

Lyle Benson, 2018

Volume 4 Issue 2, pp. 906-931

Date of Publication: 28th August 2018

DOI-<https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2018.42.906931>

This paper can be cited as: Benson, L. (2018). *Permanency of Leader Self-Confidence Development: A Longitudinal Comparative Analysis*. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 906-931.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

PERMANENCY OF LEADER SELF-CONFIDENCE DEVELOPMENT: A LONGITUDINAL COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Lyle Benson

Department of OB, HRM, and MGMT, MacEwan University, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

bensonl@macvewan.ca

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine if youths' leader self-confidence, once developed in a leadership training program, persisted over time. It is exploratory comparative analysis research comparing two studies on the same leadership training program: Benson (1991) and the Canadian Alberta Provincial Government (1995). Benson's (1991) study assessed youths' self-confidence 3 months after they attended the provincial leadership training program. The Alberta Provincial Government (1995) study assessed youths' and adults' self-confidence 1 to 8 years after they attended the same provincial leadership training program. Although this is not a true longitudinal study following the same subjects over time; it is a follow-up study measuring the impact of the provincial leadership training program on the permanency of self-confidence development and retention over time. This is one of the few leadership studies on self-efficacy and self-confidence to do this. This exploratory study will do an in-depth comparative analysis of Benson and Enstroem's (2014) Leader Self-Confidence Indicator (LSCI) 4 dimensions. Specifically, both studies (Benson, 1991 and the Alberta Provincial Government, 1995) and both data sets of both quantitative and qualitative data within those two studies will be analyzed to find out if participants increased their leadership self-confidence in any of the 4 dimensions and

retained self-confidence overtime.

Keywords

Leadership, Self-Confidence, Youth, Longitudinal Research

1. Introduction

McCormick (2001, p.31) remarked that given the enormous sums of money, employee time, and company resources expended annually on leadership and management education by business and the military, that using leadership self-efficacy as a training evaluation criterion seemed appropriate. McCormick (2001, p.22) noted that one of the most frequently reported findings in the leadership literature was the relationship between a leader's self-confidence and successful leadership. He commented that major reviews of the leadership literature found self-confidence was an important element for effective leadership (Bass, 1990; House & Aditya, 1997; Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 1994). (See also Bass and Bass (2008) and Yukl (2013).) Locke (1991, p.260) made an even stronger statement saying that it was undisputed that self-confidence is a necessary trait for successful leadership. McCormick (2001, p. 31) also asserted that in the leadership literature no study was found that measured whether a leadership development program affected trainees' efficacy beliefs. The purpose of this study is to determine if youths' leader self-confidence, once developed in a leadership training program, persisted over time.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Self-Efficacy and Self-Confidence

Efficacy is generally thought of as the capacity to produce an effect. Bandura postulates two types of expectations in his Self-Efficacy Theory (1977). The first is an efficacy expectation - a conviction that a person can successfully perform the behavior. The second is outcome expectation - a person's estimate that a specific behaviour will achieve the outcome. Thus, a person may know that certain behaviors will bring about desirable results, but might still choose to not perform those behaviours if he thinks that he is lacking the necessary capabilities to exercise those behaviours. Another implication of Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory is that although self-efficacy is context-specific, it may be transferable across different contexts. Also, Bandura cautions that self-efficacy alone will not produce the desired performance if the task-specific competencies are lacking.

Other researchers defining self-efficacy have echoed similar sentiments: a belief that one is capable of successfully performing a task, (Sherer, et al., 1982), the belief that one can perform a novel task, or the beliefs that one can cope with adversity, (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). Situational self-efficacy refers to the individual's perceived ability to perform a specific task in a given situation, a perception that might change depending on the circumstances, (Popper et al., 2004) and affirmation of ability and strength of belief, (Cramer et al., 2009). Several researchers have asserted that for practical purposes the concepts of self-efficacy and self-confidence should be thought of as being the same (Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, & Harms, 2008). In this paper, they will be considered synonymous. In Table 1, an abridged summary of the literature on definitions of self-efficacy and self-confidence is presented.

Table 1: Authors defining self-efficacy (SE) and self-confidence (SC)

Author/Year	SE/SC	Definition
Bandura 1977	SE	The conviction that a person can successfully do the expected behavior to achieve the outcome.
Sherer, et al. 1982	SE	Your belief that you are capable of successfully performing a task.
Bandura 1986	SE	People's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances. It is not concerned with the skills one has but with the judgments of what one can do with whatever skills one possesses.
Benson 1991	SC	Trusting one's own abilities and capabilities to do things; sure of myself, not scared to try things, involvement, initiative, and risking.
Shrauger & Schoen 1995	SC	People's self-judgment of their capabilities or skill, or their perceived competence to deal successfully with the demands in a variety of situations.
Schwarzer & Jerusalem 1995	SE	The belief that one can perform a novel or difficult task, or cope with adversity.
Corsini, 2002	SC	Self-assuredness in one's personal judgment, ability, power, etc., sometimes manifested excessively.
Hollenbeck & Hall, 2004	SC	Our judgment of our capability to successfully accomplish something.
Popper et al. 2004	SE	Situational self-efficacy refers to the individual's perception of the ability to perform one specific task, a perception that might change in different circumstances.
Popper, et al. 2004	SE	General self-efficacy refers to the individual's self-beliefs regarding the general and permanent level of ability to perform.
Cramer, et al. 2009	SC	Only degree of certainty of outcome.
Cramer et al. 2009	SE	Affirmation of ability and strength of belief.

2.2 Self-Confidence and Leadership Development

Several attempts have been made to include self-efficacy and self-confidence into leadership models and models of leadership development. Benson (1991) in the Wholistic Leadership Development Model focused on the Confidence-Competence Relationship. Leaders who are low performers are incompetent and lack confidence in their ability to influence the behaviors, attitudes, and values of themselves, other individuals, groups, and organizations. Leaders who are high performers are competent and confident in their ability to influence the behaviors, attitudes, and values of themselves, other individuals, groups, and organizations. Leadership training and development therefore, involves improving both the competence and the confidence of leaders, enabling them to move from low performance to high performance.

McCormick (2001) in applying Bandura's (1977) Social Cognitive Theory to Leadership showed the relationship of the concepts of self-efficacy and self-confidence to leadership models with the idea that individuals can self-regulate their thoughts, motivation, and behaviours. His model had life experiences influencing goals and self-efficacy which influenced motivation and task strategy development which then impacted behaviours which resulted in performance. These then returned to experiences which closed the loop and set the stage for the next evolution regulating behavior.

Chan and Drasgow's (2001) model on Motivation to lead included values, personality, and the quality and quantity of past leadership experiences which influenced leadership self-efficacy. This influenced a person's motivation to lead which was also moderated by their domain-specific ability, participation in leadership roles; and training, knowledge, and skills for leading; and leadership style. This resulted in leadership performance and outcomes which were also moderated by personal resources and situational factors such as group and task.

Hollenbeck and Hall (2004, p.258), created the three step Self-Confidence Development Cycle. They asserted that confidence results from our specific experiences and develops a cognitive sense-making process which we can influence. They believed that 1. people take a small risk toward a goal, 2. people succeed in that goal, and 3. people then become more confident in their abilities.

Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, and Harm's (2008) reviewed 20 articles that dealt specifically with leader efficacy. From this review, they developed two models. The first was a framework for leader efficacy and collective efficacy. The second was generalized leadership efficacy which

included four dimensions for leader efficacy: 1. thought, 2. self-motivation, 3. means, and 4. actions.

Ross's (2014) Self-Leadership Development Model expanded Neck and Manz's (2010) conceptual model. Ross proposed that personal values, positive self-esteem, and self-concept lead to a self-confident individual who demonstrates a positive attitude which results in personal self-motivation to do behaviours to achieve a specific purpose through experiences. As well, several authors created scales to measure leader self-efficacy and self-confidence. In Table 2, an abridged summary of the literature on scales that measure aspects of leader self-efficacy and self-confidence is presented.

Table 2: Scales measuring self-efficacy and leader self-efficacy

Authors	Self-Efficacy or Self-Confidence & Purpose	Scale Name	Scale Origin	# of Items & Dimensions
Sherer et. al. 1982	Self-Efficacy General questions.	Self-Efficacy Scale	Research	17 Items No Dimensions
Kane & Bates 1988	Self-Efficacy Specific questions on leadership self-efficacy.		Research	8 Items No Dimensions
Schwarzer & Jerusalem 1995	Self-Efficacy General questions about difficult tasks and adversity.	GSE General Self-Efficacy Scale	Research	10 Items No dimensions
Chan & Drasgow 2001	Self-Confidence General questions on leader motivation.	MTL Motivation To Lead	Research	27 Items 3 Dimensions
Chen, Gully & Eden 2001	Self-Efficacy General questions about goals and difficult tasks in comparison to others.	New GSE General Self-Efficacy Scale	Research	8 Items No Dimensions
Greiman & Addington 2008	Self-Efficacy Specific questions to help agricultural education teachers to assist youth to development youths' leadership abilities.	YLD-SE Youth Leadership Development Self-Efficacy	Literature Review & Bandura's Process, 2006	10 items No Dimensions

2.3 Leader Self-Confidence Indicator Model and Scale

Although self-efficacy and self-confidence are not identical concepts, they are related. As has been done by others (see Table 2 above and Table 3 below) Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy model was used as the starting theory to guide the model building process. Based on 1. Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory, 2. the literature on self-efficacy, self-confidence, and leadership; and 3. self-efficacy scales, self-confidence scales, and leadership scales; Benson and

Enstroem (2013) created a 5-phase model to explain how self-confidence functions and develops within a person; plus, a scale to measure this. They believe that moving people sequentially through the 5-phases of the model will increase their self-confidence. Bandura's (1977) Self-Efficacy Model is presented with Benson and Enstroem's (2013) Leader Self-Confidence model. As shown, the scale assesses Bandura's *Person* through four items measuring *Beliefs & Assuredness* (BA), Bandura's *Behaviors* through four items measuring *Initiating Action* (IA), Bandura's *Behaviors* through three items measuring *Influencing Others*, (IO) and the Bandura's *Outcomes* through three items measuring *Achieving Results* (AR).

Table 3: Comparison of Bandura's and Benson & Enstroem's Models

Self-Efficacy Theory Bandura, 1977	Leader Self-Confidence Model Benson & Enstroem, 2013
Person	Beliefs & Self-Assuredness
Efficacy Expectations	
Behaviours	Initiating Action & Influencing Others
Outcome Expectations	
Outcomes	Achieving Results

In Benson and Enstroem's (2013) model the five phases which people move sequentially through to develop their self-confidence are:

Phase 1- Belief and Self-Assuredness

People have an initial belief and self-assuredness about their abilities in a specific situation.

People have self-confidence, believe in their abilities, are sure of their abilities, and see them as being effective in a specific situation.

Phase 2- Initiating Action

People move out of their personal comfort zone, are able to take appropriate risks, take the initiative to start things, and try new things.

Phase 3-Influencing Others

People are actively involved with others, take charge, influence individuals, and influence groups.

Phase 4-Achieving Results

People achieve the results they wanted, the results their team wanted, and the results their organization wanted.

Phase 5- Increase in Self-Confidence

Given the previous four phases, peoples' self-confidence continues to increase, and the self-confidence cycle repeats itself. Although the subscales are somewhat independent of each other, self-confidence in each subscale is related to overall general self-confidence. Therefore, each subscale additively contributes to overall general self-confidence.

2.4 Provincial Leadership Training Program Background

In 1983 the Alberta Government Department of Recreation and Parks adopted the Wholistic Leadership Development Model (Benson, 1991) as its framework for leadership and recreation development for the Province of Alberta. Concepts and content from it was first included in the 120 courses taught at the Blue Lake Centre Provincial Leadership, Recreation, and Environment Training Centre site in Hinton, Alberta. The year 1985 was proclaimed by the United Nations as the International Youth Year (IYY). It was held to focus attention on issues of concern relating to youth. Youth activities took place all over the world (UN/GA Document, 1985). To help celebrate this year the Alberta Provincial Government, through the Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks, Wildlife Foundation, used the Wholistic Leadership Development Model (Benson, 1991) as the foundation for the creation of the provincial youth leadership training program called "Leaders In Action." It brought together youth from all the Alberta Youth Associations; the 4-H, YMCAs, YWCAs, Scouts, Girl Guides, Junior Forest Wardens, Boys and Girls Clubs, etc. In this 7-day program youth were taught a variety of leadership skills including listening, personality, conflict resolution, decision making/ problem solving, creating a positive attitude, values, building people up, and team work in the classroom morning sessions. In the afternoon youth practiced these skills in outdoor adventure activities such as climbing, canoeing, giving presentations, initiative task challenges, kayaking, orienteering, etc. In the evening, they debriefed the day and made plans on how to use the skills the next day. Over the course of 8 years there were slight modifications to the program content and the delivery of the program which was experiential activity-based learning in an outdoor setting. In 1988 the model served as the foundation for the Department of Recreation and Park's leadership development strategy (Benson, 1991, p.48).

3. Methodology

This purpose of this study was to determine if self-confidence, once developed in a leadership training program, persisted over time. This research compared two studies; Benson

(1991) and the Canadian Alberta - Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar Impact Survey Results (1995). Benson's (1991) study assessed youth's self-confidence 3 months after they attended a provincial leadership training program. The Alberta Provincial Government (1995) study assessed youth's and adult's self-confidence 1 to 8 years after they attended the same provincial leadership training program. Although this is not a true longitudinal study following the same subjects over time, it is a follow-up study measuring the impact of a leadership training program on the permanency of self-confidence development and retention over time.

3.1 The Populations and the Samples

In Benson's (1991) study the population, as identified by the Alberta Provincial Government, were groups belonging to the Provincial Youth Associations and included the Boys and Girls Clubs of Alberta, Boy Scouts of Canada, Army Cadets, Air Cadet League of Canada, Girl Guides of Canada, Duke of Edinburgh Awards, 4-H, YMCA, YWCA, Navy League of Canada, Junior Forest Wardens, Canadian Girls in Training, and the Red Cross Society. Youth leaders were also invited from three high schools. The population for Benson's study consisted of all individuals aged 14 to 17 inclusive, who served as youth leaders in a provincial association and the three invited high schools. The sample included those youth leaders who were selected from these groups who had attended the provincial leadership training program.

In the Alberta Provincial Government (1995) study the population included the above groups but also evolved over the 8 years to include other youth organizations such as Peer Support, High School Student Union Councils, Family and Community Support Services representatives and youth with no formal organization involvement. The sample included those youth leaders and adults who had attended the provincial leadership training program.

3.2 Numbers and Types of Subjects, Response Rates, and Instruments Used

In Benson's (1991) study there were 42 youth leaders who attended the provincial leadership training program. Quantitative data was collected through two instruments. The first was the Leadership Seminar Questionnaire which was designed to measure which leadership training sessions the youth leaders thought contributed to their leadership effectiveness when they returned to their back-home leadership situations in their Provincial Youth Associations. The second was an Action Planning Questionnaire which was designed to measure the degree to which youth leaders thought they achieved the leadership goals they set for themselves during the program. Of note, only half the sample set goals because Benson was also looking at goal setting and goal achievement in his study. These two instruments were mailed to the youth

leaders approximately three months after they had taken the provincial leadership training program. This was to allow time for the youth leaders to return to their Provincial Youth Associations and to use any knowledge or skills gained. The response rate for these two questionnaires was 83.33% (35/42).

Qualitative data was collected three months after youth leaders had taken the provincial leadership training program. Again, this was to allow time for them to return to their Provincial Youth Associations and to use any knowledge or skills gained. There were 42 in-person interviews conducted 3 months after the provincial leadership training program for a response rate of 100% (42/42). The in-person interviews assessed the effects of the leadership training program on the personal changes of the youth leaders. The in-person interviews were semi-structured. First an open-ended question was asked to allow the youth leaders to tell about their experience in their own way. Next, a follow-up closed question was asked so the data could be quantified. The tape-recorded information was transcribed and coded into 222 pages for data analysis. Next, data from the in-person interviews was thematically analyzed to look for patterns and effects of the provincial leadership training program on the youth leaders. Each theme was collated with percentages, rankings, and quotes to support it.

In the Alberta Provincial Government (1995) study data was collected 1 to 8 years after participants had taken the provincial leadership training program. In the Alberta Provincial Government (1995) study there 284 youth and adults who attended the provincial leadership training program from years 1 to 8. There with 149 participant telephone interviews conducted 8 years after the provincial leadership training program. This is a response rate of 60.08% (149/248). Interview participants were 77.9 % (116/149) youth and 22.1% (33/149) adults at the time of their attendance in the provincial leadership training program. A 4-page questionnaire was created based on Benson's (1991) initial research. It looked at the provincial leadership training program's impacts on participant's lives; including school, post-secondary education, work, family, other relationships, personal development, and volunteer activities; plus, the various program activities and elements. The research was conducted over the telephone and the survey takers recorded both quantitative and qualitative answers in the questionnaire provided to them. There were 2 open ended-questions: 1. Please describe the seminar's impact in more detail? and 2. Any other comments?

3.3 Limitations

1. Neither of the two studies in this paper, Benson (1991) nor the Alberta Provincial Government (1995), focused on self-confidence; therefore, questions did not directly ask about self-confidence. Thus, the data from both studies is being mined to look for expressions of self-confidence which relate to Benson and Enstroem's (2013) model of leader self-confidence development.
2. Because the purpose of the two studies and questionnaires were not identical there was not identical data to analyze, similar data; but not identical.
3. Benson's (1991) study only analyzed youth leaders while the Alberta Provincial Government (1995) analyzed both youth leaders and adult leaders - 77.9 % (116/149) youth and 22.1% (33/149) adults at the time of their attendance in the leadership training program. Therefore, the data was not totally representative of only youth leaders' development and retention of self-confidence.
4. No demographic data was available on gender, year of attendance, etc. This would have allowed a richer comparative analysis. Even though there was no year of attendance recorded, for the Alberta Provincial Government data, with the response rate of over 60% one could infer that even if all the responses were in the first 1 to 4 years after attending the program this still showed the long-term impact on participants' self-confidence development and retention.
5. Participants' memory of events 1 to 8 years after the provincial leadership training program would have affected their responses or lack of responses to both quantitative and qualitative questions; unless of course the provincial leadership training program had a high impact on participants. If so, then participants would remember specific details of the leadership training program that impacted them and how the leadership training program specifically affected them.

4. Comparative Data Results, Analysis, and Discussion- Benson (1991) and Provincial Government (1995)

For the sake of brevity in reporting qualitative data in the tables, only a maximum of 10 different sample responses are provided as examples. If an example had numerous similar responses it is indicated with a bracket and number; for example: "The seminar has helped me to gain confidence in myself and my abilities (17)." This would indicate there were 17 similar comments.

4.1 Impact on Participants' Lives - Provincial Government (1995)

Some leadership training programs try to assess the impact on participants' lives when they return to their family, home, school, volunteer, etc. situations. From the Provincial Government telephone survey interviews (quantitative data) 71.81% (107/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Leadership Training Program contributed to their personal development 1 to 8 years later. Also, from the Provincial Government telephone survey interviews (qualitative data) 65.77% (98/149) (see Table 4 below) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Leadership Training Program had a very positive impact on their lives 1 to 8 years later. This is an important finding because participants' memory of events 1 to 8 years after the provincial leadership training program would have affected their responses or lack of responses to both quantitative and qualitative questions; unless of course the provincial leadership training program had a high impact on participants. Then they would remember specific details of the how program impacted them and how the program affected them. This is also relevant because the purpose of this comparative study was to determine if the leadership training program impacted self-confidence. Specifically, if self-confidence, once developed in participants in a leadership training program, persisted and was retained over time by participants. Without a positive program impact on participants there will not be any change in participants' self-confidence. The qualitative comments in Table 4 show the positive impact the provincial leadership training program had on participants; in fact, many remembered it as a life changing experience.

Table 4: Impact on Participants' Lives

Qualitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 65.77% (98/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar had a very positive impact on their lives 1 to 8 years later.
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Analyzing the seminar's impact on me makes me realize the way it changed my life (6).2. I wouldn't be here right now if this information [seminar] wasn't presented to me.3. It gave me a positive perspective on life and a philosophy on life to live by.4. I still think of the experience, it was one of the most important parts of growing up for me.5. The concepts behind the theory parts of the seminar seem quite simple, however their impact on life is phenomenal. These are skills you just don't learn anywhere else... I have nothing but positive thoughts on the seminar. They are not memories because memories are a thing of the past, and my experiences at the seminar will carry throughout my life, in the present and the future.6. This was the best thing I ever attended.7. It had a very large impact ...there was a big impact when I returned.8. It was an inspirational, fabulous, valuable experience that I will remember for the rest of my life (4).

4.2 Comparative Data Analysis

The conceptual framework through which the comparative data (Benson, 1991 & the Alberta Provincial Government, 1994) was analyzed to determine if self-confidence, once developed in participants' in a leadership training program, persisted over time was Benson and Enstroem's (2013) Leader Self- Confidence Indicator (LSCI). As shown, the scale assesses the Bandura's *Person* through four items measuring *Beliefs & Assuredness* (BA), Bandura's *Behaviors* through four items measuring *Initiating Action* (IA), Bandura's *Behaviors* through three items measuring *Influencing Others*, (IO) and the Bandura's *Outcomes* through three items measuring *Achieving Results* (AR). Each of these four areas will be compared, analyzed, and discussed.

4.2.1 Self-Confidence Scale - Beliefs / Self-Assuredness

It has been asserted by researchers that students must be made to feel confident about being leaders (Klimoski & Amos, 2012; Parker et al., 2008; Speery, 1996; Watt, 2004) in that they possess or can develop the required competencies (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Klimoski & Amos, 2012; Lord & Hall, 2005). Lukashova and Gumarova (2017) noted that understanding their strengths and weaknesses is an essential part of self-knowledge for leaders.

The Beliefs / Self-Assuredness dimension questions assessed this aspect of Bandura's (1977) *Person*. It included: I saw myself as effective, I was sure of my abilities, I believe I was able to be effective, and I had self-confidence in myself. Both studies and both data sets of both quantitative and qualitative data (Table 5) showed that participants developed and retained their leadership self-confidence on this dimension of belief and self-assuredness 3 months to 8 years after attending the provincial leadership training program. The qualitative comments show the positive impact the provincial leadership training program had on participant's self-confidence beliefs and self-assuredness.

Table 5: *Self-Confidence Scale - Beliefs / Self-Assuredness Comparative Data Analysis*

3-month data - Benson	1-8-year data - Provincial Government
Quantitative survey data indicated 100% (35/35) of the youth responded they increased their leadership effectiveness to a large extent. Quantitative survey data indicated 31.43% (11/35) of youth responded they increased their self-confidence. Qualitative data from the in-person interviews indicated 78.57% (33/42) [69.05% - 29/42- high increase and 9.52% - 4/42- medium	Quantitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 76.51% (114/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar had a large or very large impact on their leadership effectiveness. Qualitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 6.04% (9/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar had an impact on

<p>increase] of youth responded that an important contribution to their leadership effectiveness and personal change was increased self-confidence.</p>	<p>their leadership effectiveness. Qualitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 20.81% (31/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar had an impact on their beliefs, self-assuredness, and self-confidence.</p>
<p>Comments typical of the youths' remarks from the in-person interviews about self-confidence included:</p>	<p>Comments typical of the participants' remarks from the telephone survey interviews included:</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It gave me a lot of self-confidence (2). 2. I think I'm more self-confident as a person at wherever I am because I used to be really, really quiet, but uh, I guess not anymore. 3. Like now I'm pretty confident. 4. So, that made me more self-confident in what I could do and what I thought... Like you figure, "I can do anything now!" 5. Like my best friend, she said I seem for confident that I was before. 6. I felt more confident about what I was doing... 7. Before the camp...I used to feel really insecure. 8. ... it's all related to self-confidence. 9. ... from what I've experienced so far, it's probably the most I've increased [self-confidence] in my life so far. 10. A hundred percent. Self-confidence just shot right up there. ...and like me I wasn't sure of myself and now I am. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It helped a lot, I use my leadership skills every day (4) 2. I think about all the skills I learned when I am leading. 3. The seminar provided a whole new approach to leadership which was very beneficial. 4. The seminar was definitely of significance for improving my leadership skills (2). 5. The seminar has helped me to gain confidence in myself and my abilities (18). 6. It really straightened out a lot of things, I finally knew myself and gave me a lot of confidence. 7. It happened at a time in my life that I was very self-conscious and unsure about myself. It gave me the tools to deal with possible problems and the confidence I needed at the time. 8. I'm not shy anymore, more outgoing (9). 9. My outlook on myself and my capabilities changed for the better. 10. Opened my eyes to my potential as a youth leader.

4.2.2 Self-Confidence Scale - Initiating Action

Ross (2014, p.307) established that self-confidence helped to overcome self-doubt. Ross (2014, p.307), in reviewing the research by Cameron et al. (2003); Cameron and Caza (2004); Fineman (2006); Knowles (1984); and Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000); found that self-doubt was a negative quality associated with a person's decision to remain in his or her comfort zone. Ross (2014, p.307) went on to describe comfort zone as what the person was ready to do, with self-limits that did not have risk; essentially the person remaining with the familiar. Ross (2014, p. 307) also explained how self-confidence enables the person to go beyond the comfort zone barriers, to consider pursuing new challenges, and that self-confidence helps to overcome

self-doubt by enabling the person to understand that taking risks can lead to successful goal achievement.

The Initiating Action dimension questions assessed the aspect of Bandura’s (1977) Behaviours. It included: I was able to take the initiative to start things, I was able to try new things, I was able to move out of my personal comfort zone, and I was able to take risks. Qualitative data (Table 6) showed that participants developed and retained their leadership self-confidence on this dimension of behaviours of initiating action 3 months after but not 1 to 8 years after attending the provincial leadership training program. The qualitative comments (Table 6) showed the positive impact the provincial leadership training program had on participants’ self-confidence in initiating action.

Table 6: Self-Confidence Scale - Initiating Action Comparative Data Analysis

3-month data - Benson	1-8-year data - Provincial Government
Qualitative data from the in-person interviews indicated 66.67% (28/42) of youth responded that an important contribution to their leadership effectiveness and personal change was increased ability in taking the initiative to risk and become involved	Qualitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 5.37% (8/149) (see comments below) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar had an impact on their initiating action via taking initiative, becoming involved, and taking risks.
Comments typical of the youths’ remarks from the personal interviews about initiative, risk, and involvement included:	Comments typical of the participants’ remarks from the telephone survey interviews included:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ... it helps me to take more risks. Things I was scared to do in life before, I can go ahead and try it out (5). 2. That helped me get involved more (4). 3. I really wanted to get in to start things. 4. I can get into a lot more activities. Like before I’d just sit... 5. I think I volunteer a lot more than I used to. 6. Taking more of the initiative now that I was before ... It feels better. You’re doing something instead of just sitting there when you could have done something. 8. I can do things and not be afraid to do them. 9. Maybe not more risks involved but I’ll sure tackle a task a lot faster and get it done a lot more effectively. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My procrastination is gone, I now do tasks right away. 2. I now take more of a lead role in activities and at school. 3. It has challenged me to take risks and not to be afraid of trying. If I fail I have more skills to fix the problem or to find a learning experience from it (4). 4. Going to the seminar helped give me courage to go to Japan and stick with it. 5. I am more involved in the community.

4.2.3 Self-Confidence Scale - Influencing Others – Part 1

One of the areas that leaders need to be effective in influencing others is communication - listening, speaking, presenting, etc. These specific skills are necessary for a leader to have in order to take charge, be involved, and influence others. Handy (as cited in Bass & Bass, 2008, p.189) found that successful leaders had to believe in themselves to influence people and events. Bass & Bass (2008, p.125) reviewed four studies that showed the relationship between competence in communicating and leadership. Of note is Barge and Hirokawa (as cited in Bass & Bass, 2008, p.125) who asserted that communication competencies are basic to leadership. Bass and Bass (2008, p.83) also reviewed 12 studies that positively associated speech with leadership with four of those studies specifically finding that talkativeness and verbal ability were positively associated with leadership.

The Influencing Others dimension questions assessed this aspect of Bandura's (1977) Behaviours. It included: I was able to take charge, I was able to be actively involved with others, I was able to influence individuals. And I was able to influence groups. Both studies and both data sets of both quantitative and qualitative data (Table 7) showed that participants developed and retained their leadership self-confidence on this dimension of behaviours of influencing others 3 months to 8 years after attending the provincial leadership training program. The qualitative comments (Table 7) showed the positive impact the provincial leadership training program had on participants in self-confidence in influencing others.

Table 7: *Self-Confidence Scale - Influencing Others Part 1 Comparative Data Analysis*

3-month data - Benson	1-8-year data - Provincial Government
Quantitative survey data indicated 48.57% (17/35) of youth responded they improved their communication skills. Qualitative data from the in-person interviews indicated 90.48% (38/42) of youth responded that an important contribution to their leadership effectiveness and personal change was increased ability in communication which included talking with people, expressing ideas, sharing thoughts and feelings, opening up, and speaking in front of a group of people. Another 61.9% (26/42) of youth responded that an important contribution to their leadership effectiveness and personal change was the increased ability in communication to listen and paraphrase.	Quantitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 72% (90/125) * or 60.4% (90/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar session on presentations made a large to very large contribution to them as an individual. *Note: only 125 responses recorded for this question. Quantitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 66.44% (99/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar session on communication (listening and paraphrasing) made a large to very large contribution to them as an individual. Qualitative data from the telephone survey

	interviews indicated 13.42% (20/149) (see comments below) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar had an impact on their influencing others via communication.
Comments typical of the youths' remarks from the in-person interviews about communication included:	Comments typical of the participants' remarks from the telephone survey interviews included:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opening up, I can talk to people. (3). 2. ... actually, I can explain things better to people. 3. Like if I have a problem with a cadet I'll get him to the side and talk to him... 4. ... one thing I learnt here is how you say it is more important then what you say... 5. ... it's easier to state you point of view... 6. I can express my ideas better (3). 7. ... but now I worry about what the response will be so I get my message across clearer. 8. ... cause I never used to talk around people... 9. I used to get up there and think, "Oh no! What do I say next...Now it's like I rattle on for hours and it all makes sense and it's really if I'm in a group and I have something to say ...I'll just say it. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I know how to listen and actually practice it effectively. These were things I just took for granted, but now I use them to my advantage. 2. I am a better communicator (10). 3. I became a better listener (2). 4. It helped me with communicating, speaking and not being inhibited (7).

4.2.4 Self-Confidence Scale - Influencing Others – Part 2

One of the areas that leaders need to be effective in is working with others, especially in teams. These specific skills are necessary for a leader to have in order to take charge, be involved, and influence others. In their seminal work, Bass & Bass (2008, p.135) summarized the research evidence that task competence is not enough because many bright, able, and technically proficient individuals failed as leaders because they lacked interpersonal competence. Yukl (2013) defined relations-oriented leadership as expressing concern for others, attempting to reduce emotional conflicts, harmonizing relations among others, and regulating participating. Bass & Bass (2008, p.499) reviewed 18 studies which supported the concept that interpersonal competence was important for leadership effectiveness.

The Influencing Others dimension questions assessed this aspect of Bandura's (1977) Behaviours. It included: I was able to take charge, I was able to be actively involved with others, I was able to influence individuals. and I was able to influence groups. Both studies and both data sets of both quantitative and qualitative data (Table 7) showed that participants developed and retained their leadership self-confidence on this dimension of behaviours of influencing

others 3 months to 8 years after attending the provincial leadership training program. The qualitative comments (Table 8) showed the positive impact the provincial leadership training program had on participant's self-confidence in influencing others.

Table 8: *Self-Confidence Scale - Influencing Others Part 2 Comparative Data Analysis*

3-month data - Benson	1-8-year data - Provincial Government
<p>Quantitative survey data indicated 45.71% (16/35) of youth responded they improved their understanding of people. Qualitative data from the in-person interviews, 85.71% (36/42) of youth responded that an important contribution to their leadership effectiveness and personal change was increased ability in understanding people which included awareness of people, acceptance of people, understanding people, and dealing with people.</p>	<p>Quantitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 74.5% (111/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar session on understanding self and others made a large to very large contribution to them as an individual.</p> <p>Quantitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 61.7% (91/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar session on resolving conflicts made a large to very large contribution to them as an individual.</p> <p>Quantitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 77.18% (115/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar session on positive attitudes and building people up made a large to very large contribution to them as an individual.</p> <p>Qualitative data from the telephone survey interviews 26.85% (40/149) (see comments below) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar had an impact on their influencing others via understanding self and other people, understanding personality, resolving conflicts, and problem solving.</p>
<p>Comments typical of the youths' remarks from the in-person interviews about understanding people included:</p>	<p>Comments typical of the participants' remarks from the telephone survey interviews included:</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To understand ... how others react and how I can work with that (7) 2. It's good to understand different people of different ages. 3. I find myself more accepting now of other people and just because they don't do something the same way I do, it's not necessarily bad (3). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taught me how to deal with people, understand them better, how to see others' point of view (13). 2. Helped me self-analyze myself better, know who I was and then I could deal with others better (5). 3. I also use the skills at work, working with

4. ... it helped a lot because you can separate the person from their behavior.	personality differences to get people to do things (8).
5. I am a lot less critical of people. Prejudgments you know.	4. Helped with my problem-solving skills and ability to find solutions in a group (6).
	5. Made me a stronger person with relationships (3).
	7. Made me aware of others' feelings.
	8. I could solve conflicts better.
	9. I now accept people for what they are.
	10. The enthusiasm of the [my] growth caused me to get other people motivated (2).

4.2.5 Self-Confidence Scale - Achieving Results

Bandura (1982) found that self-confidence was a crucial element that affected a person's type of goal selection. Bandura went on to assert that self-efficacy expectations will influence the magnitude, generality, and strength of a person's efforts to achieve outcomes. Ross (2014, p.299) remarked that a self-confident person believes that the self is capable of achieving. Ross (2014, p.308) established that self-confidence influenced a person's choices, aspirations, and goals. Ross (2014, p.307), in reviewing the research by Brockner and Higgins (2001); Roberts et al. (2005); Steel and Konig (2006); Stets and Burke (2003); Tichy and Sherman (1993); noted that self-doubt was reflected in a person not setting goals that were challenging or in setting goals that were unrealistic. This results in the situation where the person never starts actions to achieving their goals because failure is almost a certainty and/or the reasons for doing nothing are overwhelming, therefore, the person's self-confidence is not sufficient to achieve their goals. Luthans, Luthans, and Hodgetts, et al. (as cited in Bass & Bass, 2008, p.1070) noted that confidence and self-efficacy from previous successes influenced leaders to choose stretch goals with a sense of determination and perseverance succeed in achieving their selected goals.

The Achieving Results dimension questions assessed this aspect of Bandura's (1977) Outcomes. It included: I was able to achieve the results I wanted, I was able to achieve the results my team wanted, and I was able to achieve the results my organization wanted. Both studies and both data sets of both quantitative and qualitative data (Table 9) showed that participants developed and retained their leadership self-confidence on this dimension of behaviours of achieving results 3 months to 8 years after attending the provincial leadership training program. The qualitative comments (Table 9) showed the positive impact the provincial leadership training program had on participant's self-confidence in achieving results.

Table 9: Self-Confidence Scale - Influencing Others Part 1 Comparative Data Analysis

3-month data - Benson	1-8-year data - Provincial Government
<p>Quantitative survey data indicated 97.14% (34/35) of youth responded they had moderate to large success in achieving the 117 (average of 3.34 goals/youth) goals they set for themselves. Analysis of the first goal each youth set revealed that 70.29% (23.9/35) of youth responded they had large to very great success in achieving this goal. Analysis of the second goal each youth set revealed that 59.81% (18.54/31) of youth responded they had large to very great success in achieving this goal. Analysis of the third goal each youth set revealed that 60% (15/25) of youth responded they had large to very great success in achieving this goal.</p> <p>Qualitative data from the in-person interviews, 16.67% (7/42) of youth responded that an important contribution to their leadership effectiveness and personal change was increased ability in setting and achieving goals.</p>	<p>Quantitative data from the telephone survey interviews indicated 55.7% (83/149) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar session on goal setting made a large to very large contribution to them as an individual.</p> <p>Qualitative data from the telephone survey interviews 2.01% (3/149) (see comments below) of the past participants responded that the Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar had an impact on their achieving results via goal setting.</p>
<p>Comments typical of the youths' remarks from the in-person interviews about goals included:</p>	<p>Comments typical of the participants' remarks from the telephone survey interviews included:</p>
<p>1.... The most major thing is the goals. Having a goal, even if it's not a leadership goal. You can apply it to different things...but it's the goals.</p> <p>2. It's kinda working for me. Some of the goals I've already achieved.</p> <p>3. I'll do this and it would take me three months to do it. Now it takes me two weeks instead cause now I know how to do my goals step by step.</p> <p>4. I've just learned more goals I guess. Like how I can become a better leader...more goals in how to attain those goals. I learned that you should always make goals and keep on striving.</p> <p>5. Having goals and figuring out what I wanted to do.</p> <p>6. I learnt to say, "I can't make a big goal I have to make smaller goals and be happy with the smaller goals I do."</p>	<p>1. The goal setting was important – more detail- making choices, creating strategies (2 comments).</p> <p>2. The personal goals information was very influential on my own development – it brought me to a personal level that was higher than my age of 14.</p>

4.2.6 Summary of Comparative Data Analysis

A fundamental research principle that assists in enhanced reliability and validity is the use of multiple sources of evidence. Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, and Sechrest (1968, p.3) have

called this triangulation of measurement. Campbell and Fiske (1959) claimed the most fertile search for validity came from a combined series of different measures, each with its idiosyncratic weaknesses, each pointed to a single hypothesis. They went on to state that when a hypothesis can survive the confrontation of a series of complementary methods of testing it contains a degree of validity unattainable by one tested with a single method. The use of two studies for comparative analysis plus the use of both quantitative and qualitative data within both studies increased the reliability and the validity of the results for this study (see Table 10).

In Benson and Enstroem’s (2014) Leader Self-Confidence Indicator (LSCI), both studies (Benson, 1991 and the Alberta Provincial Government, 1995) and both data sets of both quantitative and qualitative data (Table 10) within those two studies showed that participants increased their leadership self-confidence in three dimensions. These dimensions were: 1. Beliefs and Self-Assuredness, 2. Influencing Others, and 3. Achieving Results. The dimension of Initiating Actions showed only positive results 3 months after the leadership training program, but not 1-8 years after. Although the subscales are somewhat independent of each other, self-confidence in each subscale is related to overall general self-confidence. Each subscale significantly additively contributed to overall general leader self-confidence.

The results showed that leader self-confidence was developed and retained 3 months after attending the provincial leadership training program. This is a significant finding because there is little research on the immediate impact of a leadership training program on the leader self-efficacy and leader self-confidence development of participants, especially in youth.

The results also showed that leader self-confidence was developed and retained 1 to 8 years after attending the provincial leadership training program. This is a significant finding because there is little research on the long-term impact of a leadership training program on the leader self-efficacy and leader self-confidence permanency and retention of participants, especially in youth.

Table10: *Summary of Comparative Data-Benson (1991) and Provincial Government (1995)*

Bandura Self-Efficacy	Benson & Enstroem Self-Confidence	Benson Quantitative	Benson Qualitative	Provincial Government Quantitative	Provincial Government Qualitative
Person	Beliefs & Self-Assuredness	100% 31%	78%	76%	6% 20%
Behaviours	Initiating Actions	66%			5%
Behaviours	Influencing Others - Part 1	48%	90% 61%	72% 66%	13%

Behaviours	Influencing Others - Part 2	45%	85%	74% 61% 77%	26%
Outcomes	Achieving Results	97% 70% 59% 60%	16%	55%	2%

5. Conclusions, Recommendations, and Future Research

Benson (1991) asserted that leaders who are high performers are competent and confident in their ability to influence the behaviors, attitudes, and values of themselves, other individuals, groups, and organizations. He also emphasized that leadership training and development programs must improve both the competence and the confidence of leaders, enabling them to move from low performance to high performance. Also, McCormick (2001, p. 31) asserted that in the leadership literature no study was found that measured whether a leadership development program affected trainees' efficacy beliefs.

Data from this comparative study (see Table 5) is one of the first studies to provide evidence that a leadership development program increased participants leadership effectiveness and leader self-confidence 3 months (immediate) and 1-8 years (long-term) after attending. The first conclusion from the present study confirmed that leader effectiveness and leader self-confidence can be developed in youth in a leadership training program and that leader effectiveness and leader self-confidence will persist over time to become permanent.

The second conclusion is support for Locke's (1991) emphasis that since self-confidence is an undisputed trait necessary for successful leadership, therefore, it needs to be one of the major objectives of leadership training programs. The third conclusion is the leadership literature shows a clear relationship between leader's self-confidence and successful leadership (Bass, 1990; Bass & Bass, 2008; House & Aditya, 1997; Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 1994, 2013), and provides support for McCormick's (2001) request to use leadership self-efficacy or self-confidence as a training evaluation criterion.

Last, is encouragement to continue to provide opportunities for youth to develop their leader effectiveness and leader self-confidence. This can be done by specifically designing the curriculum of leadership training programs to create successful learning experiences which result in leader skills development and self-confidence development and retention. Future research will be done to determine which program activities contributed to leader effectiveness and leader self-confidence development and retention.

Benson and Enstroem's Leader Self-confidence Indicator Scale (LSCI) measures areas of general self-confidence. By adding specific terms about negotiating and peer coaching to the LSCI item questions, it has been adapted to assess negotiating self-confidence (Enstroem & Benson, 2016) and peer coaching self-confidence (Benson & Enstroem, 2017). By adding specific terms, it can be further adapted to measure self-confidence in teams, presentations, communication, etc. As well, the LSCI can be adapted to use as a criterion to measure self-confidence in business leadership and management training programs, university courses, and high school courses.

In Benson and Enstroem's (2013) LSCI model the four phases (Belief and Self-Assuredness, Initiating Action, Influencing Others, and Achieving Results) which people move through to develop their self-confidence can be used to design a variety of learning experiences. These could include leadership and management training programs, general training programs, university courses, and high school courses. Structuring the content, delivery, assignments, and personal reflection by sequentially following the 4 phases of the model can increase participants' self-confidence development.

References

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37 (20), 122-147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *The explanatory and predicative scope of self-efficacy theory*. Guilford Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Battle, J. (1990). *Self-esteem: The new revolution*. James Battle and Associates.
- Battle, J. (1992). *Explanations for Response Choice: A Guide for the Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventories*. James Battle and Associates.
- Benson, L. (1991). *A youth leadership training case study*. (Ph.D. dissertation.) University of Alberta.

- Benson, L. & Enstrom, R. (June 2013). Educating for the future: The wholistic leadership model and the confidence-competence interplay. Proceedings of EDINEB Conference, June 5-7, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom.
- Benson, L. & Enstrom, R. (2017). Deliberate institutional differentiation through graduate attributes: Implementing professional skills at MacEwan School of Business. *Journal of Management Development*, 36(96), in press. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-08-2016-0148>
- Brockner, J. & Higgins, E.T. (2001). Regulatory focus theory, implications for the study of emotions at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 61(1), 35-66. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2972>
- Cameron, K. & Caza, A. (2004). Introductions, contributions to the discipline of positive organizational scholarship. *American behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764203260207>
- Cameron, K., Dutton, J., & Quinn, R.E. (2003). Foundations of positive organizational scholarship in Cameron, K., Dutton, J., & Quinn, R.E.(eds.). *Positive Organizational scholarship*, Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco, CA, 3-13.
- Campbell, D.T. & Fiske, D.W. (1959). Convergent and divergent discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological bulletin*, 56(2), 81-105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046016>
- Chan, K.Y. & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 481-498. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.481>
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M. & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004>
- Corsini, R. J. (2002). *The dictionary of psychology*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Cramer, R.J., Neal, M.S., & Brodsky, S.L. (2009). Self-efficacy and confidence: Theoretical distinctions and implications for trial consultation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61(4), 319-334. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017310>
- Encouraging Alberta's Future Leaders. (2013). *Edmonton Journal*. Edmonton, Alberta.
- Enstroem, R. & Benson, L. (2016). A triangulated appraisal of how hybrid activities develop students negotiating self-confidence. In Daly, P., Reid, K., Buckley, P. & Doyle, E.

- (ed.s.) Innovative Business Education Design for 21st Century Learning. Springer International Publishing, Switzerland, 41-54.
- Fineman, S. (2006). On being positive, concerns and counterpoints. *Academy of Management Review*, 31 (2), 270-291. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.20208680>
- First Nations In Alberta. (2014). Qs -6289-010-EE-A1, Catalogue: R2-141/120E. ISSN: 1927-9469.
- Greiman, B. C. & Addington, L. S. (2008). Youth leadership development self-efficacy: An exploratory study involving a new construct. *Journal of Leadership Education*,7(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.12806/V7/I1/RF1>
- Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F. & Harms, P. D. (2008). Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(6), 669–692. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.09.007>
- Hollenbeck, G.P. & Hall, D.T. (2004). Self-confidence and leader performance. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33 (3), 254-269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.06.003>
- House, R.J. & Aditya, R.N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*. 23:409-473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300306>
- Kane, T. D. & Baltes, T. R. (1998). Efficacy assessment in complex social domains: Leadership efficacy in small task groups.
- Klimoski, R. & Amos, B. (2012). Practicing evidence-based education in leadership development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, amle–2012. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0018>
- Knowles, M. S. (1984). *The Adult Learner, A Neglected Species* (3rd ed.). Gulf, Houston, TX.
- Locke, EA. (1991). *The essence of leadership: The four keys to leading successfully*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Lord, R. G. & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(4), 591–615. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.06.003>
- Lukashova, S.& Gumarova, N. (2017). Leadership profile of lawyer candidates in Kazakhstan. *PUPIL: International Journal of Teaching, Education, and Learning*,1(2), pp.62-74. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijtel.2017.12.6274>
- McCormick, M.J. (2001). Self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness: Applying social cognitive theory to leadership. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(1), 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190100800102>

- Neck, C.P. & Manz, C.C. (2010). *Mastering Self-Leadership, Empowering Yourself for Personal Excellence* (5th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Northouse, P.G. (2001). *Leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Parker, P., Hall, D. T. & Kram, K. E. (2008). Peer coaching: A relational process for accelerating career learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(4), 487–503.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.35882189>
- Popper, M., Amit, K., Gal, R., Mishkal-Sinai, M., & Lisak, A. (2004). The capacity to lead: Major psychological differences between leaders and non-leaders. *Military Psychology*, 16(4), 245-263. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327876mp1604_3
- Provincial Youth Leadership Seminar Impact Survey Results (1995). Alberta Community Development Document.
- Roberts, L.M., Dutton, J.E., Spreitzer, G.M., Heaphy, E.D., & Quinn, R.E. (2005). Composing the reflected best self-portrait, building pathways for becoming extraordinary in work organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(4), 712-736.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2005.18378874>
- Ross, S. (2014). A conceptual model for understanding the process of self-leadership development and action steps to promote personal leadership development. *Journal of Management Development*, 33(4), 299-323. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-11-2012-0147>
- Scherer, M., Maddux, J.E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R.W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports* 51, 663-671. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1982.51.2.663>
- Schwarzer, R. & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized self-efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Casual and control beliefs*, 35-37. Windsor, UK, NFER-NELSON.
- Seligman, M.E. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology, an introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55 (1), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>
- Shrauger, J.S. & Schoen, M. (1995). Self-confidence in college students: Conceptualization, measurement, and behavioral implications. *Assessment*, 2 (3), 255-278.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191195002003006>
- Steel, P. & Konig, C. (2006). Integrating theories in motivation. *Academy of Management Review*. (31 (4), 889-913. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.22527462>

- Stets, J.E. & Burke, R.J. (2003). A sociological approach to self and identity in Leary, M.R. and Tangney, J.P. (eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity*. Guilford Press, New York, NY.
- Tariq, V.N., Scott, E.M., Cochrane, A.C., Lee, M., & Ryles, L. (2004). Quality Assurance in Education, 12 (2), 70-81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880410536440>
- UN/GA Document (1985). A/40/701, October 11. Report of the Secretary General on International Youth Year to the General Assembly.
- Watt, L. (2004). Mentoring and coaching in the workplace. *Canadian Manager*, 29, 14–16.
- Webb, E.J., Campbell, D.T., Schwartz, R.D., & Sechrest, L. (1968). *Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in Organizations*, (3rd ed.). Pearson Education: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*, (5th ed.). Pearson Education: Prentice Hall. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051811429352>