FEMALE GRADUATE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES AFTER LEADERSHIP TRAINING

A Case Study

SUSAN GRANTHAM, ANNE E. PIDANO,
AND JENNIFER M. WHITCOMB

Although the increasing focus on female leadership in both the popular press and scholarly literature is relatively recent, women's leadership is not. Women have traditionally played a role in civic and cultural arenas and now have a greater opportunity to bring their particular leadership strengths to a broad range of organizations. The current paper reports on a case study about participants' attitudes after participating in a leadership seminar series program for female graduate students at a university in the Northeast. The program's design incorporated networking, goal setting, skills training, and mentoring. Postprogram results (N=17) on measures of Houghton and Neck's Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire indicated significant changes on all three of the leadership questionnaire's dimensions as well as on several subscales within the dimensions indicating that after the leadership training, the women were adapting to more transactional practices such as self-reward and goal setting.

Introduction

The popularity of books such as *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead* (Sandberg, 2013) and *Her Place at the Table: A Woman's Guide to Negotiating Five Key Challenges to Leadership Success* (Kolb, Williams, & Frohlinger, 2010), as well as articles in media outlets such as *The New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* (Singh, Nadim, & Ezzedeen, 2012), suggest that women in leadership positions is a relatively new phenomenon, but it is not. In fact, women's leadership

has traditionally been a mainstay of civic and cultural development (Kawulich, 2008), emphasizing the power of the "girl effect" in improving the lives of the population across all sectors of society (Lesser, 2010). However, leadership played out in the local community setting is often unrecognized and does not necessarily translate to leadership opportunities and roles in the workforce (Fletcher, 1999), which is the focus of the how-to books referenced here.

Today there are increased opportunities for women to assume leadership positions in the workforce based on their access to higher education and years of experience in the workforce (Trinidad & Normore, 2005). Published research regarding female leadership roles emphasizes the benefit to organizations led by women while highlighting differences in leadership styles between women and men (Boatman, Wellins, & Neal, 2011; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Loden, 1985; Shankman, Haber, Facca, & Allen, 2010). Organizations with female leaders benefit from women's emotional intelligence and tenacity, leading to empowerment and issue alignment, which is especially desirable in the workplace (Ibarra & Obodaru, 2009; Landis, Predolin, Lewis, Brousseau, & Slan-Jerusalim, 2011; Rosener, 1991; Shankman et al., 2010). Through empowerment, women envision and create a value-added component to leadership that is not strictly transactional or transformative (Werhane, 2007). Transactional leaders, broadly defined, influence subordinates using reward and punishment as a form of motivation. Alternatively, transformative leaders encourage followers to love their craft and value their own input, making a positive change toward being future leaders (Dems, 2011).

Assuming a leadership position in the workplace creates a range of issues and opportunities for women and men. However, women may emphasize creating a balanced life, and achieving that balance can be challenging (Caprino, 2013; Eagly & Carli, 2007). Meeting the challenge may actually play to the strength of female leaders as women often view challenges as an opportunity for growth rather than a problem to be solved (Regine, 2009).

One area of progress within women's leadership that has lagged behind that of men is the role of on-site mentors (Olson & Jackson, 2009). Traditional mentoring, whereby an upper-level manager picks a protégé and oversees his or her progress, has been less available to women (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Searby & Tripses, 2006). Effective mentorships require participants to work or volunteer together to engage in this relationship. Mentoring relationships often do not work for women who are trying to establish a balance between work and home responsibilities, as mentoring often takes place outside of the work environment (Dahle, 2007). In order to develop these important mentoring opportunities, females may rely more on peer networks, often with others who are not even within their company or industry (Dahle, 2007).

Due to the evolving nature of women in leadership positions, the purpose of the current project was to develop a one-semester seminar series that offered female graduate students leadership training. The training was designed so participants would learn to identify and embrace their own personal leadership potential and abilities as they moved into the workforce or moved up in organizations where they were already employed. The seminars combined skill-based training and problem-solving scenarios that supported the participants' abilities to envision solutions, leading to the self-discovery of leadership capabilities, and provided a networking and mentoring framework. Using Debebe's (2009) approach, leadership training was created for the students as an experience "that enables women learners to expand their sense of personal agency in the leadership role" (p. 2).

The female leadership seminar series discussed in this paper was developed for a cohort of female graduate students based on the premise that these students had already self-selected into a career path that required additional knowledge and that could lead to leadership opportunities. A collaborative approach was used to plan and implement the seminar series with the goal of empowering the participants to make decisions about their leadership potential (Nauman, Kahn, & Ehsan, 2010). Collaboration also reflected less of a powered position between leaders and participants (Chin, 2004), or what Hertneky (2010) calls "leading through relationships" (p. 9). The planning committee felt that exposure to the information in a leadership seminar series at this early stage of their careers could be informative and useful as the participants

moved forward in their own careers. The participants were evaluated before and after the seminar series about their attitudes toward themselves and toward leadership using four scales: Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965), Levenson's Internality, Powerful Others, and Chance Scales (1981), Nelson's Simplified Attitudes toward Women Scale (1988), and Houghton and Neck's Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (2002), to assess changes in attitudes and self-perceptions.

Women's Approach to Leadership

Women have encountered barriers in assuming leadership positions. A study by Kaufman and Grace (2011) reported that women perceived that gender-related issues were preventing their ability to become effective leaders. The gender-related issues may be explained by differences found in leadership styles. Loden (1985) posited that women's leadership styles are characterized by cooperation and collaboration in both upward and downward trajectories. Hesselbein's (1999) Wheel of Fortune model of leadership supports a multidirectional, relationship-building leadership style that is nonhierarchical and reflects a transformative method of leading. Studies have found that men continue to use hierarchical, transactional approaches in leadership positions, whereas women are adopting a combined transformational and transactional style of leadership (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). It is perhaps due to the implementation of transformational leadership, in part or in whole, that women may be perceived as less effective leaders although research has shown that organizations with female leaders have a greater return on investment (Barsh & Yee, 2011).

Reflective of the combined transformative and transactional leadership styles, leadership training has moved toward the problem-solving approach, using 360-degree feedback, feedback-intensive training, and skills-based training (Chappelow, 1998; Debebe, 2009; Van Velsor, 1998). Leadership training typically takes place on site at an organization or has been organizationally sponsored so participants can immediately implement the lessons learned. The goal has been to give participants a voice in order to achieve a positive outcome.

Finding one's voice equals power; it is the recognition of one's legitimate right to participate. A voice is often a metaphor for leadership supporting a collective understanding about an issue (Kleinermen, 2010). A voice literally explicates the words spoken to describe and detail actions. A voice reflects inner beliefs. Women use their "voice" to empower others to collaborate and move forward (Nauman et al., 2010).

Women's Attitudes and Leadership

In 2006, Clark wrote an article for *Forbes* magazine titled "Are Women Happy Under the Glass Ceiling?" that explored women's attitudes toward seeking and obtaining top positions and the pay and perks that go with those jobs. Although leadership takes place in many sectors of rank-and-file employees, it is often equated with the decision-making responsibilities of higher management jobs. Clark's article suggested that both men and women feel that there is a glass ceiling and, in general, women are more willing to remain under it in order to maintain a balance between their work and home lives. Women assume that leadership responsibilities are often viewed as an impossibility in terms of maintaining this balance (Hertneky, 2010). A 2002 Families and Work Institute study reports that only 36% of college-educated women wanted to move into a job with more responsibility.

The question then becomes: Is it possible to be a leader and maintain the desired life balance? If not, why not? To answer these questions it is important to explore women's attitudes toward themselves, other women, and work expectations, in order to understand women's hesitancy in assuming leadership roles.

Self-esteem is a critical component of leadership (Rosenberg, 1989). Self-esteem does not translate into leaders having all of the answers. In fact, strong self-esteem would support a leader knowing that critical information and input is likely to come from others. According to Rosenberg (1989), self-esteem is the overall evaluation of one's own value or worth. Someone with low self-esteem is unlikely to seek leadership positions. Alternatively, persons with higher self-esteem are not constrained by self-doubts and may seek opportunities to be leaders. Self-esteem is crucial to effective leadership. Thus, the first research question focused on the role of leadership training and self-esteem: Will leadership training result in higher self-esteem?

If a woman has high self-esteem, is it possible that she lacks a locus of control when it comes to dealing with leadership? Do women feel that they are in control of their destiny or does "it" happen to them? Levenson (1981) explored perceptions about the level of control an individual feels s/he has over her or his life and created a scale that evaluated whether someone felt in control (internality), felt powerful others were in control, or felt it was simply a matter of chance. Like self-esteem, one would need a strong feeling of internal control, the ability to self-direct one's life events, in order to seek leadership positions. Thus research questions 2 and 3 explore whether leadership training increases the dimension of internality and reduces the dimensions of powerful others and chance.

Along with self-esteem and locus of control orientation, personal bias plays a part in expectations of leadership. Women are often perceived as competent or likable but seldom both (Catalyst, 2010). Do women expect more of other women? According to a study by Lougheed (2000) examining leadership and gender, perhaps they do. Women continue to specify a preference for male bosses (Newport, 2011; Newport & Wilke, 2013). A study by Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra (2009) found that women were generally considered "less qualified" than men, especially if the women worked in a less congruent industry than the respondent worked in.

Sandberg (2013), the chief financial officer at Facebook, self-reported that in the past she has been more lenient with men than with women. Eagly and Karau (2002) outlined the incongruity toward women in leadership positions as two forms of prejudice: (a) women as potential leaders are perceived less favorably; and (b) women's actions in performing behaviors associated with leadership are perceived less favorably than when men perform the same actions. Research question 4 was developed to ascertain what women's attitudes are toward other women's behavior and whether the participants' attitudes changed after participating in the leadership seminar series.

Women's leadership styles have been documented to be more transformational than transactional (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Transactional leadership styles reinforce the idea of rewards for achievements. Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001)

found that women were beginning to employ contingent reward behaviors more often associated with transactional leadership functions. The shift to incorporating contingent rewards in relation to one's leadership style is a telling sign in the evolution of women's leadership. Research question 5 examined the role of leadership training and perceptions toward the use of rewards by assessing whether leadership training changes women's perception of the use of self-reward behavior as a function of leadership.

The literature indicated that being mentored is a critical component of leadership opportunities for women (Olson & Jackson, 2009). Women who are not sponsored or mentored seldom rise above the lower echelons of entry-level management (Howard & Wellins, n.d.). Therefore, mentorship was incorporated into the seminar series.

In conclusion, this study reports the findings of a female leadership seminar series that focused on allowing participants to discover and understand their own leadership potential with the aim that the participants would find that the "best" leadership style was one of their own making. In short, the goal was to help the participants to create their own leadership vision without it being tied to a specific job, life circumstance, or mentorship opportunity.

Method

This project was developed to create a seminar series for young women so that they would come to understand their leadership potential. Participants responded to a series of established scales before and after participating in the semester-long seminars in order to evaluate if there had been a change in the participants' attitudes toward their own leadership potential and women as leaders in general.

SEMINAR DEVELOPMENT

Through a series of four meetings, a planning committee developed the seminar series for female graduate students with a focus on increasing the students' ability to recognize leadership potential in themselves and others and to seek leadership opportunities. The conceptual basis for the series incorporated the premise of women-only training, which has been supported as a method that provides an environment where

Table 1. Leadership Seminar Series Topics		
Session	Year 1	Year 2
1	Team-building meal	Team-building meal
	Understanding One's Self Mentoring and Being Mentored*	Appreciative Inquiry
2	Living a Balanced Life	Authentic Self
3	Breathing Life into Presentations	Financing Your Plan
4	Goal Setting and Assessment	Finding Your Voice
5	Volunteer work day	Volunteer work day

*In Year 1 student participants were paired with faculty and staff mentors. In Year 2 student participants were assigned to peer mentor groups.

women feel comfortable about establishing leadership ambitions and recognizing their leadership strengths (Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003).

Female graduate students were selected as participants for the seminar series based on the fact that these students had exhibited a desire to rise within their chosen fields by pursuing additional education and/or training as graduate students. An announcement about the leadership seminar series was e-mailed to the deans of various colleges on campus, posted on the university's website, and published in the online campus newspaper. Faculty-to-student recruitment was also used to identify students who might want to participate. Subsequently, interested students filled out an application that required a brief (250-word limit) statement about why they wanted to participate.

Eighty-five percent of the applicants were accepted in the first year (16 participants) and 80% (12 participants) of the applicants were accepted in the second year. The applications were assessed and ranked primarily based on the indicated level of interest in the program as expressed through the short essay and other leadership training experiences the applicant listed. A few candidates were eliminated based on the applicant's previous leadership training experience and participation in similar types of leadership seminar experiences because it was felt that the proposed seminars would not greatly benefit them. Other candidates were eliminated because the seminar series was not designed to help them accomplish the tasks specified in their essay such as completing their dissertation.

The seminar series was conducted twice, both times during the spring semester, and was composed of two separate cohorts. Based on feedback from the first-year cohort's responses to the seminar experience,

adjustments were made to the structure of the seminars the following year, such as the order of the presented topics (see Table 1). Additional changes included (a) reducing the cohort size from 16 to 12, (b) meeting biweekly instead of monthly, and (c) using peer mentors instead of the professional staff mentors used the first year. Although specific demographic information was not requested as part of the application process, it became known during the seminars that participants included full- and part-time students, women who worked full time or not at all, students going straight through school and those returning to school after a long break of many years, single women, married women, women with children, and students who were United States citizens as well as international students.

Each session lasted between 2 and 4 hours. The longer sessions took place initially, to establish participant relationships, and at the end of the seminar, so that participants could participate in a community-based volunteer activity such as landscaping a safe house for women and children. The seminar series was designed to provide a combination of self-discovery, skills, and goal setting. Although the order of presentations, session titles, and presenters differed slightly between the 2 years, the content covered was substantially the same.

ASSESSMENT

The scales used to evaluate the research questions included Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (SES) (1965), Levenson's Internality, Powerful Others, and Chance Scales (1981), Nelson's Simplified Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS) (1988), and Houghton and Neck's Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (2002).

Rosenberg's scale is a unidimensional measure, originally intended for an adolescent population. It

has been used extensively in research, and Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman (1991) note that it "is the standard against which new measures are evaluated" (p. 123). Based on several different studies, Robinson et al. reported reliability (internal consistency) of .77 and .88 using Cronbach's alpha. The authors further reported test–retest reliability values of .82 (2-week interval) and .85 (1-week interval) from two different studies. Additionally, Robinson et al. cited a range of studies supporting both the Rosenberg scale's convergent validity (e.g., positive relationship with another self-esteem scale and negative relationships with anxiety and depression) and its discriminant validity (no significant correlation with such factors as age, marital status, or gender).

Levenson's Internality (I), Powerful Others (P), and Chance (C) Scales (IPC) were developed to assess three independent aspects of control: belief in control over one's life, belief that others exert control over one's life, and belief in the role that chance plays (Robinson et al., 1991). Robinson et al. (1991) noted that the scales have been used with a range of populations and report both reliability and validity values from Levenson's own work (e.g., Kuder-Richardson internal consistency values of .64, .77, and .78 for the three scales). Although Robinson et al. credited this instrument with being "one of the first…to disaggregate the components of locus of control and to create a multidimensional scale" (p. 426), they also indicate that the results obtained from the scales can be conceptually challenging.

There have been several versions of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (Daugherty & Dambrot, 1986; Nelson, 1988). The current study used Nelson's (1988) simplified version because reliability and validity estimates for men and women were available. Reported reliability alpha values were .84 ($N = 278$) for females and males, .83 for those under age 40, and .85 for women only (all ages, $N = 117$).

Houghton and Neck (2002) presented results from a factor analysis of their Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ), based on previous measures, which has three independent factors related to constructive thoughts, behavior, and natural rewards. This questionnaire has been used to evaluate participants' self-direction and motivation to perform well through autonomous activities and decision making (Norris,

2008). A sense of autonomy influences self-leadership (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Behavior-focused strategies facilitate personal behavior by using self–goal setting, self-reward, self-punishment, self-observation, and self-cueing (Neck & Houghton, 2006) and natural reward strategies result in activities whereby the tasks themselves become naturally rewarding (Manz & Neck, 2004). Constructive thought strategies create positive habitual ways of thinking (Neck & Houghton, 2006) and can change how one cognitively frames issues to produce a positive expectation (Boss & Sims, 2008).

In order to assess changes in participants' self-esteem, locus of control, attitudes toward other women, and decision-making behaviors, the participants completed a series of identical questionnaires before the first seminar and at the conclusion of the last seminar.

Results

Not all participants filled out the pre- and postsurveys, for a variety of reasons. These results reflect the scores of the 17 participants who completed the questionnaires both before and after participating in the seminar series. The 17 participants included 10 from the first year and 7 from the second year. The 11 participants who did not fill out both the pre- and postsurveys had either arrived late during the first session of the seminar when the questionnaires were being filled out or were unable to participate in the last session of the seminar.

The first research question focused on the role of leadership training and self-esteem: Will leadership training result in higher self-esteem? A paired samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether respondents' self-esteem increased after participating in the leadership seminar series. Although not significant, the results indicate that self-esteem did increase as the $M = 16.00$ for the prescore and $M = 15.00$ for the postscore, ($t(16) = 1.03$, $p = .31$). The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale results in scores ranging between 10 and 30, where *lower* scores indicate higher self-esteem, indicating that the respondent's reported self-esteem was already sufficiently high before participating in the leadership series.

The second research question asked whether leadership training increases the dimension of internality. The results were not significant but indicate that the

internality dimension in the locus of control construct did increase where $M = 4.38$ for the prescore and $M = 5.29$ for the postscore. ($t(16) = 1.38$, $p = .18$). This result shows a slight movement in participants' feeling that they have more control over their own actions and subsequent outcomes.

The third research question, will leadership training decrease the dimensions of powerful others and chance, also provided results that were not significant but did indicate that the chance dimension in the locus of control construct did decrease where $M = 2.91$ for the prescore and $M = 2.77$ for the postscore. ($t(16) = 1.34$, $p = .19$). The change in the powerful others dimension showed a very minor decrease where $M = 3.06$ for the prescore and $M = 3.04$ for the postscore. ($t(16) = .18$, $p = .85$).

The fourth research question, will leadership training change women's attitudes toward the behavior of women, indicated no change in this score where the preseminar series $M = 93.11$ and the postseminar series $M = 93.00$. Total scores on the measure ranged between 22 and 110 with lower scores indicating that respondents held more traditional views toward women's roles. Even before the leadership seminar series the participants' views toward women were not aligned with traditional sex orientation roles.

Research question five examined whether leadership training changes women's perceptions about self-leadership through the use of self-reward. The self-leadership questionnaire is comprised of three scales: behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought patterns. The behavior-focused strategies scale is designed to measure the growth in self-awareness in terms of managing behaviors involving necessary tasks (Houghton & Neck, 2002). Scores for this subscale range between 18 and 90, where higher scores indicate participants' responses to self–goal setting, self-reward, self-punishment, self-observation, and self-cueing (see Table 2). Participants reported an increase in behavior-focused strategies after participating in the seminar, which supports the findings by Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) that women are incorporating more contingent reward behaviors associated with transactional leadership functions. Respondent scores also increased in regard to self–goal setting, self-reward, and self-observation subscales. The results for the global natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies dimensions also demonstrated significant changes in participants' responses in the pre- and postmeasurement. In addition, significant increases emerged on the visualizing successful performance and evaluating beliefs and assumptions subscales of the constructive thought patterns dimension (see Table 2).

In terms of mentorship participants, most participants reported that the relationship was somewhat to very

Dimension	Subscale	Mean Preseminar	Mean Postseminar	df	t	p
Behavior-focused strategies	Self–goal setting	20.00	22.06	16	−3.00	.01
	Self-reward	9.93	12.18	16	−2.20	.04
	Self-punishment	14.87	15.18	16	−0.33	.74
	Self-observation	15.93	17.31	16	−2.90	.01
	Self-cueing	8.31	8.43	16	−0.41	.68
	Dimension total	69.04	75.18	16	−20.46	.00
Natural reward strategies	Focusing thoughts on natural rewards	19.73	21.40	15	−2.82	.05
Constructive thought pattern strategies	Visualizing successful performance	18.50	20.19	16	−2.17	.05
	Self-talk	11.50	11.69	16	−0.31	.76
	Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	14.31	15.69	16	−2.42	.03
	Dimension Total	44.31	47.56	16	−2.29	.04

Table 2. Houghton and Neck's (2002) Self-Leadership Questionnaire Subscales (N = 17).

helpful regardless of whether they were mentored one on one, as was the process in the first year of the program, or whether they participated in the peer mentoring groups, as was the structure during the second year.

Discussion

The results of the current case study are encouraging in terms of the potential for leadership training to have a positive impact for women who participate in such experiences. The comparison of preseminar and postseminar scores on the three primary dimensions, and several of the subscales, from Houghton and Neck's (2002) RSLQ did yield statistically significant differences. Such a pattern of results suggests that the seminar had the most influence on those reported thoughts and behaviors that are most directly related to self-leadership and that Houghton and Neck (2002) have described as "a process through which people influence themselves to achieve the self-direction and motivation necessary to behave and perform in desirable ways" (p. 672). Certainly, for women who are enrolled in graduate education programs, and who presumably have set important personal, academic, and/or professional goals for themselves, this is a critical consideration, especially when many of them may be balancing the competing demands of school, work, and family. These findings are in agreement with reported results from previous studies demonstrating that women are employing contingent reward behaviors, such as self-reward, and reflect a move by women to incorporate more transactional leadership practices (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Additionally, incorporation of transactional leadership styles may help women define the life balance they seek. The desire to establish this balance keeps some women from pursuing leadership positions (Caprino, 2013). The finding also supports a primary purpose of the seminar series, which was for the participants to create their own leadership vision.

Specifically, respondents showed the greatest change in the behavior-focused strategies of self–goal setting, self-reward, and self-observation. The result may be attributed to two of the seminar sessions, Goal Setting and Assessment (year 1) and Financing Your Plan (year 2), that focused on establishing financial goals

and financial self-rewards and represented a transaction based on successful completion of a goal. The participants also indicated an increased ability to reshape or reconsider tasks to make them more enjoyable. Finally, participants reported a significant change on the dimension of constructive thought patterns in terms of strategies of visualizing successful performance and evaluating beliefs and assumptions.

One might reasonably ask why no significant differences emerged for the SES, the IPC, and the AWS. For this particular group of women, it is suggested that the answer lies in the preseminar ratings on these measures. Self-esteem was already reasonably robust and attitudes toward women were already more liberal than traditional, indicating a homogeneity among the participants and a ceiling effect. The participants were all graduate students who self-selected into the seminar series by applying to participate. It should also be noted that the simplified AWS was published in a 1988 paper, and it may be that in the ensuing two decades society's overall attitudes toward women have become less traditional and so there may a narrower range of attitudes in a given group—especially one that is composed entirely of females.

The findings for the Internality, Powerful Others, and Chance Scales must be interpreted very tentatively, given that none of the differences between pre- and postseminar scores were statistically significant. However, the change in the mean Internality score was consistent with an increased perception of having more control over one's life, whereas the mean Chance score decreased slightly and the mean Powerful Others score was virtually unchanged. It may be that for the women in this group relationships with significant others (family, friends, and professors) remained stable and therefore engendered no changes in the Powerful Others scale.

Although the authors anticipated that scores on all of the measures might change after participation in the seminar, the findings may indicate that the RSLQ simply taps into very different dimensions than do the other questionnaires. Similarly, although the seminar series was not specifically designed to address the three core components (behavior, constructive thought, self-reward) evaluated by the Houghton and Neck (2002) scales, or the dimensions assessed by the other

instruments, it may be that the session topics corresponded with these more than with issues related to self-esteem, control, or attitudes toward women.

Although the current case study contributes to the limited empirical literature on women and leadership training, there are several qualifications that must be noted. The number of women who participated over the 2 years of the program was small and self-selected. Therefore, it is not possible to generalize the findings to any other group, including female graduate students in general. In addition, all of the measures used in the study relied on self-report and so were subject to all of the constraints of such measures; most important, the responses were all based on participants' perceptions and beliefs and were not corroborated or supported with data from other sources. It may also be that some responses, especially after the program ended, were influenced by social desirability. The seminar series was relatively brief and it is not possible to demonstrate actual cause and effect nor have any knowledge of other changes or influences in these women's lives during this time.

Future research on similar projects would do well to include multiple sources of data and to collect additional data several months after the program, which is difficult to do with graduate students who often leave the area upon graduating. It would be extremely helpful to have a better understanding of whether changes in responses to questionnaires such as the RSLQ would persist and whether there might be any "sleeper" changes that emerge on any of the other measures. In developing leadership training for women in graduate programs, who tend to be in the early stages of their career, it would be prudent to emphasize constructive thought pattern behavior whereby the participants establish goals and develop behaviors that help them achieve their goals, such as visualizing a successful performance and self-reflection. Future leadership training evaluation may show even greater results among women who would not necessarily self-select into this type of training. In conclusion, and despite its limitations, the authors believe that the seminar series was a meaningful experience for the women who participated. Although the concepts and language of self-leadership theory were not used specifically in implementing the program, the participants did in fact demonstrate positive changes with respect to self-leadership growth. It is hoped that the seminar

participants were able to develop their own leadership vision through a combination of self-discovery, skills training, and goal setting and that helped them to envision a balanced life that includes a leadership role.

References

Barsh, J., & Yee, L. (2011, April). Unlocking the full potential of women in the U.S. economy. Special report produced exclusively for *The Wall Street Journal* Executive Task Force for Women in the Economy. Retrieved from http://www.mckinsey.com/client_service/organization/latest_thinking/unlocking_the_full_potential

Boatman, J., Wellins, R. S., & Neal, S. (2011). Women work: The business benefits of closing the gender gap. *Global Leadership Forecast.* Retrieved from http://www.ddiworld.com/DDIWorld/media/trendresearch/womenatworkgendergap_br_ddi.pdf

Boss, A. D., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2008). Everyone fails! Using emotion regulation and self-leadership for recovery. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*, 135–150.

Caprino, K. (2013). The top 6 reasons women are not leading in corporate America as we need them to. *Forbes.* Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/kathycaprino/2013/02/12/the-top-6-reasons-women-are-not-leading-in-corporate-america-as-we-need-them-to/

Catalyst. (2010). *The double bind dilemma for women in leadership: Damned if you do, doomed if you don't.* Retrieved from http://www.catalyst.org/uploads/the_double_bind_for_women_in_leadership_flyer.pdf

Chappelow, C. T. (1998). 360-degree feedback: Best practices to ensure impact. In C. D. McCauley, R. S. Moxley, & E. Van Velsor (Eds.), *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development,* 58–84. Greensboro, NC: CCL Press.

Chin, J. L. (2004). 2003 Division 35 presidential address of the American Psychological Association: Feminist leadership, feminist visions and diverse voices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28,* 1–8.

Clark, H. (2006, March). Are women happy under the glass ceiling? *Forbes.* Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/2006/03/07/glass-ceiling-opportunities--cx_hc_0308glass.html

Dahle, C. (2007). Women's ways of mentoring. *Fast Company.* Retrieved from http://www.fastcompany.com/34854/womens-ways-mentoring

Daugherty, C. G., & Dambrot, F. H. (1986). Reliability of the attitudes toward women scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46,* 449–453.

Debebe, G. (2009). Transformational learning in women's leadership development training: Center for gender in organizations. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal, 29*(7). Retrieved from http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/Vol29_2009/Debebe.pdf

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11,* 227–268.

Dems, K. (2011). Transactional vs. transformational leadership: Pick your style! *Bright Hub.* Retrieved from http://www.brighthub .com/office/home/articles/83132.aspx

Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 539-546. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.539

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(9), 62–71.

Eagly, A. H. & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leaderships styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues: Gender, Hierarchy, and Leadership, 57,* 781–798.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 569-591. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 233–256.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109,* 573–59

Families and Work Institute. (2002). *2002 national study of the changing workforce.* Retrieved from http://www.familiesand work.org/highlights-of-the-national-study-of-the-changing -workforce-2002/

Fletcher, J. K. (1999). *Disappearing acts: Gender, power, and relational practice at work.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2009). Causal attributions about feminine and leadership roles: A cross cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *40,* 492–509.

Hertneky, R. P. (2010). The role of balance in women's leadership self-identity. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal, 30*(14). Retrieved from http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl /Vol30_2010/Hertneky_Balance_vol_30_No_14_9_21_10.pdf

Hesselbein, F. (1999). Managing in a world that is round. In F. Hesselbein & P. M. Cohen (Eds.), *Leader to leader: Enduring insights on leadership from the Drucker Foundation's award winning journal* (pp. 9–14). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Houghton, J. P., & Neck, C. P. (2002). The revised self-leadership questionnaire: Testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *17,* 672-691.

Howard, A., & Wellins, R. S. (n.d.). *Holding women back: Troubling discoveries—and best practices for helping female leaders succeed—a*

special report from DDI's Global Leadership Forecast 2008–2009. Retrieved from http://www.ddiworld.com/DDIWorld/media /trend-research/holding-women-back_tr_ddi.pdf

Ibarra, H., & Obodaru, O. (2009). Transforming leaders: Women and the vision thing. *Harvard Business Review, 87*(1), 62–69.

Kaufman, E. K., & Grace, P. E. (2011). Women in grassroots leadership: Barriers and biases experiences in a membership organization dominated by men. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 4*(4), 6–16. doi:10.1002/jls.20188

Kawulich, B. B. (2008). Giving back to the community through leadership. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal, 28.* Retrieved from http://advancingwomen.com/awl/awl_wordpress/giving -back-to-the-community-through-leadership/

Kleinerman, K. (2010). Singing for leadership: Fostering the development of female leaders through voice. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal, 30*(4), 1–23.

Kolb, D. M., Williams, J., & Frohlinger, C. (2010*). Her place at the table: A woman's guide to negotiating five key challenges to leadership success.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Landis, D., Predolin, J., Lewis, J., Brousseau, K., & Slan-Jerusalim, R. (2011, November*). In case of emergency, break glass ceiling.* The Korn Ferry Institute. Retrieved from http://stage.kornferryinstitute .com/files/pdf1/In_case_of_emergency_break_glass_ceiling.pdf

Lesser, E. (2010). The new leadership story. Transcript of *Women & Power: Our Time to Lead Conference held at Omega Institute, September 24–26, 2010.* Retrieved from http://www.feminist.com /resources/artspeech/genwom/elizabethspeech.html

Levenson, H. (1981). Differentiating among internality, powerful others and chance. In H. M. Lefcourt (Ed.), *Research with the locus of control construct* (Vol. 1, pp. 15–63). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine leadership, or, how to succeed in business without being one of the boys.* New York, NY: Times Books.

Lougheed, J. (2000). Attitudes toward women leaders analyzed by gender and occupation. *Advancing Women in Leadership, 3*(1). Retrieved from http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl /winter2000/lougheed.html

Manz, C. C., & Neck, C. P. (2004). *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nauman, S., Khan, A. M., & Ehsan, N. (2010). Patterns of empowerment and leadership style in project environment. *International Journal of Project Management, 28,* 638–649.

Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research: Past developments, present trends and future possibilities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(4), 270–295.

Nelson, M. C. (1988). Simplified attitudes toward women scales. *Sex Roles, 18*, 289–296. doi:10.1007/BF00288291

Newport, F. (2011, September 8). Americans still prefer a male boss: Many have no preference. Both men and women prefer a male boss. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/149360/americans-prefer-male-bosses-no-preference.aspx

Newport, F., & Wilke, J. (2013, November 11). Americans still prefer a male boss: A plurality report that a boss' gender would make no difference. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/165791/americans-prefer-male-boss.aspx

Norris, S. E. (2008). An examination of self leadership. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, *1*(2), 43-61. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/elj/vol1iss2/ELJ_V1Is2_Norris.pdf

Olson, D. A., & Jackson, D. (2009). Expanding leadership diversity through formal mentoring programs. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *3*(1), 47–60. doi:10.1002/jls.20095

Regine, B. (2009). *Iron butterflies: Women transforming themselves and the world*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the adolescent self-image* (Rev. ed.). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Rosener, J. B. (1991). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 69*(1), 150–160.

Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work and the will to lead.* New York, NY: Knopf.

Searby, L., & Tripses, J. (2006). Breaking perceptions of "Old Boys' networks": Women leaders learning to make the most of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership, 4*(3), 179–195.

Shankman, M. L., Haber, P., Facca, T., & Allen, S. J. (2010). Gender and leadership through the lens of emotionally intelligent leadership. *Leadership Review*, *10*, 88–103.

Singh, P., Nadim, A., & Ezzedeen, S. R. (2012). Leadership styles and gender: An extension. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(4), 6–19.

Trinidad, C., & Normore, A. H. (2005). Leadership and gender: A dangerous liaison? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*, 574–590.

Van Velsor, E. (1998). Designing 360-degree feedback to enhance involvement, self-determination and commitment. In W. Tornow & M. London (Eds.), *Maximizing the value of 360-degree feedback: A process for successful individual and organizational development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vinnicombe, S., & Singh, V. (2003). Women-only management training: An essential part of women's leadership development. *Journal of Change Management, 3*, 294–306.

Werhane, P. H. (2007). Women leaders in a globalized world. *Journal of Business Ethics, 74,* 425-435. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9516-z

Susan Grantham is an Associate Professor in the School of Communication at the University of Hartford. She earned her Ph.D. at the University of Florida in communication, leadership and education. She may be contacted at grantham@hartford.edu.

Anne E. Pidano received her Ph.D. from the University at Albany, State University of New York. After 25 years working in community-based settings as a clinician, supervisor, and administrator, she became a faculty member in the Department of Psychology/Graduate Institute of Professional Psychology at the University of Hartford where she is currently an Associate Professor. She may be contacted at pidano@hartford.edu.

Jennifer Marie Whitcomb is a doctoral candidate at the Graduate Institute of Professional Psychology, University of Hartford. In 2009, she received her Bachelor's degree in General Psychology from Eastern Connecticut State University. She earned her Master's degree in Clinical Practices from the University of Hartford in 2011. Jennifer is a student affiliate of the American Psychological Association and a member of Psi-Chi. Communications can be directed to jennie.m.whitcomb@gmail.com.