INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN IMPLICIT THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP ABILITY AND SELF-EFFICACY

Predicting Responses to Stereotype Threat
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Extending research on implicit theories to the leadership domain, we examined how individual differences in belief about the malleability of leadership ability influenced responses to stereotype threat. The study consisted of two time periods. At time 1, we assessed individual differences in implicit theories of leadership ability and self-efficacy for leadership. At time 2, we activated a stereotype threat in a high-stakes environment. Results revealed that women reported lower self-evaluation after a stereotype threat when they had low self-efficacy and believed leadership ability to be fixed (entity theory) rather than malleable (incremental theory). Results are discussed in terms of how implicit theories generate a network of allied cognitions and emotions that subsequently predict stable patterns of behavior.

The most dangerous leadership myth is that leaders are born—that there is a genetic factor to leadership. This myth asserts that people simply either have certain charismatic qualities or not. That’s nonsense; in fact, the opposite is true. Leaders are made rather than born.

—Warren G. Bennis

Leadership has far-reaching consequences in business and society. However, in the United States relatively few elite positions of power are held by women (Eagly & Carli, 2007). This lack of representation of women in the upper echelons of American business and government is a social issue (e.g., Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hoyt & Blascovich,
It is a problem, we believe, that may be exacerbated by the “dangerous leadership myth” noted by Bennis (2003, 2007), a pioneer in the field of leadership studies. Specifically, we suggest that thinking of leadership as an innate trait may serve as a barrier to female leadership success. In contrast, believing that leadership ability can be developed may contribute to leadership aspirations for females who contend with debilitating suspicions of leadership inferiority (Aronson, Fried, & Good, 2002; Hoyt, 2005; Hoyt & Chemers, 2008). The goal of the current research is to examine how individual differences in beliefs about the malleable versus fixed nature of leadership ability contribute to the process of overcoming negative stereotypes. Specifically, we build on Dweck’s implicit theory framework (Dweck, 2009; Molden & Dweck, 2006) and extend it to a leadership context to explore responses to the stereotype that females are inferior leaders.

**Stereotype Threat**

Stereotype threat occurs when an individual is in a position to potentially confirm a negative stereotype that disparages the ability of members of his or her own social group. Stereotype threat can contribute to the underperformance of individuals belonging to a range of negatively stereotyped groups; for example, women on math tasks (e.g., Inzlicht & Ben-Zeev, 2000) or Latinos and African Americans on intellectual tasks (Aronson, Quinn, & Spencer, 1998; Gonzales, Blanton, & Williams, 2002; Steele & Aronson, 1995). The self-blame and loss of self-esteem seen by those suffering from stereotype threat can produce a vicious cycle of increased anxiety, feelings of despair, and subsequent poor performance. Because stereotypes are pervasive and difficult to change, researchers have begun to examine other ways to help individuals overcome stereotype threat (e.g., Heilman, 2001). In the current research, we focus on individual differences in implicit theories and self-efficacy for leadership as two relevant theoretical perspectives for understanding who overcomes stereotype threat.

**Implicit Theories**

Individuals hold implicit theories of diverse human characteristics (e.g., intelligence, personality), and these theories vary in the degree to which such characteristics are conceptualized as stable (entity theorists) versus changeable (incremental theorists; for a review see Molden & Dweck, 2006). Individual differences in implicit theories have been shown to have far-reaching consequences in the wake of challenges and setbacks. Across an array of domains including academics (e.g., Hong, Chiu, Dweck, Lin, & Wan, 1999), athletics (e.g., Ommundsen, 2003), and negotiation (e.g., Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007), results consistently reveal that individuals who hold incremental-oriented theories seek challenges, value effort, and persist in the face of obstacles. In contrast, individuals who hold entity-oriented theories avoid challenges, feel helpless, and resign when setbacks arise (Dweck, 2009).

Research indicates that stereotype threat can lead to negative self-evaluations similar to those experienced after setbacks by individuals who hold an entity theory of ability (Good, Aronson, & Inzlicht, 2003). For example, in an academic context minority students tend to obtain lower grades than their white counterparts, in part because of the negative stereotype threatening minority students’ intellectual ability (Steele & Aronson, 1995). However, an intervention encouraging an incremental message of intelligence counteracted the potential deleterious effects of stereotype threats. Specifically, minority students in the incremental message condition reported greater enjoyment, engagement, and higher grades for academic endeavors relative to those in a control group (Aronson et al., 2002). Additionally, in spite of the gender-math stereotype, a sample of middle school female students mentored to view intelligence as malleable scored higher on math standardized test scores than females in a control condition (Good et al., 2003). Experimental results from these interventions suggest that an incremental mind-set can insulate individuals from the negative effects of stereotype threats.

Why are individual differences in implicit theories relevant when challenges or stereotype threats arise? For entity theorists, a failure or negative stereotype represents an ability that cannot be developed or improved. For example, while working on a challenging academic task, students who held an entity theory indicated they “wouldn’t feel smart enough to make it” (Dweck, 1999, p. 46). Unfortunately, the derogation is not specific
to the task but also extends to feelings about the self. Students who held entity theories of intelligence also reported feeling dejected, depressed, and hopeless. Alternatively, for students who held incremental theories, setbacks represented an opportunity to learn. This mastery-oriented response of incremental theorists is in stark contrast to the feelings of helplessness in the wake of negative information that individuals who hold entity-oriented theories often report.

**Self-Efficacy**

Self-efficacy is another factor that can buffer the negative responses associated with taxing situations, including stereotype threat. Social-cognitive theory describes self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Unlike more global concepts such as self-esteem, self-efficacy is domain-specific and refers to individuals’ beliefs about what they can do with the skills they have. Self-efficacy is critical in helping individuals navigate challenging circumstances because it influences goals, thought patterns, persistence, and stress reactions (Bandura, 1997). For example, after negative stereotype activation, women who reported high leadership efficacy demonstrated heightened performance, greater domain identification, and increased well-being relative to those who reported low self-efficacy (Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007).

Although research suggests that implicit theories and self-efficacy provide perspectives through which responses to stereotype threat can be understood, to our knowledge research has yet to merge these two approaches to examine responses to a leadership stereotype threat. In various domains, research hints at the potential benefits of such integration. For example, a study on academic remedial action revealed that students who held incremental or entity theories did not differ in their desire to take a needed course if they had high academic self-efficacy. However, when academic self-efficacy was low, students who held entity theories of intelligence reported less interest than students who held incremental theories in developing the necessary skills (see Hong et al., 1999). An additional study, merging the implicit theory framework with a self-efficacy approach, examined the tendency for individuals to engage in self-defeating behavior after social exclusion. Results revealed that participants who held an entity theory, rather than an incremental theory, of social ability and low social efficacy reported nonadaptive responses to exclusion (Briones, Tabernero, & Arenas, 2007).

**Conceptualization of Current Study**

In the current research, we integrate the implicit-theory approach and self-efficacy theory to examine women’s responses to leadership stereotypes. Stereotype threat may emerge in a leadership context because of the perception that women are less competent and less worthy of positions of leadership than men (e.g., Boldry, Wood, & Kashy, 2001; Heilman, 2001). An implicit-theory perspective, in the context of leadership, refers to the beliefs people hold regarding whether leadership ability is a fixed entity or a malleable attribute. For example, some individuals might believe that “trying to change your leadership ability is like trying to change your natural eye and hair color. You can’t do it because leaders are born.” In contrast, other individuals may believe “practice, hard work, effort, and persistence can improve leadership ability.”

One important note bears mention. The implicit theories studied in the current paper are separate and distinct from similarly named implicit personality leadership theories (ILTs), and research related to various implicit perceptions of leaders, followers, teachers, and mentors (e.g., Middlebrooks & Haberkorn, 2009; Salter, Green, Ree, Carmody-Bubb, & Duncan, 2009). Specifically, ILT refers to individuals’ widely held and shared conceptions of what constitutes a leader (Eden & Leviatan, 1975; Forsyth & Nye, 2008). In contrast, Dweck’s implicit self-theory, although still considered a theory of personality, builds on a social cognitive perspective to examine differences in beliefs about the malleability of human attributes (Dweck, 2009).

Implicit theory research has focused on how these beliefs influence affect, cognition, and behavior, especially in the wake of setbacks. In the current study, we suggest that endorsing a more incremental-oriented theory of leadership ability, rather than an entity-oriented theory, can buffer against the potential deleterious
effects of low self-efficacy in the wake of a leadership stereotype threat. To test this hypothesis, at time 1 female participants completed measures of the independent variables including implicit theories of leadership and self-efficacy for leadership. At time 2, one week later, we activated a leadership stereotype threat in a laboratory setting and created a high-stakes environment in which participants believed their leadership ability would be evaluated. We then examined self-evaluations, which have been shown to be an important predictor of female leadership achievement (e.g., Davies, Spencer, & Steele, 2005; Hoyt, 2005; Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007).

Here are our specific hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Individuals who are more oriented toward entity beliefs of leadership, relative to incremental beliefs, will report more negative self-esteem and lower postthreat efficacy in response to stereotype threat.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals with low (relative to high) self-efficacy for leadership (SEL) will report more negative self-esteem and lower postthreat efficacy in response to stereotype threat.

Hypothesis 3: Implicit theories of leadership will interact with self-efficacy in predicting responses to stereotype threat. Specifically, individuals’ self-esteem and postthreat efficacy will be more strongly influenced by initial self-efficacy for individuals who hold more-entity-oriented (relative to incremental-oriented) beliefs of leadership ability.

Method

Participants

We recruited approximately 50 undergraduates to participate. We chose this number taking into account the number of variables in the proposed model and the expected effect size, which suggest that a sample of 34 to 76 participants should yield adequate power (Cohen, 1992). Specifically we recruited 51 undergraduate women, over the age of 18, from a small liberal arts college in the U.S. Southeast. Participants received either course credit or five dollars as an incentive for participating. We recruited via introductory psychology classes and flyers on campus advertising the experiment. The average age was 19.24 (SD = 1.32). Participants consisted primarily of freshmen and sophomores (64%). Approximately three-fourths of the participants were Caucasian (78% white, 10% Asian American, 6% black or African American, 6% other/mixed).

Procedures

Participation involved completing a short Web-based survey (time 1) as well as coming into the laboratory for a 30-minute research session (time 2). At time 1, participants first consented to participate online prior to completing demographic information along with a questionnaire on implicit theory of leadership and self-efficacy for leadership. Participants then signed up to complete time 2 of the study. One week later, participants came to the lab in groups of three or four. At this point, the researcher again asked participants to sign a consent form. Then, to manipulate stereotype threat, in line with past research (Hoyt 2005; Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007, in press), we provided participants with statistics indicating the high number of men in leadership positions relative to women and informed them that “we want to explore why these numbers are so high for men and low for women, considering that research suggests that gender differences in leadership performance do emerge.” We focused on the stereotype threat condition, rather than including an identity-safe or control condition, on the basis of research suggesting that implicit theories matter most when individuals are faced with a clear challenge or failure. It is only after such threats to self-esteem that holding an entity theory renders individuals vulnerable to helpless and defensive behavior. Thus, much research on implicit theories has focused on conditions of vulnerability such as setbacks or stereotype threat. Additionally, in line with past stereotype threat research (e.g., Aronson et al., 2002), we created a high-stakes environment by informing participants that they would be asked to work together in the group and would be assigned either the leadership role or the active participant role. We incorporated this component to lead participants to believe there was a possibility of confirming the negative stereotype if assigned to the leadership position.

Following introduction of the high-stakes stereotype threat environment and prior to completing the dependent measures, participants completed a few filler tasks to avoid direct association with the threat and outcome
variables (i.e., postthreat efficacy and self-esteem). We immediately debriefed participants and informed them they would not be participating in a group activity. To ensure that participants would not have suspicion regarding the desired outcomes of the study, we used methods similar to those in past leadership stereotype threat studies that were successful in not arousing suspicion (Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007, in press). Accordingly, students did not report suspicion regarding the nature of the study.

MEASURES

Implicit Self-Theory of Leadership
We administered a three-item implicit self-theory of leadership scale by modifying Dweck’s implicit theory of intelligence assessment, replacing the word intelligence with leadership or lead. An example item: “To be honest, you can’t really change your ability to lead.” In this shortened scale, participants indicated their agreement or disagreement with the items using a 7-point scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). We recoded such that higher numbers represent agreement with an incremental theory ($\alpha = 0.62$). Past studies extending implicit theories to novel domains have used similar methods and found adequate reliability and validity (e.g., Burnette, in press; Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007).

Self-Efficacy for Leadership (SEL): Initially
Prior to the threat, we used a self-efficacy for leadership measure developed by Murphy (1992) and used in previous research examining leadership self-efficacy and stereotype threat (Hoyt, 2005; Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007, in press). Example items are “Overall, I believe that I can lead a work group successfully” and “In general, I am very good at leading a group of my peers.” Participants indicated their agreement or disagreement on the seven-item measure using a 7-point scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The SEL measure at time 1 exhibited good internal reliability ($\alpha = 0.78$). Past studies have found similar reliability and have exhibited good discriminant, convergent, and construct validity (Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007; Murphy, 1992; Murphy & Ensher, 1999).

Self-Esteem
We used a seven-item modified assessment of self-esteem from the Heatherton and Polivy (1991) scale. Example items were “I feel confident about my abilities” and “I feel inferior to others at this moment” (reverse scored). Participants indicated their agreement or disagreement using a 5-point scale that ranged from 1 (disagree completely) to 5 (agree completely). The self-esteem measure exhibited good internal reliability ($\alpha = 0.88$). Heatherton and Polivy’s scale (1991) has been well validated, and modified assessments have also been shown to exhibit adequate reliability and validity (Hoyt, Aguilar, Kaiser, Blascovich, & Lee, 2007; Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007, in press).

Self-Efficacy for Leadership (SEL): Postthreat
We used the same assessment of SEL as in the initial Web-based survey, again with good reliability ($\alpha = 0.88$), to examine if efficacy after the threat varied as a function of initial self-efficacy for leadership and implicit theory.

Perception of Threat
We also included a single-item assessment of perception of leadership stereotype threat to confirm that incremental and entity theorists did not differ in their perceptions of gender differences in leadership ability. Specifically, we asked participants to indicate their agreement or disagreement using a 5-point scale that ranged from 1 (disagree completely) to 5 (agree completely) on the item “There are gender differences in leadership ability.”

Results
For our primary hypotheses, we used the standard regression approach to explore first- and second-order effects with continuous variables (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). To confirm that implicit theories of leadership ability did not predict differences in perception of leadership ability in the wake of the stereotype threat, we regressed the single item perception of threat assessment on implicit theories of leadership ability. Results revealed no significant difference [$\beta = 0.10$, $t(45) = 0.71$, $p = 0.48$].

For our primary hypotheses, we first regressed the measure of self-esteem on implicit theories of leadership, self-efficacy for leadership, and their interaction term (see Table 1 for means and SDs of all variables in model). In support of the first two hypotheses, results revealed a significant effect for implicit self-theory
[\beta = 0.27, t(45) = 2.06, p < 0.05] and for self-efficacy for leadership [\beta = 0.46, t(45) = 3.44, p < 0.01]. Specifically, results indicate that greater orientation toward an incremental self-theory of leadership ability and greater self-efficacy for leadership predicted higher self-esteem following the stereotype threat. However, consistent with hypothesis 3, an implicit theory x self-efficacy interaction qualified these first-order effects [\beta = -0.25, t(45) = 2.02, p < 0.05]. As illustrated in Figure 1, and in line with predictions, tests of simple slopes conditioned one standard deviation above and below the means of implicit theory and leadership self-efficacy (Aiken & West, 1991) revealed a significant association of self-efficacy with self-esteem among individuals with entity-oriented beliefs (1SD) [\beta = 0.70, t(45) = 4.24, p < 0.001] but a nonsignificant association for individuals with incremental-oriented beliefs (+1SD) [\beta = 0.19, t(45) = 1.00, p > 0.05].

We next regressed the postthreat measure of self-efficacy on implicit theories of leadership, initial leadership self-efficacy, and their interaction term. Implicit theories did not directly predict postthreat efficacy. However, not surprisingly analyses revealed that higher initial efficacy predicted higher postthreat efficacy [\beta = 0.67, t(46) = 6.26 p < 0.001]. We also explored the interactive effect of initial self-efficacy and implicit theory on postthreat leadership self-efficacy. In support of hypothesis 3, results revealed a significant effect of the implicit theory x self-efficacy interaction effect on postthreat leadership self-efficacy, after controlling for initial self-efficacy scores [\beta = -0.21, t(46) = -2.04, p < 0.05]. Results are depicted in Figure 2. Consistent with the pattern of results for self-esteem, tests of simple slopes conditioned one standard deviation above and below the means of implicit theory and initial efficacy (Aiken & West, 1991) revealed a stronger association of initial efficacy with posttask efficacy among individuals with more-entity-oriented beliefs [\beta = 0.88, t(46) = 6.49, p < 0.001] compared to individuals with incremental beliefs [\beta = 0.46, t(58) = 2.85, p < 0.01].
Discussion

In extending implicit self-theories to a leadership context, our findings support a long line of research across domains revealing that entity theorists struggle in challenging times, whereas incremental theorists respond with more mastery-oriented coping (Molden & Dweck, 2006). Specifically, results from the current research suggest that incremental beliefs about leadership ability predicted greater self-esteem after a stereotype threat relative to entity beliefs. Furthermore, the results corroborated previous research highlighting the important role of leadership self-efficacy in helping people successfully navigate leadership challenges (Bandura, 1997; Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007). High initial leadership self-efficacy buffered the deleterious effects of stereotype threat on both self-esteem and postthreat efficacy. However, in contrast to predictions, implicit theories did not directly predict self-efficacy after threat.

Results supported the proposition that the relation between implicit theories, self-efficacy, and stereotype threat is more complex than direct effects alone. Rather, individual differences in implicit theories moderated the impact of leadership efficacy on responses to threat. Specifically, results indicated that for individuals who held incremental-oriented theories, initial self-efficacy had no effect on subsequent self-esteem and a limited effect on postthreat efficacy. In contrast, for individuals who held entity-oriented theories with low self-efficacy, the leadership stereotype threat resulted in classic stereotype threat vulnerability responses including lower self-esteem and significantly reduced postthreat self-efficacy (Steele & Aronson, 1995).

Limitations

Although findings primarily supported our hypotheses, we highlight a few limitations of the present research. First, we have focused on the negative ramifications of entity theorizing in responding to leadership threats. However, it is important to note that implicit theories have potential costs and benefits. It is possible that entity theorists could experience a “roller coaster” effect with lower lows and higher highs (Harackiewicz & Elliot, 1995, p. 299). That is, since entity theorists believe performance to be indicative of a fixed ability, when successful they should theoretically reap the positive affective, cognitive, and motivational benefits. Thus, future research should also examine the interaction of implicit theories and self-efficacy after affirmative and successful outcomes.

Second, the sample was limited to a rather small number of university-age females in the United States. It is plausible that there could be important age, experience, and cultural differences in adoption of entity and incremental beliefs of leadership. Although past research on individual differences in implicit theories suggests that the affective, cognitive, and behavioral responses to challenges emerge across cultures (e.g., Hong et al., 1999) and developmental stages (e.g., Blackwell, Trzesniewski, & Dweck, 2007), future inquiry should explore cultural and intergenerational differences within a leadership context (Dickson, Den Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003). Furthermore, future research should recruit diverse samples with varying backgrounds and educational experiences because these demographic differences may influence self-concept.

Additionally, future research should replicate the moderation effect with larger samples, considering the relatively small sample used in the current study (Aguinis, 1995). Another limitation is that our implicit theory measure had average internal reliability. A substantial drawback of using brief but valid measures is that their unreliability diminishes the likelihood of detecting effects. Thus, even though we found significant results in spite of the diminished reliability, future research should replicate and extend findings from this initial line of inquiry using reliable assessments of constructs, including behavioral outcomes related to leadership emergence and effectiveness. Additionally, to gain an understanding of the causal role of implicit self-theories in leaders’ responses to challenging situations, future research should attempt to experimentally manipulate implicit theories. Although implicit theories are thought to be trait-level constructs, research suggests they can be successfully primed, manipulated, and changed through interventions (e.g., Burns & Isbell, 2007; Coleman, 2004). Future research could assess how, and to what degree, incremental theories of leadership can be encouraged and if such manipulations can contribute to a causal understanding of the relation among variables.

Future Directions

The current work focused on a specific challenge relevant to females within a leadership context. However, leaders...
face a variety of challenges in today’s complex global marketplace. For example, government and business leaders are asked to deal with issues related to downsizing, competition in the global economy, ethical dilemmas, economic downturn, and the struggle to develop procedures that lead to success in free markets (Boyatzis, 2008). The burden to overcome these obstacles and ensure the success of a country or an organization is often the responsibility of leaders who are asked to set a path and follow it despite high risk of failure. Considering the number of challenging situations leaders may face, future work could examine how implicit theories and self-efficacy influence leadership performance and motivation when leaders face additional situations where there are negative expectations about the potential for success. Empirical demonstrations reveal that expectations are fundamental in promoting achievement (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1992; Carver & Scheier, 1998). However, whether one responds with doubt or confidence may depend in part on one’s implicit theory. Future research could thus explore if holding an incremental theory of leadership helps leaders navigate other challenging situations and low expectations for success.

Future work could also extend the current findings beyond the context of leadership. For example, merging recent work extending implicit theories to the domain of negotiation (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007) with theories regarding the gender wage gap (e.g., Babcock & Laschever, 2003), future work could examine if an incremental theory of negotiation skills fosters more active negotiation for females. Examining how implicit theories interact with various self-concepts to predict response to multiple challenges across an array of contexts may prove useful both practically and theoretically.

Future research could also examine the application of interventions aimed at helping to alleviate the negative consequences of having low self-efficacy or holding entity beliefs in the wake of stereotype threat. For example, on a practical level data indicate that the costs associated with training new employees are substantial for contemporary companies (Wentland, 2003). As a result, staffing firms and human resource consultants in the employee selection and training processes may be able to use the findings from the current study to identify individuals who have the propensity (e.g., individuals who have incremental-oriented beliefs, and/or high leadership self-efficacy) to respond effectively in leadership situations. For individuals who may not respond well in challenging leadership situations (e.g., entity-oriented beliefs, low leadership self-efficacy), staffing firms and consultants can provide targeted training and facilitation. However, before applications and interventions are examined, future work is still needed to corroborate and build on the current findings. We hope this initial extension of implicit theories to a leadership context fosters such exploration.

Conclusion

To our knowledge, our research is the first to merge Dweck’s implicit self-theory approach (1999) with the self-efficacy literature to examine how female leaders respond to stereotype threat. This perspective has the potential to further knowledge about individual differences in response to challenge. An imperative component of personality psychology, which is focused on investigating individual differences, is not simply an understanding of what behavioral traits people display; it is also important to understand how people function and cope in the wake of a setback. Indeed, if we want to know who someone really is, we often ask questions about how he or she copes when life is less than ideal (Molden & Dweck, 2006). The implicit theory perspective, similar to other personality theories (e.g., Mischel & Shoda, 1995), suggests that individual differences in core beliefs about human attributes generate “a network of allied beliefs, goals, and emotions, that, in turn, create important stable patterns of behavior” (Molden & Dweck, 2006, p. 200–201; see also Cervone, 2004). Similarly, the current work suggests that individual differences in beliefs about the nature of leadership ability and one’s own leadership efficacy predict self-evaluations in the wake of stereotype threat.

Research on leadership ability and emergence has a long history of examining the question of whether leaders are made or born. For example, early research building on Carlyle’s “great man” theory (1907), the notion that history is shaped by the forces of extraordinary leadership, has focused on the traits and genetic underpinnings of leadership ability (e.g., Arvey, Rotundo, Johnson, Zhang, & McGue, 2006; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). However, theories of leadership emergence and
effectiveness also recognize the multidimensional nature of leadership behavior, including the contribution of social, cognitive, and situational constructs (e.g., Chan & Drasgow, 2001). Initial results from the current study suggest there is potential value in encouraging individuals to believe that leaders are made, not born.
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