of self-leadership is to maximize one's potential to live a self-fulfilling life in both professional and personal areas. I am conducting my doctoral research project to investigate selected factors that impact on self-leadership development, and wanted to ask you please to review the attached instrument as part of the Field Test. The dependent variable of this study is individual score in the self-leadership questionnaire. The independent variables are family environment, community environment, stressful events in life, locus of control, and prior experiences in leadership.

The population I will be studying are the members of Ohio Americorps. A pilot test with a sample of the population will be conducted as soon as I receive your comments.

Please feel free to write on the questionnaire. All your comments will be welcomed, particularly those referring to face and content validity. Also, please make sure that you comment on the length of the questionnaire, as well as how long it took you to complete. I would appreciate if you return the instrument with your comments by June 1st. Please use the enclosed self-addressed envelope and the campus mail system to return the package.

Your contribution to this study is very much appreciated. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate in contacting Ana Kazan, at 292-0991, or e-mail kazan.l@osu.edu.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND SUPPORT
APPENDIX G
COVER LETTER FIRST MAILING
July 19, 1999

Dear .............,

Have you ever wondered why some of us make better decisions for our lives, while others struggle in each step? The set of skills that promote effectiveness in making decisions, being focused and motivated to conduct one's own life, and choosing the best routes for oneself is called self-leadership. I am a doctoral candidate at The Ohio State University conducting research on factors that impact on individual's self-leadership development.

Although your participation is voluntary, I invite you to please take approximately 30 minutes of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. You are part of a group of individuals who have been randomly chosen among all Ohio AmeriCorps members to participate in this study. The reason I am studying AmeriCorps members is because you have already demonstrated significant leadership skills by choosing an effective route to continue your education. All answers are strictly confidential and I will be the only one with access to your name and data. The questionnaires are coded only to allow follow-up with non-respondents. This research has been approved by Kitty Burcsu and Judy Overly of the Ohio Governor's Community Service Council, who provided access to the Ohio AmeriCorps database.

As a thank you gift for those who complete the questionnaire by the deadline of JULY 30, I am offering you not only the enclosed OSU pencil, but also the opportunity to be placed in a drawing to win one of 10 beautiful OSU sweatshirts. A third and maybe more important gift I would like to offer you is the opportunity to know your scores on the questionnaire. Knowing your scores will give you new insights on your personal circumstances, allow for internal growth, identification of personal goals, and ultimately self-leadership development.

Should you have any questions or concerns please call me at 614/292-0991. I will be happy to talk to you. Thank you for your consideration and your cooperation. I will look forward to hearing from you by JULY 30.

Sincerely,

Ana Kazan
Graduate Research Associate
Department of Human and Community Resources Development

Jo M. Jones, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Human and Community Community Resources Development, and Leadership and Learning Officer, OSU Extension
APPENDIX H
REMINDER POSTCARDS
AFTER FIRST MAILING
Dear Ohio AmeriCorps member,

Here I am standing with my empty hands, waiting for your response to the self-leadership questionnaire I sent to you last week. If you have already completed and returned it, please accept my most sincere "THANKS." If you haven't completed it yet, please don't wait any longer. Fill it out right now and return it to me in the envelope I enclosed for your convenience! I can no longer wait to draw the 10 OSU sweatshirts among those who completed both questionnaires. If you lost the questionnaire, please call me at 614/292-0991 and I will send you another one. I am looking forward to getting your envelope in the mail! Have a great week!

Ana Kazan, doctoral candidate
The Ohio State University
109 Agricultural Administration Building
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210
August 4, 1999

Dear

Remember me? I am the doctoral candidate at The Ohio State University conducting research on factors that impact on individual's self-leadership development. I sent you a letter on July 19, with a survey, some candy, an OSU pencil, and the opportunity to win one of 10 OSU sweat-shirts for those who responded to the questionnaire by July 30. The questionnaire is part of my research on self-leadership. Self-leadership is the set of skills that promote effectiveness in making decisions, being focused and motivated to conduct one's own life, and choosing the best routes for oneself.

Although your participation is voluntary, I want to invite you once again to please take approximately 30 minutes of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. As an incentive for your response, I now am offering a drawing for five OSU T-shirts, to those who return the questionnaire by August 16. Please, remember that you are part of a group of individuals who have been randomly chosen among all Ohio Americorps members to participate in this study. Americorps members were chosen because you already have demonstrated significant leadership skills by choosing an effective route to continue your education. All answers are strictly confidential and I will be the only one with access to your name and data. The questionnaires are coded only to allow follow-up with non-respondents. This research has been approved by Kitty Burcsu and Judy Overly of the Ohio Governor's Community Service Council, who provided access to the Ohio Americorps database.

You are very important to my research, and besides the OSU T-shirts, I am also offering, as a thank you gift, the opportunity for you to receive your scores on the questionnaire. Knowing your scores will give you new insights on your personal circumstances, allow for internal growth, identification of personal goals, and ultimately self-leadership development.

Please do not hesitate in calling me at 614/292-0991 should you have any questions or concerns. I will be happy to talk with you. Thank you for your consideration and your cooperation. I will look forward to hearing from you by August 16.

Sincerely,

Ana Kazan
Graduate Research Associate
Department of Human and Community Resources Development

Jo M. Jones, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Human and Community Resources Development, and Learning and Leadership Officer, OSU Extension

The Ohio State University, The United States Department of Agriculture, and County Commissioners Cooperating.
APPENDIX J
REMINDER POSTCARDS
SECOND MAILING
Dear Ohio Americorps member,

I have been looking for your questionnaire and just can't find it... If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire about self-leadership I sent to you last week, please accept my most sincere "THANKS." If you haven't completed it yet, please take a few moments to fill it out now and send it back to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope that was sent to you. If you lost the questionnaire, please call me at 614/ 292-0991 and I will send you another one. Don't forget, the OSU T-shirts are waiting for you! As soon as I receive your completed questionnaire, I'll put your name in the drawing.

I am looking forward to getting your envelope in the mail.

Have a great day!

Ana Kazan, doctoral candidate
The Ohio State University
109 Agricultural Administration Building
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210
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