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Problem Statement
There have been increasing numbers of formal library leadership development programs (LDP) for emerging leaders but there has been no certainty as to whether these programs improve the leadership self-efficacy (LSE) of participants, nor has there been any indication as to what content and attributes of these programs affect the development of LSE in participants. Can LSE be developed through formalized leadership program interventions, and if so, how?

Question 1: How does participation by emerging leaders in a library leadership development program affect their leadership self-efficacy?

Question 2: What content and structural attributes of a library leadership development program are relevant to the development of leadership self-efficacy in emerging leaders?

Question 3: What about the content and structural attributes of a library leadership development program make them relevant to the development of leadership self-efficacy in emerging leaders?

Theoretical Foundation

Social Cognitive Theory
1. How a person thinks affects actions & vice versa
2. How a person thinks affects their environment & vice versa
3. The environment affects our actions & responses & vice versa


Leadership Development Programs
- Little evaluation but perceived to affect “self-confidence”
- Framework for Leadership Development Program evaluation
- Improvement Effectiveness of Leadership Development Interventions
- Developing emerging Library Leaders building self-efficacy so that they will continue using leadership skills to lead

From the Experiment:
Participants exposed to the LDP had a significantly greater increase in LSE than those not exposed to the LDP when measured immediately after the program and 7 months thereafter.

From the Qualitative Component:
Content Analysis
- 18 elements were perceived by at least 35% of the participants to be important to LSE: Mentors, Feedback, Understanding Oneself, Teams, Leading Change, Risk, Stress & Conflict, States - Striking a Balance, Overconfidence & Skepticism
- Gender had no significant effect on LSE scores.

Implications
- Program content tailored to match initial levels of LSE
- Selection of Participants: Maximizing Benefit versus ethics of choice
- Training for Mentors - Expert Mentors not just Library Leaders

Participants with initial LSE scores below the median had significantly greater gains in LSE than did participants with initial LSE scores above the median.

- Gender had no significant effect on LSE scores.
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