

Fear of Leadership: Conceptualization, Implicit and Explicit Measures

By

Özlem Yürekli

A Thesis Submitted to the
Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of
Master of Arts
in
Psychology
Koç University
August 2015

Koç University

Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a master's thesis by

Özlem Yürekli

and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,

and that any and all revisions required by the final

examining committee have been made.

Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Zeynep Aycan

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Cemalcılar

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Seda Ertaç

Date:

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for any award or any other degree or diploma in any university or other institution. It is affirmed by the candidate that, to the best of her knowledge, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Signed

Özlem Yürekli

DEDICATION

To My Family & To My Manager

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Prof. Dr. Zeynep Aycan. “It was a privilege to work with her, thus I am honoured.” She always becomes a role model in my life. I cannot find the best words to express my gratefulness to her. It cannot be described but only experienced.

I am also thankful to Assoc. Prof. Zeynep Cemalcılar for providing the guidance and support necessary for me to complete my graduate education. I also would like to thank to Assoc. Prof. Seda Ertaç for devoting her time to contribute to my research ideas through her precious and insightful comments.

Sometimes I get tired, lost and desperate in this trip. Each time, my manager, Ebru Meriç Akgül stands by me and gives the courage and motivation to finish this thesis. She has provided countless emotional and psychological support. She also shared her valuable knowledge even she is from totally different discipline. This thesis would have never ended without her.

I am also grateful to my friends, Berke Gürkan, Ayça Alaylı, Hurigül Bayram, and Yasemin Sandıkçı (her family also). They always give their unconditional support and encouragement. I know that I am lucky to have such kind of great people in my life.

I also would like to thank to The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) for their financial support throughout my graduate and undergraduate education.

Finally, I am indebted to thank “Yürekli’s”, my dearest family, for their everlasting motivation and lifelong trust in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------------|
| STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP | III |
| DEDICATION | IV |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | V |
| ABSTRACT | IX |
| ÖZET | X |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2.LITERATURE REVIEW | 2 |
| 2.1. Fear of Leadership: A New Construct | 2 |
| 2.2. Fear of Leadership: The Implicit Association Test (IAT) of FOL | 6 |
| 2.3. Correlates of FOL: Validation of a New Measure | 9 |
| 2.3.1. <i>Motivation to lead.</i> | 10 |
| 2.3.2. <i>Neuroticism</i>..... | 10 |
| 2.3.3. <i>Cultural Intelligence.</i> | 11 |
| 2.3.4. <i>Future Leadership Intention.</i>..... | 11 |
| 3. METHOD | 13 |
| 3.1. Scale Development..... | 13 |
| 3.1.1.1. Participants and procedure | 13 |
| 3.1.1.2. Measures. | 14 |
| 3.1.1.2.1. <i>FOL questionnaire.</i> | 14 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.1.1.2.2. <i>Demographics</i> | 15 |
| 3.1.2. Study 2: Development of IAT-FOL | 15 |
| 3.1.2.1. Participants and procedure..... | 15 |
| 3.1.2.2. Measures..... | 17 |
| 3.1.2.2.1. <i>IAT-FOL</i> | 17 |
| 3.1.2.2.2. <i>Demographics</i> :..... | 18 |
| 3.2. Scale Validation | 18 |
| 3.2.1. Participants and procedure..... | 18 |
| 3.2.2. Measures..... | 18 |
| 3.2.2.1. <i>FOL questionnaire</i> : | 18 |
| 3.2.2.2. <i>CONCOS</i> : | 18 |
| 3.2.2.3. <i>Neuroticism</i> : | 18 |
| 3.2.2.4. <i>MTL</i> : | 19 |
| 3.2.2.5. <i>Cultural intelligence</i> : | 19 |
| 3.2.2.6. <i>Future leadership intention</i> : | 19 |
| 4. RESULTS..... | 20 |
| 4.1. Scale Development..... | 20 |
| 4.1.1. Study 1: Item Development for the Explicit FOL Scale | 20 |
| 4.1.2. Study 2: Development of IAT-FOL | 24 |
| 4.2. Scale Validation | 25 |
| 4.2.1. Factor Structure of FOL Questionnaire..... | 25 |
| 4.2.2. Correlates of FOL..... | 29 |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| 5. DISCUSSION | 33 |
| REFERENCES | 42 |
| APPENDICES | 49 |

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to conceptualize a new construct called as fear of leadership (FOL). People with FOL have experienced worries about the possible negative consequences of leadership position. We conducted two different studies to capture this construct. The first study including employee sample (N=323) was done with the purpose of developing explicit measure of FOL while the second study including student sample (N=205) aimed at the development of implicit measure of FOL and the validation of FOL. Several constructs such as concerns over negative consequences of success (CONCOS), neuroticism, motivation to lead (MTL), cultural intelligence (CQ) and future leadership intention were included for the validation purpose. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses indicated three-dimensional FOL (i.e. fear of imbalance in work, family and personal life, fear of failure and fear of harming others). The bivariate correlation analysis revealed that FOL was positively correlated with CONCOS, neuroticism and negatively correlated with future leadership intention. However, FOL was not associated with MTL. Furthermore, the explicit and the implicit measures of FOL were not correlated. These results provided support for construct and criterion-related validities of the measure.

Keywords: fear of leadership, implicit and explicit measures, concerns over negative consequences of success, motivation to lead, neuroticism, implicit association test

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı Lider Olma Korkusu'nu (LOK) kavramlaştırmaktır. Lider olma korkusu liderlik pozisyonunun getirebileceği olası olumsuz sonuçları göz önünde bulundurarak endişelenmek olarak tanımlanır. Bu kavramı ele almak amacıyla iki farklı çalışma gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışan (N= 323) örnekleminden oluşan ilk çalışmada LOK'un doğrudan/açık ölçümlenmesini sağlayan ölçeğin geliştirmesi amaçlanmıştır. Öğrenci (N= 205) örnekleminden oluşan ikinci çalışmada ise LOK'un örtük/gizil ölçümleme aracının geliştirilmesi ve geçerlilik çalışmasının ortaya konulması amaçlanmıştır. Geçerlilik çalışması için de başarının olumsuz sonuçları ile ilgili endişeler, nörotisizm, liderlik motivasyonu, kültürel zeka ve gelecekte lider olma niyeti gibi birçok kavrama yer verilmiştir. Keşfedici ve doğrulayıcı faktör analiz sonuçları LOK'un üç boyutlu (iş-aile ve kişisel hayatı dengeleyememe korkusu, başarısızlık korkusu ve başkalarına zarar verme korkusu) bir kavram olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Korelasyon sonuçlarına göre LOK, başarının olumsuz sonuçları ile ilgili endişeler, nörotisizm ve gelecekte lider olma niyeti ile ilişkiliyken; liderlik motivasyonu ile ilişkili bulunmamıştır. Bunun yanısıra, LOK'u ölçümlemek için geliştirilen doğrudan ve örtük ölçümleme araçları arasında da korelasyon bulunmamıştır. Bütün bu bulgular ölçeğin yapısal ve bağıntılı geçerliliğini desteklemektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: lider olma korkusu, doğrudan/açık ve örtük/gizil ölçümleme, liderlik etme motivasyonu, nevroitiklik

INTRODUCTION

Leadership emergence literature investigates characteristics of individuals who emerge as leaders in the eye of the followers. These characteristics are usually related to traits (Gough, 1990; Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1984) or impression management behaviors (Cronshaw & Ellis, 1991; Dobbins, Long, Dedrick, & Clemmons, 1990; Ellis, Adamson, Deszca, & Cawsey, 1988; Ellis & Cronshaw, 1992; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991). However, this literature does not inform us about individuals' own willingness to emerge as leaders. Followers may be willing to appoint someone as a leader, but that person may not have an intention to accept this appointment. Our research attempts to answer why some individuals are not eager to become leaders compared to others. We propose a new construct named as "fear of leadership" to explain this phenomenon. The aim of the study is to provide a new conceptualization, to develop and to validate explicit and implicit measures of fear of leadership to fill this existing gap in the literature.

Our conceptualization and explicit and implicit measurements of fear of leadership are expected to have theoretical and practical contributions to the literature in several ways. First, for the first time in the literature, the reasons why people *avoid* leadership positions are investigated. This is expected to be an important theoretical contribution. If we have insights about people's fears to become leaders, we can predict their response to those fears and rule out these fears by developing effective coping strategies. Second, this study provides not only an explicit but also an implicit way of measuring fear of leadership construct. As a consequence of this, the probability of responding in a social desirable way can be eliminated by adding implicit measure of the construct. For instance, in the future, organizations that give more weight to the leadership competency can use this measure to easily distinguish people

who have a real fear of leadership from people who consciously distort their image about leadership to appear overly positive.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Fear of Leadership: A New Construct

There is a common assumption that becoming a leader is a valuable and desirable goal that should be actively pursued (Mills, 2005). However, some individuals may believe that leadership has negative consequences. For instance, imagine a person who is working as a mid-level manager in one of the well-known companies. At some point in her/his career, s/he is offered a promotion to the top level managerial position. However, s/he does not accept this promotion because of some concerns such as destruction of private life, being unable to balance work-family, being always obliged to prove herself/himself, and treating others unfair. Do you think that s/he is manifesting fear of leadership? We think, yes.

We first introduce the fear of leadership (FOL) construct and discuss why we needed to develop a new construct. Next, we present several similar constructs in the literature to provide the nomological net of FOL, such as fear of success (FOS), fear of failure (FOF), imposter phenomenon (IP), and concerns over negative consequences of success (CONCOS). Last, we discuss these constructs in terms of their similarities and differences with FOL.

We define a person with FOL as someone who has worries and fears about the possible negative consequences of leadership (Aycan, Başkurt, Ozkuvanci, Sandal, Yaman, Yurekli, 2014). At first glance, we speculate that these concerns may be related to family, self and work domains to provide an insight about FOL although we do not claim a priori theoretical factor structure of it. An increase in uncertainties about the job, losing self-confidence in case of failure at work, worries about becoming a cruel person, inability to

allocate enough time for the family, increased stress-level and health problems caused by work-related issues can be some examples of these concerns.

Other similar constructs such as FOS (Horner, 1968), FOF (Birney, Burdick, & Teevan, 1969), IP (Clance & Imes, 1978) and CONCOS (Ho & Zemaitis, 1981) cannot address the question of why some people have a tendency to withdraw from leadership specifically. In other words, these constructs have more general assumptions about fears related to success situations. However, we are more interested in fears in leadership rather than fears in success as a broad category. Thus, we need to provide a new construct, FOL which is more context-specific compared to other related constructs in the literature.

FOL construct is inspired by Horner's (1968, 1972) conceptualization of fear of success (FOS). According to Horner (1972), gender stereotyping leads to fear of success. Achievement resulting from the motivation and effort to compete with others can be perceived and interpreted differently depending on genders. Having such kind of motives is regarded as appropriate and favorable qualities for men whereas it is inappropriate and unfavorable attributes for women. Therefore, a woman learning to live with such perception and discrimination may have a motive to avoid success due to expected negative consequences of it, such as social rejection or loss of femininity. Even a woman who rejects these gender-role stereotypes may be in conflict about success, because of the perception that others have a tendency to judge successful women as unfeminine or threatening.

Our definition of FOL is different from the definition of FOS proposed by Horner (1968) in several ways. First, FOS is the result of gender stereotyping. However, our concept of FOL is the result of the belief about the possible negative consequences of acceptance of a leadership position. Second, Horner's (1972) conceptualization of FOS is a more general term. Being graduated from medical school with the highest degree can be considered as an

example of success. However, our concept of fear of leadership is specific to a leadership position. Third, according to Horner's theoretical framework (1968, 1972), one can assume that women are more susceptible to fear of success than men based on the existence of cultural stereotypes regarding the appropriate roles of women in society. However, our FOL construct can be applied both to women and men. Therefore, one would not necessarily expect to find significant gender differences in FOL. Last, Zuckerman and Allison (1976) developed an objective measure of fear of success which supported Horner's conceptualization of fear of success. The items used for assessing FOS related to the benefits of success (e.g., "When you are the best, all doors are open"), the cost of success (e.g., "The cost of success is overwhelming responsibility"), and the attitudes toward success when compared to other alternatives (e.g., "It is more important to play the game than to win it"). On the other hand, our FOL measure is supposed to be related to the possible negative consequences of being a leader with respect to self, family and work domains. Furthermore, in contrast to FOS, there are not any positive sub domains or benefits of FOL.

In the conceptualization of FOL, another important question to pose is "Are the fear of success and fear of failure two sides of the same coins?" According to the literature, they are not. Birney, Burdick, and Teevan (1969) conceptualized Fear of Failure (FOF) as the fact that putting great effort to achieve does not always end up with the expected and desired results. For instance, some people deceive themselves to set a goal that is far below their qualifications because of the motivation to protect their self-images and to ensure their integrities in case of being failed. Likewise, it is also possible to set unrealistically high goals. In this way when the person finds oneself in a failure situation, it is not surprising and disappointing at all for the other people around him/her. According to Birney and his colleagues (1969), individuals with FOF can be characterized as those who escape from evaluative situations, do not take the responsibility of their actions; hence, just ascribe failure

to external things such as bad luck, underestimate the importance of the attribute being assessed, make a wrong judgment about their performance and accept being a loser. Unlike Horner's (1968, 1972) conceptualization of FOS, the conceptualization of FOF offered by Birney, Burdick, and Teevan (1969) does not imply gender differences.

Our concept of FOL is also different from FOF proposed by Birney's and colleagues (1969). People who have fear of failure seem to develop consciously or unconsciously defensive mechanism towards the possibility of failure beforehand. In other words, they are engaging in different kinds of avoidance behavior related to success. On the other hand, in our concept of FOL, people appear to rationalize and have a relation with their fears regarding leadership by emphasizing the expected negative consequences of leadership position rather than just escaping from leadership position in advance. Nevertheless, similar to FOF, our concept FOL is also applicable to men and women. Moreover, in FOL, there are some items tapping concerns about the possible negative consequences of being failed at work such as losing self confidence in case of failure and being embarrassed in case of failure.

Other related construct to FOL is the Imposter Phenomenon (IP) proposed by Clance and Imes (1978). The IP was particularly common among high achieving women. Women believe that they are not really genius although they achieve great things in either academic or professional life. They have a tendency to attribute their outstanding success to simple luck or interpersonal traits such as being attractive, sensitive, or having a good sense of humor. They feel that they had somehow fooled the world and they do not take the ownership of their achievements. According to Clance and Imes (1978), women having IP can share common characteristics such as generalized anxiety, having low self-esteem, being depressed and getting frustrated easily. Unlikely, our concept of FOL is not related to generalized anxiety and frustration regarding achievement. It is more likely to be associated with specific anxiety arising from the possible negative outcomes of becoming a leader. Especially, this specific

anxiety may result from the idea that leadership position may bring overwhelming responsibilities. This idea or anticipation can generate high pressure on people who have fear of leadership since they think it becomes difficult to sustain their accustomed way of living.

In the literature, concerns over the negative consequences of success (CONCOS) offered by Ho and Zemaitis (1981) appears to be the one that comes closest to our conception of FOL, as they both include the possible negative consequences of being leader if being a leader is perceived as a success. Some example items of CONCOS are “I am prone to worry that undue pressures would be placed on me if I were to develop considerable competency in some field” and “I would not worry that others might think I was peculiar or strange if I were too devoted to my work” (Ho & Zemaitis, 1981). FOL, in contrast, is expected to specify those negative consequences as being present in the three domains of self, family, and work. Therefore, the concerns in FOL are more context-specific resulting from the expected responsibilities of leadership position, whereas the concerns in CONCOS seem to be self-related resulting from the responsibilities of any kind of success situation. Thus,

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive correlation between FOL and CONCOS.

2.2. Fear of Leadership: The Implicit Association Test (IAT) of FOL

In this study, we also developed an implicit measure of FOL since showing a fear of leadership can be considered as a negative and undesirable trait especially across individuals who are supposed to be promoted from middle-level managerial positions to high-level managerial positions in the organizations. Therefore, the high probability of concealing the fears related to leadership can be eliminated by developing an implicit measure of the construct.

Greenwald, McGhee and Schwartz (1998) introduced a promising new measurement tool for assessing implicit processes: The Implicit Association Test (IAT). The IAT measures

to what extent the concepts are automatically associated with each other by comparing response times on two combined discrimination tasks. Participants are required to assign single stimuli (e.g., words, pictures) as quick as possible to a given pair of target categories (e.g., Blacks vs. Whites). The strength of association between two concepts is evaluated by combining a given pair of target categories with a supposedly associated pair of attributes (e.g., positive vs. negative) both in an association-compatible (White + pleasant) and an association-incompatible manner (Black + pleasant). Relative associative strength between the two pairs of concepts can be interpreted by the difference between the mean response latencies for association-compatible and association-incompatible assignments (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). The underlying mechanism of the IAT is that if the strength of the association between concepts is quite high, individuals do the categorization task automatically and quickly when the same response key is shared by the two associated concept instead of a different response key. For instance, individuals who have implicit prejudice against Blacks react more fast when Black names and unpleasant attributes share same response key, compared to the reversed scenario (Black + pleasant) (Greenwald et. al., 1998).

The IAT has been utilized in almost all disciplines of psychology, such as clinical psychology (Teachman, & Woody, 2003), social psychology (Uhlmann & Swanson, 2004), consumer psychology (Maison, Greenwald, & Bruin, 2001), health psychology (Wiers, Van Woerden, Smulders, & De Jong, 2002), and personality psychology (Asendorpf, Banse, & Mücke, 2002). Commonly, IAT has been used to investigate attitudes toward insect and flowers, stereotypes and prejudices about ethnic groups (Black vs. White) (Greenwald et. al., 1998), fear of spiders (Ellwart, Rinck, & Becker, 2006) anxiety (Egloff & Schmukle, 2002) and self-esteem (Greenwald & Farnham, 2000).

The easiest way of getting information about a person's attitudes and traits is to use their explicit answers using questionnaires. Questionnaires can be applied economically and objectively, and they also generally indicate good reliabilities (Carter & Williamson, 1996). Unfortunately, the degree to which the tool measures what it claims to measure is still debatable although the validity of explicit measures has been demonstrated in several studies (Funder, 2001). Therefore, some researchers claimed that constructs that are difficult to be tapped by self-report can be measured by implicit measures which are reliable predictors of behavior (Egloff & Schmukle, 2002).

Implicit and explicit measures sometimes have substantial correlations (Banse, Seise, & Zerbes, 2001), but sometimes are mutually exclusive (Karpinski & Hilton, 2001). There are some possible explanations for such large variations in the correlation between explicit and implicit measures. First, implicit measures are generally unbiased by motivational influences whereas explicit measures are often impacted by social desirability concerns. One can assume that if people are not motivated to control their responses on the self-report, the correlation between explicit and implicit measures should be high (Fazio & Olson, 2003). Therefore, the correlation between explicit and implicit measures can be changed depending on the topics or constructs. For instance, for common topics such as consumer preferences, the correlation may be high whereas for socially sensitive topics such as prejudice against minority group, the correlation may be low (Hoffman et. al, 2005).

Second, according to dual attitudes model proposed by Wilson, Lindsey and Schooler (2000) explicit and implicit measures can assess two independent representations that vary based on the cognitive effort which is necessary for their retrieval from memory. They argued that old representations activated automatically when facing with relevant stimulus reflected by implicit measures. However, old representations seem to be reflected by explicit measures only when people do not have either the motivation or the cognitive capacity to retrieve more

recently gained representations from memory. Thus, the correlations between explicit and implicit measures may be high when spontaneous judgment is done; but correlations may be low, when deliberate processing occurs (Koole, Dijksterhuis, & Van Knippenberg, 2001).

Although there are contradictory propositions on the explicit and implicit measures of a construct and thus researchers have not reached a consensus among themselves yet, we still decided to develop the implicit measure of FOL and to investigate the relation of it with explicit measure. We believe that even if we could not find any correlation between implicit and explicit measure of FOL, we still contribute this debate in the literature.

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive correlation between IAT-FOL and explicit self-report of FOL.

2.3. Correlates of FOL: Validation of a New Measure

In this study, we included concerns over the negative consequences of success (CONCOS) and neuroticism for convergent validity of FOL because we believe that these constructs are theoretically related to FOL. For instance, CONCOS is the closest construct to FOL in the literature. Similarly, the items measuring FOL are related to anxieties and concerns about the possible adverse results of becoming a leader and thus it is intuitively meaningful to assume that neuroticism as a personal trait referring to the tendency to experience general stress and anxiety in every situation of life can be linked with FOL. Moreover, motivation to lead (MTL) included for divergent validity of FOL since these two constructs are independently predict to leadership behavior. Besides, we included cultural intelligence (CQ) for discriminant validity, because it has no theoretical relationship with FOL. Last, future leadership intention was involved for criterion-related validity of FOL since it is assumed that one's intention more likely and accurately informs us about the occurrence of actual behavior in advanced.

2.3.1. Motivation to lead. Chan and Drasgow (2001) conceptualized motivation to lead (MTL) as “an individual difference construct that influences a leader’s or leader- to-be’s decisions to assume leadership training, roles, and responsibilities”. Those requirements have an influence on to which extent person puts an effort at leading and persistence as a leader. Leadership behaviors such as participation in leadership roles and training within a specific domain of work or life activity can be predicted by interaction between individual differences in MTL and person’s occupational or life-domain interests and abilities. One can assume that based on this approach leadership training and experience can lead to a change in individual differences in MTL which are also an immediate outcome of one’s leadership self-efficacy and accumulated leadership experience. Furthermore, socio-cultural values, personality and acquired social skills and knowledge for leading have an influence on leadership self-efficacy and accumulated leadership experience. A key assumption of this approach is that MTL can be changed through one’s leadership skills and leadership styles which are learned.

Chan and Drasgow (2001) conceptualized MTL in terms of three components; affective MTL, social-normative MTL and noncalculative MTL. Some individuals are just interested in leading others which refers to affective component of MTL whereas others would lead because of the reasons like a sense of duty or responsibility related to the social-normative component of MTL. In addition, it is possible that people may only lead if they do not calculate the costs of leading relative to the benefits, which is the noncalculative part of MTL.

Hypothesis 3: There is a negative correlation between FOL and MTL.

2.3.2. Neuroticism. Neuroticism is conceptualized as the tendency to experience negative emotions such as anger, sadness, embracement, anxiety, distress or depression. In the literature, it also refers to the degree of emotional stability (McCrae & Costa, 1987). It is a very broad and pervasive dimension of personality. According to Eysenck’s theory of

personality (1967), neuroticism is associated with low tolerance for stress or aversive stimuli. People with high scores on neuroticism are characterized by emotional reactivity and vulnerability to stress. Furthermore, those people tend to interpret ordinary situations as threatening and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult and they have a feeling that they are unable to cope with stress effectively in general.

Hypothesis 4: There is a positive correlation between FOL and neuroticism.

2.3.3. Cultural Intelligence. Earley and Ang (2003) defined cultural intelligence (CQ) as “a person’s ability and capacity to function effectively in culturally diverse settings”. Cultural intelligence is composed of four different subclasses such as metacognitive CQ, cognitive CQ, motivational CQ and behavioral CQ. Metacognitive CQ is about the thought processes that person applies to get and understand cultural knowledge. Cognitive CQ refers to person’s knowledge about cultures in terms of similarities and differences. Motivational CQ is person’s interest and energy to learn about cross-cultural situations. Behavioral CQ reflects the ability to perform and act appropriately when interacting with people from different cultures (Earley & Ang, 2003; Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006). In the current study, we expect no relationship between FOL and CQ.

2.3.4. Future Leadership Intention. In social psychology literature, researchers paid a lot of attention to the relations among attitudes, intentions and behaviors to explain the reasons of action. According to the theory of reasoned action (TRA) (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) and the theory of planned behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1985), person’s behavior can be mostly and substantially predicted by his/her intention to perform it. Therefore, in this study, we decided to include future leadership intention as a stronger predictor of becoming a leader in the near future since we did not have a chance to observe actual leadership behavior of a person in real life. Thus,

Hypothesis 5: There is a negative correlation between FOL and future intention to become a leader.

METHOD

3.1. Scale Development

We conducted two different studies to measure and validate FOL. The first study was done with the purpose of developing explicit measure of FOL while the second study aimed at the development of implicit measure of FOL and the validation of FOL.

3.1.1. Study 1: Item Development for the Explicit FOL Scale

3.1.1.1. Participants and procedure. The development of explicit measure of FOL was composed of a qualitative phase for item generation and a quantitative phase for item analysis. We used two different samples. In both samples participants recruited through convenient sampling.

In the qualitative phase (Sample 1), we conducted 15-minute interviews. Sample 1 was composed of 15 employees and 20 students. Fifty-five percent of this sample was female and the mean age was 30.31 with the standard deviation of 6.94. Employees were from diverse occupations such as engineers, psychologists, research and teaching assistants at Koç University, and executives in the private sector companies.

We conducted face-to-face interviews in Turkish. We asked students to assume that they would become a leader of college student council and asked employees to assume that they would become a high-level manager in their organizations. Then, participants were asked what kind of fears they would experience when they are offered such leadership positions. Many of interviewees indicated that they would experience fears about increasing responsibilities, increasing work-related uncertainties, and being unable to make time for their friends. Based on the relevant literature and most frequently indicated fears, a 34-item list was developed about fears regarding consequences of leadership (See Appendix A for items).

In the quantitative phase (Sample 2), participants were recruited using social media websites such as Facebook, and LinkedIn. Sample 2 comprised of 323 full time employees (175 women, 148 men). The mean age was 29.89 with the standard deviation of 7.38. The occupational distribution of employees was diverse such as engineers, teachers, academicians, government officers, consultants, and lawyers. Their working experiences were ranged from 5 months to 35 years. Furthermore, their job positions were ranged from specialists to executives.

Before conducting these studies, ethical committee approval was taken. In the beginning of the study, individuals were agreed to participate voluntarily by signing the informed consent presented at the beginning of the survey in the Qualtrics, Sample 2 was instructed about the purpose of the study, and the tasks that required to do through the study. Moreover, they informed that they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The FOL questionnaire consisting of 34-items was applied to the participants; and at the end of the survey, they were expected to the fill demographics. The survey took the respondents nearly 30 minutes to complete.

3.1.1.2. Measures. Sample 2 were distributed a survey consisting of FOL questionnaire and demographics using Qualtrics online survey.

3.1.1.2.1. FOL questionnaire. Newly constructed FOL questionnaire was composed of 34 items. Participants were asked to evaluate these 34-items (e.g. doing harm to the organizations in case of failure, being relentless and insensitive person and being unable to balance work and family) to what degree they would experience those potential fears in case of a hypothetically offered leadership position. Response scales ranged from 1 (slightly) to 5 (extremely). The higher score that participant takes means that individual have high level of FOL.

3.1.1.2.2. Demographics. Several demographics were asked to the participants included gender, age, education, number of years in work life, occupation, and job title.

3.1.2. Study 2: Development of IAT-FOL

3.1.2.1. Participants and procedure. In this study, we developed the implicit measure of FOL. Our participants in Sample 3 were students taking Introduction to Psychology course at Koç University. Sample 3 was composed of 148 women and 57 men. The mean age was 21.36 with the standard deviation of 3.01. Most of the students were sophomore and junior.

Their participation was voluntary; therefore they took course credit in exchange to their participation. They were invited to the computer lab and were individually tested in Psychology Laboratory at Koç University. They sat in front of a computer where the IAT-FOL was functioning. After finishing the IAT-FOL, they were requested to fill out several questionnaires used for the purpose of scale validation.

Using the same rationale as was used by Greenwald, McGhee and Schwartz (1998), we adapted the IAT to provide an implicit measure of the FOL. For this purpose, the categorization into “Me as a Leader” and “Other Person as a Leader” was combined with the classification of items into “Anxiety” and “Calmness” categories. The IAT-FOL was composed of a sequence of seven blocks. There was some practical and test trials in this experiment in accordance with the standard protocol (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). The reason for practice tasks was to acquaint participants with the stimulus materials and the sorting rules.

Participants were instructed that they would be making a series of category judgments. During each of the seven blocks, the name of the categories was presented on the right and left corners of the screen to remind participants where they should categorize the coming

stimuli. On each trial, a stimulus word was presented in the centre of computer screen, and participants were told to press “D” key with the left index finger or the “K” key with the right index finger to categorize the coming stimulus as quickly and as correctly possible into one of the two categories (in single categorization tasks) or one of the four categories (in combined categorization tasks). They were told to keep their index fingers on the “D” and “K” keys throughout the experiment to facilitate fast responding. An interval time was 150 ms. The computer recorded elapsed time from the beginning of each stimulus presentation until the occurrence of correct response.

In Block 1, participants practiced the target-concept discrimination by categorizing stimuli such as my follower and his schedule into “Me as a Leader” and “Other Person as a Leader” categories. This block was composed of 10 practice trials and each item was presented once. Similarly, in Block 2, they were expected to do same for the attribute discrimination by sorting items such as successful and unsuccessful into “Calmness” and “Anxiety” categories, consisting of 14 practice trials. Block 3 was introduced as the initial combined task. For participants who have FOL, Anxiety/ Me as a Leader combination was regarded as compatible pairs whereas Calmness/Me as a Leader combination was considered as incompatible pairs. In this block, first time participants were supposed to sort items into two combined categories (Calmness/ Me as a Leader or Anxiety/Other Person as a Leader), each including the attribute and target concept that were assigned to the same key (e.g. Calmness + Me as a Leader for the “D” key and Anxiety + Other Person as a Leader for the “K” key). In this block, participants saw the total 24 words randomly. Block 4 was the same as Block 3. It was used for test purpose while Block 3 was used for practice purpose. Block 5 was reversed target-concept discrimination. In this block, participants did same thing as in Block 1. The only difference was that it used the switched key assignment for the target concepts. Block 6, which is the second combined task, which was used as complementary to

Block 3 & 4. Participants were expected to do similar operation in Block 3 depending on different combined categories (e.g. Calmness + Other Person as a Leader for the “D” key and Anxiety + Me as a Leader for the “K” key). Last, Block 7 was also similar to Block 6. It was just used for the test purpose.

To counterbalance the order effect of blocks, half of the participants were given odd numbers while the rest of the participants were assigned to even numbers. Participants who had odd numbers first saw compatible pairs (Anxiety/Me as a Leader) in the Block 3 & Block 4; and then they saw incompatible pairs (Calmness/Me as a Leader) in the Block 6 & Block 7 whereas the other half who had even numbers first saw incompatible pairs (Calmness/Me as a Leader) in the Block 3 & Block 4; and then they saw compatible pairs (Anxiety/Me as a Leader) in the Block 6 & Block 7.

3.1.2.2. Measures. Newly developed IAT-FOL measure was applied to Sample 3 and demographic information of participants was also obtained.

3.1.2.2.1. IAT-FOL. The four categories used for the IAT-FOL was: Me as a Leader, Other Person as A Leader, Anxiety and Calmness. For Me as a Leader and Other Person as A Leader categories, total 10 words (5 words per each category) were used while for Anxiety and Calmness categories, total 14 words (7 words per each category) were used. All of the words were Turkish. In total, 24 stimulus words were presented to the participants (see Appendix B). Words used in “Me as a Leader” and “Other Person as a Leader” categories were mostly pronouns and stimuli chosen by considering about the leadership context (e.g., my follower, and his schedule etc.). Likewise, words used within the “Anxiety” and “Calmness” categories were the ones that authors judged to be both familiar to and unambiguously classifiable by members of the subject population (e.g., successful, and unsuccessful etc.). All stimuli belonged only to one category and were easy to understand and be classified by most participants. The total score in the IAT- FOL was calculated as a D

score. The higher and positive D scores indicate that individuals experience implicitly FOL and do not consciously aware of it.

3.1.2.2.2. Demographics: Demographics including gender, education, age and part-time working experience or internship were applied to the participants at the end of the study.

3.2. Scale Validation

3.2.1. Participants and procedure. Participants for scale validation were same as Study 2 explained above. After taking part in IAT-FOL, they were expected to fill several questionnaires creating by Qualtrics.

3.2.2. Measures. Some measures (IAT-FOL & Demographics) in Study 2 were also used for the purpose of scale validation. In addition to these, Sample 3 was distributed survey consisting of FOL questionnaire, CONCOS, Neuroticism, MTL, Cultural Intelligence and Future Leadership Intention.

3.2.2.1. FOL questionnaire: We used the last version of FOL questionnaire consisting of 16-items that was created after the item and exploratory analysis of Sample 2 in Study1 (see Appendix C). The higher scores indicate the higher FOL of individuals that have.

3.2.2.2. CONCOS: We used Ho and Zemaitis's (1981) CONCOSS. It consists of 27 items. Response scales are Likert type ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In this study, we used 12 items (see Appendix D). Participants taking higher scores reveal that they experience CONCOS more compared to ones getting lower scores.

3.2.2.3. Neuroticism: We used the neuroticism subscale of Personality Traits Inventory developed and adapted to Turkish culture by Gencoz and Oncul in 2012. The scale is composed of 9 items that are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (see Appendix E). The higher scores represent that participants are more prone to neuroticism.

3.2.2.4. MTL: We used Chan and Drasgow's MTL Scale (2001) which was translated into Turkish. This scale is composed of 27 items. Nine of them measures affective identity MTL, the other nine items measures socio-normative MTL, and the last 9 items measures noncalculative MTL. The response scales ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In this study, we just used affective-identity MTL and socio-normative MTL (see Appendix F). The higher scores reflect the higher MTL that individuals have.

3.2.2.5. Cultural intelligence: We used Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQ) offered by Thomas' et. al. in 2008. This scale is composed of 10 items that are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) (see Appendix G). The higher total scores participants acquire, the higher cultural intelligence that they have.

3.2.2.6. Future leadership intention: We measured the leadership intention of participants by 4 questions. The answers to these questions were "yes" or "no". The questions were respectively like that: "Would you like to be a leader in a student club in which you are a member of/ team-work/ group project?"; "Are you willing to accept the leadership position assigned to you in a student club in which you are a member of/team-work/ group project?"; "Are you willing to give the last decision on behalf of others?"; and "Is there a leadership position that you may encounter in the near future?". The majority of "yes" responses to these 4 questions indicate that people have an intention to become a leader in the future.

RESULTS

4.1. Scale Development

4.1.1. Study 1: Item Development for the Explicit FOL Scale

The analysis of the data (Sample 2) collected with the purpose of initial item selection consisted of two parts: item statistics and exploratory factor analysis.

First, prior to the main analysis, distributions of all 34-items in the FOL questionnaire were examined for normality. In this step, three different criteria; high item skewness, high item kurtosis, low item-total correlation, were determined to exclude items (De Vellis, 2003). After the item analysis, we decided to remove the “item 13”, because of the violation of normality assumption. All of the remaining items demonstrated acceptable levels of normality and high item-total correlation (see Table 1).

Table 1

Item Analysis of FOL Questionnaire

| Items | Mean (SD) | Skewness | Kurtosis | Item-Total Correlation |
|---|-------------|----------|----------|------------------------|
| 1. Being unable to fulfil the responsibilities of my new position | 3.25 (1.33) | -.35 | -1.04 | .59 |
| 2. People's intimacy because of their self-interests | 2.78 (1.26) | .15 | -1.04 | .49 |
| 3. Being unable to cope with the crisis at work | 3.03 (1.25) | -.08 | -1.03 | .65 |
| 4. Being envied | 1.99 (1.06) | 1.02 | .51 | .40 |
| 5. Increasing responsibilities | 2.70 (1.14) | .10 | -.71 | .49 |
| 6. Being unable to make time for my friends | 2.78 (1.11) | -.03 | -.70 | .53 |
| 7. Having work-related health problems | 2.86 (1.39) | .04 | -1.28 | .59 |
| 8. Increasing work - related uncertainties | 3.13 (1.23) | -.17 | -.93 | .67 |
| 9. Being obliged to take more risks | 3.06 (1.12) | -.22 | -.70 | .60 |
| 10. Doing harm to the organization in case of failure | 3.21 (1.26) | -.24 | -1 | .55 |
| 11. Decreasing allocated time for myself | 3.13 (1.17) | -.25 | -.70 | .52 |
| 12. Being unable to do my duties as being a mother/father | 3.49 (1.28) | -.55 | -.71 | .63 |
| 13. Being affected by the evil eye | 1.60 (.96) | 1.69 | 2.33 | .33 |
| 14. Having all eyes on me | 2.02 (1.10) | .91 | .06 | .50 |
| 15. Being embarrassed towards everyone in case of failure | 2.98 (1.34) | -.05 | -1.13 | .60 |
| 16. To become a cruel person | 2.56 (1.35) | .39 | -1.01 | .57 |
| 17. Being unable to balance work-family | 3.15 (1.31) | -.17 | -1.06 | .71 |
| 18. Having problems with my spouse/partner | 3.18 (1.26) | -.18 | -1.01 | .71 |
| 19. Being obliged to be a "model" for others | 2.29 (1.07) | .53 | -.38 | .56 |
| 20. Exhaustion of life - related goals | 2.38 (1.38) | .59 | -.97 | .57 |
| 21. Being objected to more criticism | 2.65 (1.20) | .13 | -.95 | .65 |
| 22. Probability of being put my nose out of joint | 2.62 (1.20) | .25 | -.82 | .59 |
| 23. Being thought that I don't deserve that position | 2.50 (1.33) | .41 | -1.04 | .61 |
| 24. Increasing attention to my faults compared to the past | 2.94 (1.16) | -.11 | -.83 | .70 |
| 25. Treating others unkindly | 2.82 (1.25) | .01 | -1.05 | .64 |
| 26. Being unfair | 3.18 (1.39) | -.25 | -1.20 | .63 |
| 27. Losing self confidence in case of failure | 3.01 (1.34) | -.05 | -1.15 | .71 |
| 28. Being always obliged to prove myself | 2.84 (1.28) | .04 | -1.06 | .68 |
| 29. Coming into prominence and being perceived as pedant | 2.53 (1.25) | .35 | -.95 | .63 |
| 30. Being unable to allocate enough time for my family | 3.34 (1.27) | -.33 | -.88 | .70 |
| 31. Increasing stress | 3.38 (1.21) | -.34 | -.75 | .68 |
| 32. Increasing enemies at workplace | 2.72 (1.22) | .18 | -.89 | .65 |
| 33. Destruction of private life | 3.35 (1.32) | -.32 | -1.07 | .67 |
| 34. Being unable to establish authority over the employees | 3.18 (1.32) | -.27 | -1.06 | .67 |

Second, the content of the Fear of Leadership (FOL) Scale was further explicated by examining its factor structure. We ran exploratory factor analysis. A principal component analysis with varimax rotation was used to assess factor structure. According to analysis result, our scale revealed 7 factors that accounted for 66.84 % of the total variance with four of them explaining greater variance. In order to find the number of factors that can adequately explain the observed correlations among the observed variables, eigenvalue criterion and scree plot were used. According to scree plot and eigenvalues, the first 4 factors were the strongest ones explaining 57.11 % of the total variance.

To have a meaningful understanding of these factors, rotated factor matrix was analyzed. Five items (15, 21, 24, 27, 28) in the first factor were about “fear of failure”. This factor explained the 38.41 % of the total variance in the data set. Five items (12, 17, 18, 30, 33) in the second factor were related to “fear of work-family imbalance”. This factor accounted for 7.70 % of the total variance. Three items “16, 25, 26” measuring the concerns about “fear of harming others” were clustered under Factor 3. This factor explained the 5.94 % of the total variance. Last, three items (6, 7, 11) in the Factor 4 seemed to measure concerns associated with “fear of harming personal life” dimension. This factor accounted for 5.05 % of the total variance in the data set.

Based on the exploratory factor analysis (see Table 2), we decided to reduce 33 items to 16 items for the FOL questionnaire (Aycan, Başkurt, Bıçaker, Ozkuvanci, Sandal, Yaman, & Yurekli, 2014).

Table 2

Principal Component Factor Analysis of FOL with Varimax Rotation with Sample 2 (N= 323)

| Items | Factor Loadings | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <i>Factor 1: Fear of Failure</i> | | | | |
| Being embarrassed towards everyone in case of failure | .62 | | | |
| Being objected to more criticism | .72 | | | |
| Increasing attention to my faults compared to the past | .73 | | | |
| Losing self confidence in case of failure | .69 | | | |
| Being always obliged to prove myself | .70 | | | |
| <i>Factor 2: Fear of Work-Family Imbalance</i> | | | | |
| Being unable to do my duties as being a mother/father | | .60 | | |
| Being unable to balance work-family | | .64 | | |
| Having problems with my spouse/partner | | .61 | | |
| Being unable to allocate enough time for my family | | .77 | | |
| Destruction of private life | | .50 | | |
| <i>Factor 3: Fear of Harming Others</i> | | | | |
| To become a cruel person | | | .56 | |
| Treating others unkindly | | | .73 | |
| Being unfair | | | .79 | |
| <i>Factor 4: Fear of Harming Personal Life</i> | | | | |
| Being unable to make time for my friends | | | | .68 |
| Decreasing allocated time for myself | | | | .73 |
| Having work-related health problems | | | | .49 |
| Fear of Leadership ($\alpha = .92$) | | | | |

4.1.2. Study 2: Development of IAT-FOL

The IAT-FOL data (Sample 3) were treated in accordance with the procedure recommended by Greenwald et. al. (2003). Data screening and cleaning were done in the following two steps. In the first step, the data were eliminated if the response time was greater than 10,000 msec. In the second step, subjects who had 10 % of trials including latency less than 300 msec. were deleted from the data set to discriminate the subjects who were really paying attention to the test and who were just pressing the keys automatically without taking the instructions into consideration.

Next, score computation was conducted in the five steps. First, we computed the “inclusive” standard deviation for all trials in Block 3 (combined task/practice) and Block 6 (reversed combined task/practice) and in Block 4 (combined task/test) and Block 7 (reversed combined task/test). Second, we computed mean latency for responses in each of the blocks separately (Block 3, Block 4, Block 6, and Block 7). Third, we calculated the mean differences for practice blocks (Mean Block 6- Mean Block 3) and test blocks (Mean Block 7- Mean Block 4). We computed IAF-FOL effect by subtracting the mean latency in the critical trials of Block 4 (Anxiety/ Me as a Leader) from the critical trials of Block 7 (Calmness/ Me as a Leader). We did similar mathematical computation for practice blocks as well. In the fourth step, we divided each mean difference score its associated “inclusive” standard deviation that we calculated in the first step. After that step, we got two mean difference ratios; one of which belongs to practice trial while another belongs to test trial. In the last step, we calculated the equal-weight average of these two difference ratios to acquire ultimate D score. D score has a possible range of -2 to +2. A positive D score indicates stronger association between target and attribute whereas negative D score reveals weaker association between target and attribute (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). In the data set, all D scores were ranged between -2 and +2; they were also normally distributed.

To eliminate the order effect of the combined task (Anxiety/Me as a Leader or Calmness/Me as a Leader) in IAT-FOL, Blocks 3-4 and Blocks 6-7 were counterbalanced. According to the t-test result; there was not significant effect of order on D scores; $t(203) = -1.49, p = .137$. However, this counterbalanced condition caused difference in the signs of ultimate D scores resulting from the third step of analysis; computation of mean difference. To keep the directionality of measures the same for all IAT measures, D scores were reversed by subtracting them from zero for the half of the participants who first saw “Calmness/Me as a Leader” and then “Anxiety/Me as a Leader” (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). All in all, positive D score indicates higher FOL while negative D score indicates lower FOL.

4.2. Scale Validation

4.2.1. Factor Structure of FOL Questionnaire. To examine and confirm the factor structure, we first conducted exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with 16 items, followed by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using data from Study 2 (Sample 3). According to EFA results, FOL items were clustered in 3 factors explaining the 66.90 % of the total variance. The scree plots also revealed three factors, pointing to three different latent constructs. Factor 1 entitled as “fear of imbalance in work-family & personal life” accounted of 43.18 % of the total variance in the data set. Factor 2 named as “fear of failure” explained the 15.10 % when Factor 3 called as “fear of harming others” accounted of 8.61 % of the total variance. The loading of items under these factors was presented in the Table 3.

Table 3

Principal Component Factor Analysis of FOL with Varimax Rotation with Sample 3 (N= 205)

| Items | Factor Loadings | | |
|--|-----------------|-----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| <i>Factor 1: Fear of Imbalance in Work- Family & Personal Life</i> | | | |
| Being unable to do my duties as being a mother/father | .73 | | |
| Being unable to balance work-family | .71 | | |
| Having problems with my spouse/partner | .63 | | |
| Being unable to allocate enough time for my family | .77 | | |
| Destruction of private life | .73 | | |
| Being unable to make time for my friends | .45 | | |
| Decreasing allocated time for myself | .59 | | |
| Having work-related health problems | .50 | | |
| <i>Factor 2: Fear of Failure</i> | | | |
| Being embarrassed towards everyone in case of failure | | .72 | |
| Being objected to more criticism | | .77 | |
| Increasing attention to my faults compared to the past | | .81 | |
| Losing self confidence in case of failure | | .75 | |
| Being always obliged to prove myself | | .76 | |
| <i>Factor 3: Fear of Harming Others</i> | | | |
| To become a cruel person | | | .74 |
| Treating others unkindly | | | .83 |
| Being unfair | | | .66 |
| Fear of Leadership ($\alpha = .91$) | | | |

This analysis suggested a possibility of 3-factor model. Therefore, we wanted to compare 3 and 4 factor models through CFA. To be sure that, whether FOL questionnaire was one dimensional or not, we also looked at the one-factor model results. To test the model, interpret the findings, and chose the best model, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Indices (TLI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) were used. According to CFA results, it indicated that FOL questionnaire was not one dimensional construct. Furthermore, both of the models appeared to be acceptable and not different from each other (see Table 4). Chi-square difference test also supported indifference between models, $X^2(3, N = 205) = 10.277, p = .97$. To increase parsimony, we opted for 3-factor model.

After giving ultimate decision about FOL Questionnaire, we performed a univariate ANOVA to compare FOL level of individuals in terms of gender. Results revealed a significant difference between gender s; $F(1, 204) = 7.73, p < 0.05$. That is, women ($M = 3.62, SD = .72$) were more prone to experience FOL compared to men ($M = 3.30, SD = .71$)

Table 4

Comparison of Alternative CFA Models of FOL with Sample 3

| | $\chi^2(df)$ | CMIN/DF | CFI | TLI | RMSEA |
|----------------|-------------------------|---------|------|------|-------|
| One-Factor | $\chi^2(101) = 820.923$ | 7.89 | .620 | .561 | .183 |
| Three - Factor | $\chi^2(101) = 244.132$ | 2.41 | .924 | .910 | 0.08 |
| Four – Factor | $\chi^2(98) = 233.855$ | 2.38 | .928 | .912 | 0.08 |

Note. N= 205. CFI: comparative fit index, TLI: Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA: root-mean-square error of approximation All χ^2 values are significant at $p < .000$

4.2.2. Correlates of FOL. We examined the relations between FOL questionnaire, IAT- FOL and other variables such as CONCOS, and neuroticism included for convergent validity, MTL included for divergent validity, cultural intelligence included for discriminant validity and future leadership intention included for criterion-related validity. We conducted bivariate correlation analysis to understand the relations of all variables. Descriptive statistics of all variables are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of All Variables in Study 2

| Variable | M | SD | Min. | Max. |
|--|------|------|-------|------|
| IAT-FOL | -.54 | .37 | -1.35 | .51 |
| FOL | 3.53 | .73 | 1.38 | 4.88 |
| Fear of Imbalance in Work-Family & Personal Life | 3.64 | .78 | 1.13 | 5 |
| Fear of Failure | 3.48 | .97 | 1 | 5 |
| Fear of Harming Others | 3.32 | 1.10 | 1 | 5 |
| CONCOS | 2.49 | .58 | 1.17 | 4.83 |
| Neuroticism | 2.76 | .59 | 1.22 | 4.22 |
| MTL | 3.26 | .42 | 1.50 | 4.56 |
| Future Leadership Intention | .70 | .26 | .00 | 1.00 |
| Cultural Intelligence | 3.63 | .44 | 2.30 | 4.70 |

According to bivariate correlation analysis results, Hypothesis 1 stating that there would be a positive correlation between FOL and CONCOS was supported, $r = .32$, $p < .01$, providing evidence for convergent validity of FOL construct. Unlikely, Hypothesis 2 indicating that there would be a positive correlation between IAT-FOL and explicit FOL was not confirmed. Furthermore, IAT-FOL did not correlate any of the variables. Hypothesis 3 stating that there would be a negative correlation between FOL and MTL was not supported, providing evidence for divergent validity of FOL construct. However, Hypothesis 4 indicating that there would be a positive association between FOL and neuroticism was confirmed, $r = .22$, $p < .01$, providing evidence for convergent validity of FOL construct. Last, Hypothesis 5 indicating that there would be a negative correlation between FOL and future leadership intention was affirmed, $r = -.17$, $p < .05$, providing evidence for criterion-related validity of FOL construct. For further information for correlation analysis, look at the Table 6.

Table 6

Correlates of FOL Questionnaire

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| 1- IAT-FOL | | | | | | | | | |
| 2- FOL | .02 | | | | | | | | |
| 3- Fear of Imbalance in Work-Family & Personal Life | .07 | .86** | | | | | | | |
| 4- Fear of Failure | -.02 | .77** | .40** | | | | | | |
| 5- Fear of Harming Others | -.02 | .78** | .57** | .49** | | | | | |
| 6- CONCOS | .13 | .32** | .20** | .41** | .16* | | | | |
| 7- Neuroticism | .06 | .22** | .09 | .34** | .10 | .30** | | | |
| 8- MTL | -.06 | .11 | .09 | .14* | .02 | .18** | .01 | | |
| 9- Future Leadership Intention | -.08 | -.17* | -.09 | -.17* | -.17* | -.10 | -.15* | .54** | |
| 10- Cultural Intelligence | .11 | -.03 | .00 | -.04 | -.05 | -.03 | -.19** | .27** | .26** |

DISCUSSION

The main purposes of the present study were to conceptualize a new construct named as fear of leadership (FOL), to develop and validate new instruments of FOL. EFA, CFA and bivariate correlations were utilized to test these aims. We obtained diverse findings. Some of the findings were aligned with our anticipations whereas others did not confirm our expectations. First, we found that FOL described as worries and fears about the possible negative consequences of leadership had three different dimensions, namely fear of imbalance in work, family & personal life, fear of failure and fear of harming others. Second, we found that implicit and explicit measures of FOL were not significantly correlated with each other. Moreover, IAT-FOL was not associated with any other variables such as CONCOS, neuroticism, MTL, future leadership intention and CQ in the study.

In general, data supported our hypotheses and provided evidence for the construct and criterion-related validity of FOL. FOL had significant correlation with CONCOS and neuroticism that were included for convergent validity. These significant correlations substantiated the claim about the construct validity of the measure. People who had high scores in CONCOS and/or neuroticism were more likely to have high FOL scores. Therefore, it was concluded that FOL theoretically converged with CONCOS and neuroticism. Moreover, as opposed to our anticipation, we did not find any relation between FOL and MTL included for divergent validity. In other words, when the level of individuals' FOL increased, the level of individuals' MTL did not change. Thus, one assumed that FOL and MTL were discriminant constructs to predict leadership behaviour. Next, as we hypothesized, FOL significantly predicted person's intention to become a leader in the future. It constituted evidence for criterion-related validity of FOL. Last, there was no significant relationship between FOL and CQ included for discriminate validity. That is, FOL and CQ theoretically diverged from each other.

The first version of FOL was composed of 34 items. After the item elimination and exploratory factor analysis with employee sample (Sample 2, N= 323), 16 items remained. These items were used in the Study 2, which was conducted for validation purpose by student sample (Sample 3, N= 205). According to EFA and CFA, the final version of FOL that consisted of total 16 items had three different factors respectively, fear of imbalance in work-family & personal life (8 items), fear of failure (5 items) and fear of harming others (3 items). Furthermore, items loaded on each factor produced high internal consistency estimates. Reliability scores for each dimension were found like $\alpha = .88$ for “fear of imbalance in work-family & personal life”, $\alpha = .90$ for “fear of failure” and $\alpha = .86$ for “fear of harming others”. All in all, the reliability score for the whole measure was quite high ($\alpha = .91$).

In the beginning, although we have not had precise theoretical factor structure of FOL, we assumed that FOL would have three different dimensions associated with self, family and work domains. We preferred to classify factors of FOL by more general terms rather than specific ones. However, there were similarities between our expectations and the empirical findings in terms of dimensions of FOL even if our expectation was not supported completely. For instance, self and family domains that we first thought as two different dimensions were merged under the first dimension of FOL; more specifically, called as the fear of imbalance in work, family and personal life. Furthermore, the second dimension of FOL; fear of failure, was almost close to our expectation of work domain. In other words, the items in this dimension such as “being embarrassed toward everyone in case of failure, and being always obliged to prove myself etc.” seemed relevant to the performance anxiety at work. Nevertheless, we did not anticipate any factor of FOL with regard to concerns about harming others such as “treating others unkindly”. This factor revealed that person start worrying about having negative, indirect or unfavorable impact on employees or followers when moving to the high level positions such as CEO or CFO.

We proposed that implicit and explicit measures of FOL would be related with each other. However, the bivariate correlation analysis was failed to support this hypothesis. In the literature, there are contradictory findings about the relation between implicit and explicit, self-report measures of various constructs. Some researchers argued that implicit and explicit measures converged to predict behaviour (Banse, Seise, & Zerbes, 2001) while others suggested that implicit measures were independent from explicit measures (Karpinski & Hilton, 2001; Wilson, Lindsey, Schooler, 2000). For instance, in the original study conducted by Greenwald et al. (1998), the average correlation between implicit and explicit measures were found that $r = .25$ across the three studies. Besides, the investigation of individual correlations of the original study where only 2 over 16 scores achieved significant level indicated that the correlation between explicit and implicit measures ranged from $-.04$ to $.64$ (Greenwald et al., 1998). Therefore, this finding promoted the idea that the implicit and explicit measures should divergent from each other.

According to dual process theory, there are two different kinds of evaluation of the same attitude object resulting from different information processing; implicit processing that refers to fast, automatic and unconscious processes (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) and explicit processing that refers to deliberate, thoughtful and conscious processes (Olson & Fazio, 2001). Some researchers indicated that attitudes are stable evaluations, hence they are automatically activated (Bargh, Chaiken, Raymond, & Hydes, 1996) while others offered that they are context sensitive constructions, thus they often change (Petty, Schuman, Richman & Strathman, 1993). Elaboration likelihood model proposed by Petty and Cacioppo in 1986 and heuristic-systematic model offered by Chaiken in 1987 in the persuasion literature shed more light on this argument. According to elaboration likelihood model, there are two modes of information processing; central route and peripheral route. Being motivated and having ability to think about an argument, people think carefully and deliberately about a situation.

However, when the motivation and ability are low, it causes unsystematic processing and thus people rely on shortcuts and heuristics to make judgements (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986).

The reason why we could not find any relation between implicit and explicit measures can be explained by four different arguments. First, the degree of automatic association between the paired categories in IAT was calculated by subtracting the average response time in matched category from the average response time in mismatched category (Greenwald et al., 1998). The relative categories being compared should matter, because the automatic associations between target and attribute could not be evaluated independent of one of the categories (Teachman, Gregg & Woody, 2001). In that sense, the choice of category names could have a strong impact on IAT scores. For instance, name of the categories in the previous studies were quite complementary with each other from participants' perspectives like White and Black, man and women etc. In this study, the choice of name of categories "Me as a Leader" and "Other Person as a Leader" could make the automatic association difficult for participants even though there were some similar categorical names in other studies such as me and other (Tulbure, 2006). It would be more complementary if we used "Leader" and "Follower" as classifications.

Second, according to environmental association model of IAT (Karpinski & Hilton, 2001), IAT may reflect the association that a person has been exposed to in his or her environment rather than the degree of evaluative association that the person holds. On the other hand, explicit measures assess the level of endorsement toward the construct that the person has. For instance, one can assume that IAT about the attitudes toward White/Black indicates the amount of having positive experience with White people and negative experience with Black people rather than favourable assessment of Whites over Blacks. Thus, in this study, if the salience of experience as being a leader was quite weak, it would be difficult to make a strong association between targets and attributes for participants.

Moreover, the generalization of findings across individuals and the application of IAT-FOL as a discriminative measurement of unwillingness to become a leader would be hard if IAT measurement had been affected by person's environment and experience.

Third, the correlation between the IAT-FOL and explicit FOL may have failed to emerge due to the methodological constraints such as being restricted in their range of explicit ratings. In this study, we used 5-point likert type scales ranging from 1 (slightly) to 5 (extremely). For the explicit measure, participants made their decision about each item in the FOL questionnaire by choosing one of the values from rating scale. The total score of the participants in the FOL questionnaire was calculated by adding these values. However, in IAT-FOL, the computational procedure was different and participants' total score taken from IAT-FOL did not correspond to 5-point rating system in FOL questionnaire. Therefore, semantic differential type of scale could have been used for explicit measure of FOL to eliminate this constraint.

Last, social desirability concerns lead to absence of correlation between implicit and explicit measures, particularly when the construct measured is quite sensitive such as racism (e.g. Black vs. White) or sexism (e.g. Women vs. Men) (Devine & Elliot, 1995). In that kind of context, when the attitudes of people are measured explicitly, they need to hide true feelings and opinions; hence, researchers cannot find any relation between implicit and explicit measures. However, in this study, this situation could not cause lack of relation between implicit and explicit measures of FOL, because FOL was not critical topic especially for our participants that most of them were sophomores, and juniors. In the student sample, the probability of facing with leadership situation in the near future might quite low. This argument could be applicable if our sample were employees specifically for those whose promotion was discussed at work.

We proposed that FOL and MTL would be negatively related with each other. That is, when the FOL of person would increase, motivation of individual to lead would decrease. However, the bivariate correlation analysis of the present study indicated that FOL and MTL were not associated with each other. In other words, they were orthogonal. This finding could be supported by approach and avoidance motives proposed by Elliot in 1999 and “competitive neurosis” construct offered by Horney in 1936.

Elliot and Covington (2001) described motivation as the trigger and initiator of the behaviour. There are two types of motivation, namely approach and avoidance that differ from each other as a function of valence. In approach motivation, the occurrence of behaviour is triggered and oriented by a positive/favourable event or the possibility of it whereas in avoidance motivation, the occurrence of behaviour is triggered and oriented by a negative/unfavourable event or the possibility of it (Elliot, 1999). Although approach and avoidance motivation seem to opposite to each other, they can exist together to predict behaviour. Similarly, in the current study, FOL and MTL were not correlated but each of them could independently predict individual’s intention to become a leader in the future.

Horney’s theory (1936) about competitive neurosis suggested that children who grow up in a family environment in which there is a strong emphasis on competition would have two contradicting feelings. In other words, they have a strong desire to achieve and to become first at this competition. However, they simultaneously experience anxiety because of the pressure resulting from the idea that losing the competition may cause the loss of affection and admiration of parents. These results indicated that the contradictory feelings and thoughts could coexist. Therefore, one can assume that FOL and MTL could coexist together and predict leadership behaviour independently.

We have not been in a position to find similar findings from previous studies since it has been the first time FOL introduced in the literature. Nevertheless, we can speculate that

motivation and anxiety may be two different constructs to predict behaviour. Even if an individual has a motive to lead, s/he would not like to become a leader because of possessing the fear of leadership. The other way around, one does not want to be a leader due to the lack of motivation to lead even if s/he has a high level of fear of leadership. Therefore, in this manner, it seems that FOL should be used in combination with MTL to predict the leadership behaviour accurately. To reach a confident conclusion, we conducted regression analysis with student sample (N = 205) to investigate the interaction between FOL and MTL to predict future leadership intention. Results indicated that there was no significant interaction between those variables. These results can be explained by different arguments. First, being specific to that sample, we might just fail to support our expectation about the relation between FOL and MTL to predict leadership behaviour. Second, both FOL and MTL can be strong enough to predict leadership behaviour independently, as it was founded in this analysis; therefore, MTL can just use complementary to FOL in the following studies. All in all, future empirical research should be conducted to reach correct conclusion about the relation FOL and MTL to predict leadership behaviour.

In the beginning, although we have not expected any gender differences in FOL we found that women were more likely to have FOL compared to men in Study 2. However, we cannot generalize this finding because percentage of women was more than the percentage of men in the sample. Therefore, we need more studies to be sure about the gender differences in FOL. Furthermore, we do not expect any cross cultural differences in FOL. In other words, FOL is expected to be a universal construct. On the other hand, it can be speculated that the dimensions of FOL scale such as fear of imbalance in work, family & personal life, fear of failure and fear of harming others can be varied across countries in terms of distributions; however, the mechanism underlying FOL is expected to be similar regardless of culture. For instance, in Western countries, especially for women the distributions of scores in fear of

imbalance in work, family & personal life domain can be different from Eastern countries because of the egalitarian values. However, fear of failure and fear of harming others domains seem not to prone to cultural differences. All in all, future studies should be conducted in different cultures to reach correct conclusion.

The present study has several strengths. Initially, it was the first time that the reason why an individual does not want to become a leader has been discussed. Thus, this study has theoretically filled this existing gap in the literature. Second, we have a new instrument to assess to which extent a person experiences fear of leadership. Therefore, the development and validation of FOL scale can be used in applied settings. For instance, practitioners can apply FOL scale in the recruitment stage to assess if a job candidate can be considered as a potential leader in their organization or not. Moreover, when deciding the promotion of an employee for the leadership position such as a team leader, HR professionals can use this FOL scale to make an appropriate decision in the performance evaluation stage. Third, the IAT literature composed of many conflicting findings about the association between IAT and self-reports. Thus, each study conducted by researchers in this area has made a significant contribution to enlighten this condition. Even if we failed to support our hypothesis that IAT-FOL and self report of FOL would be positively associated, we have still made a valuable contribution to the IAT literature in which the opponents indicated that IAT and explicit measures were addressing the different aspect of behaviour, thus they diverged from each other (Karpinski & Hilton, 2001). Our results also supported this argument.

Despite these strengths, there are some limitations of the study. First, our participants were employees in Study 1 while the participants of the Study 2 were students. In Study 2, because of the convenience, we preferred student sample. However, it could be better if we used employee sample in Study 2 like in Study 1 because it might be hard to associate the items in the FOL questionnaire like “being unable to do my duties as being mother/father” for

students. The results can reflect the imagination and forecasts of distant future in terms of facing with possible leadership position rather than the real scenario situation. Therefore, it can be a threat to the external validity of the study. Second, our student participants in Study 2 were studying at Koç University. To make the sample more diverse, students from public universities in Turkey would be included in this study. As a result, the concerns about the generalizability issues could be eliminated. Third, Koç University is a private university and as sample characteristics, the SES of students is generally high. Besides, the self esteem of the students would be expected to be high in this academic and family environment in which there is a strong emphasis on the positive sides of leadership and being independent. Therefore, we could have added self esteem scale to this study and controlled the effect of it. Fourth, in this study, we added some questions to understand the relation between FOL and leadership behaviour. However, the questions just tapped the intention of participants rather than behaviour itself. Therefore, the instruments or experiments would be designed to measure leadership behaviour itself. Last, only survey methodology was used in this study. In order to strength the power of findings of this study, in addition to Study 1 and Study 2, the experiment would be conducted in the following studies.

In the future, it is necessary to conduct other studies about FOL to support the theoretical framework of FOL and results provided by this study. Furthermore, if it is possible to encounter with a situation in which being a leader comes into question, this study should be replicated and the results should be compared to see whether any difference between imaginary and real settings would occur. After answering the question that why people avoid leadership positions by explanation of FOL, the next question should be like: “Who is the most successful and effective leader: a person who has FOL or a person who lacks of FOL?” Therefore, future research should address this question.

REFERENCES

- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, S. K. 2006. Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group and Organization Management*, 31: 100–123.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds), *Action Control: From Cognition to Behavior* (pp. 11-39). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Asendorpf, J. B., Banse, R., & Mücke, D. (2002). Double dissociation between explicit and implicit personality self-concept: The case of shy behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 380-393
- Aycan, Z., Baskurt, A. B., Ozkuvanci, C., Sandal, C., & Yurekli, O. (2014). Fear of leadership: Measurement and Conceptualization. 28th International Congress of Applied Psychology, France.
- Banse, R., Seise, J., & Zerbes, N. (2001). Implicit attitudes towards homosexuality: Reliability, validity, and controllability of the IAT. *Zeitschrift für Experimentelle Psychologie*, 48, 145– 160
- Bargh, J. A., Chaiken, S., Raymond, P., & Hymes, C. (1996). The automatic evaluation effect: Unconditionally automatic attitude activation with a pronunciation task. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 32, 104-128.
- Birney, R. C., Burdick, H., & Teevan, R. C. (1969). *Fear of failure*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Carter, MP and Williamson, D (1996) Questionnaire Design. Staffordshire University Business School, Leek Road, Stokeon-Trent ST4 2DF, United Kingdom.
- NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 481-498.
- Chaiken, S. (1987) The heuristic model of persuasion. In M. P. Zanna, J. M. Olson and C. P. Herman (eds.), *Social influence: The Ontario Symposium, 5*, 3-39, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Clance P. R., & Imes S. A. (1978). The imposter phenomenon in high achieving women: Dynamics and therapeutic intervention. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 15*, 241-247.
- Cronshaw, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). A process investigation of self-monitoring and leader emergence. *Small Group Research, 22*, 403-420.
- Devine, P. G., & Elliot, A. J. (1995). Are racial stereotypes really fading? The Princeton trilogy revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 1139-1150.
- De Vellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London, UK: Sage.
- Dobbins, G., Long, W., Dedrick, E., & Clemmons, T. (1990). The role of self-monitoring and gender on leader emergence: A laboratory and field study. *Journal of Management, 16*, 609-618.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (2002). Predictive validity of an Implicit Association Test for assessing anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1441-1455.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The Biological Basis of Personality*. Springfield: Thomas.
- Ellis, R., Adamson, R., Deszca, G., & Cawsey, T. (1988). Self-monitoring and leader emergence. *Small Group Behavior, 19*, 312-324.

- Ellis, R., & Cronshaw, S. (1992). Self-monitoring and leader emergence: A test of moderator effects. *Small Group Behavior, 23*, 113- 129.
- Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychology, 34*, 169–189.
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 218-232.
- Elliot, A. J., & Covington, M. V. (2001). *Approach and avoidance motivation. Educational Psychology Review, 13*, 73-92.
- Ellwart, T., Rinck, M., & Becker, E. (2006). From fear to love: Implicit and explicit associations towards spiders. *Emotion, 6*, 18–27.
- Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 297-327.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Funder, D. C. (2001). Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 197–221.
- Gençöz, T. & Öncül, Ö. (2012). Examination of personality characteristics in a Turkish sample: Development of the basic personality traits inventory. *The Journal of General Psychology, 139*, 194-216.
- Gough, H. G. (1990). Testing for leadership with the California Psychological Inventory. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 355–379). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1464–1480.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Farnham, S. D. (2000). Using the Implicit Association Test to measure self-esteem and self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 1022-1038.
- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 197–216.
- Ho, R., & Zemaitis, R. (1981). Concern over the negative consequences of success. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 33*, 19-28.
- Hoffman, W., Gawronski, B., Gschwendner, T., Le, H., & Schmitt, M. (2005). A Meta-analysis on the correlation between the implicit association test and explicit self-report measures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(10), 1369-1384.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49*(6), 493–504.
- Horner, M. S. (1968). Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and noncompetitive situations (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 30*, 407.
- Horner, M. S. (1972). Toward an understanding of achievement related conflicts in women. *Journal of Social Issues, 28*, 157-175.
- Horney, K. (1936). Cultural and neurosis. *American Sociological Review, 1*, 221-230.

Hummert, M. L., Gartska, T. A., O'Brien, L. T., Greenwald, A. G., & Mellott, D. S. (2002).

Using the Implicit Association Test to measure age differences in implicit social cognitions. *Psychology & Aging, 17*, 482-495.

Karpinski, A., & Hilton, J. L. (2001). Attitudes and the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 774-788.

Koole, S. L., Dijksterhuis, A., & van Knippenberg, A. (2001). What's in a name: Implicit self-esteem and the automatic self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 669-685.

Kotter, J. P., (1990) *Force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.

Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relationships between personality traits and leadership perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 402-410.

Maison, D., Greenwald, A. G., & Bruin, R. (2001). The Implicit Association Test as a measure of implicit consumer attitudes. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 32*, 1-9.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 81-90.

Mills, D. Quinn. *Leadership: How to Lead, How to Live*. Waltham, MA: Mind Edge Press, 2005.

- Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2001). Implicit attitude formation through classical conditioning. *Psychological Science, 12*, 413–417.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Petty, R. E., Schumann, D. W., Richman, & Strathman, A. (1993). Positive mood and persuasion: Different roles for affect under high and low elaboration conditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 5–20
- Teachman, B., Gregg, A., & Woody, S. (2001). Implicit attitudes toward fear-relevant stimuli in individuals with snake and spider fears. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 110*, 226–235.
- Teachman, B. A., & Woody, S. R. (2003). Automatic processing in spider phobia: Implicit fear associations over the course of treatment. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 112*, 100-109.
- Thomas, D.C., Stahl, G., Ravlin, E.C., Pekerti, A., Maznevski, M., Lazarova, M.B., Jackson, D.J.R., Elron, E., Ekelud, B.Z., Cerdin, J-L., Brislin, R., Aycan, Z., & Au, K. (2008). Cultural Intelligence: Domain and Assessment. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, 8*(2), 123-143.
- Tulbure, B. T. (2006) Dissimulating anxiety in front of the Implicit Association Test (IAT) *Cognition, Brain, Behavior, 10*, 559-579.
- Uhlmann, E., & Swanson, J. (2004). Exposure to violent video games increases automatic aggressiveness. *Journal of Adolescence, 27*, 41-52.
- Wilson, T., Lindsey, S. & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review, 107*, 101-126.

Wiers, R. W., Van Woerden, N., Smulders, F. T. Y., & De Jong, P. J.(2002). Implicit and explicit alcohol related cognitions in heavy and light drinkers. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 111*, 648-658.

Wilson, T., Lindsey, S. & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review, 107*, 101-126.

Zaccaro, S., Foti, R., & Kenny, D. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 308-315.

Zuckerman, M., & Allison S. N. (1976). An objective measure of fear of success: Construction and validation. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 40*, 422-431.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FOL SCALE

Kariyerinizin bir aşamasında çalıştığınız kurumda **liderliğe adaylığınızın** söz konusu olduğunu düşünün.

Liderlik pozisyonunu kabul etmeniz durumunda aşağıdaki **kaygıları** ne oranda yaşadınız?

Liderlik pozisyonunun aşağıdaki olası sonuçları:

1. Çok düşük oranda kaygı yarattı
2. Düşük oranda kaygı yarattı
3. Orta düzeyde kaygı yarattı
4. Büyük oranda kaygı yarattı
5. Çok büyük oranda kaygı yarattı

Liderlik pozisyonunun aşağıdaki olası sonuçları ne oranda kaygı yarattı?

| | 1. Çok düşük oranda kaygı yarattı | 2. Düşük oranda kaygı yarattı | 3. Orta düzeyde kaygı yarattı | 4. Büyük oranda kaygı yarattı | 5. Çok büyük oranda kaygı yarattı |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Pozisyonumun getirdiği sorumlulukları yerine getirememek | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| İnsanların çıkar ilişkisi için benimle yakınlaşması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| İşte çıkabilecek krizlerle baş edememek | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kıskanılan bir kişi olmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Sorumluluklarımın artması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Arkadaşlarıma yeteri kadar zaman ayıramamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| İşten kaynaklanan sağlık problemleri yaşamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| İşteki belirsizliklerin artması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Daha fazla risk almak zorunda kalmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başarısız olma durumunda kuruma zarar vermek | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kendime ayırdığım zamanın azalması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | 1. Çok düşük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 2. Düşük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 3. Orta düzeyde kaygı yaratırdı | 4. Büyük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 5. Çok büyük oranda kaygı yaratırdı |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Anne/Baba olarak görevlerimi yerine getirememek | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Nazar deęecek olması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Tüm gözlerin üzerimde olması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başarısız olma durumunda herkese karşı mahcup olmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Acımasız ve katı bir insan olmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Eşimle/Partnerimle sorunlar yaşamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başkalarına "örnek olmak" zorunda kalmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Hayattaki hedeflerimin tükenmesi | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Daha fazla eleştiriye maruz kalmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Ayağımın kaydırılma olasılığı | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Aslında bu pozisyonu hak etmediğimin düşünülmesi | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Yaptığım hataların eskiye oranla daha çok dikkat çekmesi | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başkalarına karşı kırııcı davranmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Adil olamamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başarısız olursam kendime güvenimin sarsılması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kendimi her zaman kanıtlamak zorunda olmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Sivrilmek ve ukala olarak algılanmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Aileme yeteri kadar zaman ayıramamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Stresimin artması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| İş ortamında düşmanlarımın artması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Özel hayatımın yok olması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Çalışanlar üzerinde otorite kuramamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Aile iş dengesi kuramamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

APPENDIX B

WORDS FOR IAT-FOL

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| - <u>Lider Ben</u> | <u>Lider Başkası</u> |
| 1) Ekibim | Amaçları |
| 2) Yetkim | Çalışanları |
| 3) Ajandam | Maaşı |
| 4) Planlarım | Programları |
| 5) Projelerim | Seyahatleri |
| - <u>Olumlu</u> | <u>Olumsuz</u> |
| 1) Soğukkanlı | Stresli |
| 2) Mutlu | Başarısız |
| 3) Dingin | Endişeli |
| 4) Özgüvenli | Panik |
| 5) Sakin | Agresif |
| 6) Başarılı | Hasta |
| 7) Huzurlu | Beceriksiz |

APPENDIX C

FOL SCALE_LAST VERSION

Kariyerinizin bir aşamasında çalıştığınız kurumda **liderliğe adaylığınızın** söz konusu olduğunu düşünün.

Liderlik pozisyonunu kabul etmeniz durumunda aşağıdaki **kaygıları** ne oranda yaşardınız?

Liderlik pozisyonunun aşağıdaki olası sonuçları:

1. Çok düşük oranda kaygı yaratırdı
2. Düşük oranda kaygı yaratırdı
3. Orta düzeyde kaygı yaratırdı
4. Büyük oranda kaygı yaratırdı
5. Çok büyük oranda kaygı yaratırdı

Liderlik pozisyonunun aşağıdaki olası sonuçları ne oranda kaygı yaratırdı?

| | 1. Çok düşük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 2. Düşük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 3. Orta düzeyde kaygı yaratırdı | 4. Büyük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 5. Çok büyük oranda kaygı yaratırdı |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Arkadaşlarıma yeteri kadar zaman ayıramamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| İşten kaynaklanan sağlık problemleri yaşamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kendime ayırdığım zamanın azalması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Anne/Baba olarak görevlerimi yerine getirememek | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başarısız olma durumunda herkese karşı mahcup olmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Acımasız ve katı bir insan olmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Eşimle/Partnerimle sorunlar yaşamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Daha fazla eleştiriye maruz kalmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Yaptığım hataların eskiye oranla daha çok dikkat çekmesi | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başkalarına karşı kırıcı davranmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Adil olamamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | 1. Çok düşük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 2. Düşük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 3. Orta düzeyde kaygı yaratırdı | 4. Büyük oranda kaygı yaratırdı | 5. Çok büyük oranda kaygı yaratırdı |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Başarısız olursam kendime güvenimin sarsılması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kendimi her zaman kanıtlamak zorunda olmak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Aileme yeteri kadar zaman ayıramamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Özel hayatımın yok olması | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Aile iş dengesi kuramamak | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

APPENDIX D

CONCOSS

Aşağıda değerlendirmenizi istediğimiz bazı ifadeler verilmiştir. Lütfen, her bir ifadeye ne derece katıldığınızı ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz.

| | Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum | Katılmıyorum | Ortadayım | Katılıyorum | Kesinlikle Katılıyorum |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Herhangi bir şeyde oldukça yetkinsem başkalarının beni kendi çıkarları için kullanabileceklerinden endişelenirim. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Bir şeyi çok iyi yapıyorsam başkalarının başarımla baltalamaya çalışabileceğinden endişelenirim. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kimse beni tehdit olarak algılamasın diye bazen elimden gelenin daha azını yaparım. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Bazen şansımın yaver gitmesi ve öğretmenlerin ilgisizliği sayesinde okuldaki dersleri geçtiğime inanırım. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Çok bilgili olduğum için başkalarının benden hoşlanmayacağından endişelenirim. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başkalarından daha iyi bir iş çıkarırsam başkalarını kendime düşman edebileceğimi düşünürüm. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Çok iyi bir şey başardığımda başkalarının beni kıskanabileceğinden endişelenirim. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kimi zaman başka biri benden daha iyi yapabilsin diye kasıtlı olarak ortalama ya da vasat işler yaparım. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Başkalarından başarılı olduğumda bundan keyif alıyormuşum gibi görünmemeye çalışırım. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| İşime kendimi çok | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Running head: FEAR OF LEADERSHIP

| | Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum | Katılmıyorum | Ortadayım | Katılıyorum | Kesinlikle Katılıyorum |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| adadığım için başkaları tarafından garip ya da tuhaf olarak algılanmaktan endişelenirim. | | | | | |
| Herhangi bir şeyde göze çarpıcı şekilde başarılı olsam başkalarının benimle alay edebileceğine dair endişelenirim. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Zorlayıcı olmayan faaliyetleri çekici bulmam. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

APPENDIX E

NEUROTICISM SCALE

Aşağıda size uyan ya da uymayan pek çok kişilik özelliği bulunmaktadır. Bu özelliklerden her birinin sizin için ne kadar uygun olduğunu maddelerin yanlarında bulunan seçeneklerden bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

| | Hiç Uygun Değil | Uygun Değil | Kararsızım | Uygun | Çok uygun |
|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Sinirli | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Agresif | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kızgın | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Huysuz | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Sabırsız | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kaprisli | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Aceleci | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Alıngan | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Kaygılı | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

APPENDIX F

MTL SCALE

Aşağıda kendiniz hakkında değerlendirme yapacağınız ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu bölümde vereceğiniz cevaplar sizi tanımamızı sağlayacağı için çok önemlidir.

Doğru yada yanlış cevap yoktur. Kendiniz hakkında, her bir ifadeye ne derece katılıp katılmadığınızı maddelerin yanlarında bulunan seçeneklerden bir tanesini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

1= Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum 2= Katılmıyorum 3= Ortadayım 4= Katılıyorum 5= Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

- _____ Çoğu zaman, bir grup çalışması içindeyken yönetilen olmaktansa yöneten(lider) olmayı tercih ederim.
- _____ Yalnızca başkaları istediği için liderlik etmeyi asla kabul etmezdim.
- _____ Bir gruba lider olarak yapacağım katkının yönetilen olarak yapacağım katkıdan daha fazla olacağına inanıyorum.
- _____ Çoğu zaman, çalıştığım gruplarda lider olmayı isterim.
- _____ Bir lideri aktif olarak destekleyen ama lider olarak görevlendirilmeyi tercih etmeyen biriyimdir.
- _____ Çalıştığım grupların veya takımların çoğunda, idareyi ele almaya eğilimliyimdir.
- _____ Liderlik görevlerini geri çevirmek doğru değildir.
- _____ Diğer grup üyeleri tarafından liderlik etmem istenir veya liderliğe aday gösterilsem lider olmayı kabul ederim.
- _____ Bireylerin, onlardan liderlik görevleri veya pozisyonuna gelmeleri istendiği zaman kabul etmeleri beklenir.
- _____ Bireyler, başkaları tarafından aday gösterilmek veya istenmektense, liderlik etmeye gönüllü olmalıdırlar.
- _____ Liderlik etmenin istenmesi bir şeref ve ayrıcalıktır.
- _____ Bir grubun lideri olmaya nadiren isteksiz, genellikle istekliyimdir.
- _____ Başkalarına liderlik etmekle ilgilenen biri değilimdir.
- _____ Başkalarının sorumluluğunu almayı seven biriyimdir.
- _____ Eğer yapabileceğim, her zaman başkalarına liderlik etmeye gönüllü olmam gerektiği öğretildi.
- _____ Eğer başkalarına liderlik etmem istenirse, bunun görevim olduğunu hissederim.
- _____ Bana, başkalarına liderlik etmenin değerine inanmam öğretildi.
- _____ Kesinlikle doğuştan gelen bir liderlik özelliğim yok.

APPENDIX G

CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE

Aşağıdaki ifadeler bir kişinin başka kültürlerden kimselerle etkileşimleri sonucu yaşadıkları deneyimler hakkındadır. Lütfen maddelerin **sizin özelliklerinizi** ne ölçüde yansıttığını her bir maddenin yanındaki boşluğa size uygun rakamı yazarak belirtiniz.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----|--------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Hiç | Çok az | Biraz | Çok fazla | Tamamen |

1. ____ Dünyadaki kültürlerin birbirlerinden ne açıdan farklı olduklarını bilirim.
2. ____ Kişisel deneyimlerimden, okuduklarımdan vs. yola çıkarak kültürler arası farklılıklara örnekler verebilirim.
3. ____ Farklı kültürlerden kişilerle konuşmaktan hoşlanırım.
4. ____ Diğer kültürlerden insanların hislerini doğru bir şekilde anlayabilirim.
5. ____ Bazen başka kültürlerden insanları anlamaya çalışırken olaylara onların perspektifinden bakmaya çalışırım.
6. ____ Davranışlarımı farklı kültürden durumlara ve kişilere uyum sağlamak için değiştirebilirim.
7. ____ Farklı bir kültürdeyken ve farklı kültürlerden insanlarla birlikteyken gecikmeleri sinirlenmeden kabul ederim.
8. ____ Başka kültürden birisi ile etkileşim halindeyken kültürel birikimimi kullandığımı farkında olurum.
9. ____ Kültürün benim ve farklı kültürlerden insanların davranışları üzerindeki etkileri hakkında çokça düşünürüm.
10. ____ Farklı bir kültür içerisinde ve farklı kültürlerden insanlarla birlikteyken nasıl davranacağımı planlamam gerektiğinin farkındayım.