

# **WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP SELF-EFFICACY AND STRESS?**



**By: Lydia Sleeman**

**First Reader: Dr. Ryan Pickering**

**Second Reader: Prof. Nancy Frambes**

**Submitted to the Psychology Department, Allegheny College  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE  
March 31, 2025**

## **WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP SELF-EFFICACY AND STRESS?**

A Senior Comprehensive Project  
Presented by: Lydia Sleeman  
Author of Comp

Date: March 31, 2025

Pledge: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_

(Insert name of first reader)

\_\_\_\_\_

(Insert name of second reader)

### **Abstract**

There has been limited research conducted investigating the potential relationship between someone's belief in their leadership abilities (leadership self-efficacy) and that person's perceived stress. The need for this gap to be filled prompted the creation of this study which looked at the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and stress in undergraduate college students at a small U.S. liberal arts college. 32 participants completed an online correlational design study. The relatively new Leadership Self-Efficacy scale was used, which identifies six dimensions (sub-scales) within, along with the Perceived Stress Scale to investigate this relationship. The current study hypothesized a negative relationship between each dimension, and the entirety, of leadership self-efficacy and stress. The examined correlations indicated a negative correlation between leadership self-efficacy and stress. Limitations and future directions are also discussed.

*Keywords:* stress, leadership, self-efficacy

## **What is the Relationship Between Leadership Self-Efficacy and Stress in College Students?**

Throughout life, leadership positions are common in most careers such as: a management position at a grocery store, an employee at a school, being a doctor at a hospital, in the military or law enforcement, or being a role model in a family. Therefore the importance of leadership is prevalent to almost everyone, and there is 'no one-size-fits-all' approach to leadership positions. One of the most important tools that will affect leadership is the individual's belief in their leadership abilities, or the individual's self-efficacy. However, with any position of leadership comes the responsibility of managing stress. It is crucial for people to learn how to deal with stress, especially leaders because they encounter a great deal of stress (Harms et al., 2017, p. 178). The way they handle the stress will indicate their leadership skills and abilities.

### **Leadership Self-Efficacy**

The broad term self-efficacy, meaning "an individual's belief in his or her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments (Bandura, 1997, p. 3)" has been a subject of importance for decades since Bandura's research between the 70's and 90's. Recently, researchers have identified specific areas of self-efficacy, including leadership self-efficacy, and what criteria makes an effective leader. Hannah et al. (2012, p. 144), being among these researchers, agrees with Bandura's definition of self-efficacy, however specifies additional criteria that can further one's leadership self-efficacy. Such as: one's ability to complete tasks, generate novel solutions, motivating subordinates, and coordinating resources needed to succeed. These areas could also be discussed as sub-categories of leadership self-efficacy.

In addition to studies involving self-efficacy and leadership self-efficacy, researchers started to specify their studies by looking at leadership self-efficacy and additional variables. For example, Ali et al. (2018) was also interested in leadership self-efficacy however took it a step further by comparing it to one of the most important aspects of being a leader, leadership effectiveness; “successfully exercising one's influence over a group to achieve a desired result” (Cooper, 2004, p. 845). Ali et al. (2018) hypothesized a positive relationship between Leadership Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness within business leaders and subordinates in Ethiopia. However, the results confirmed their hypothesis was incorrect. Although, they did encounter a noteworthy result which indicated a valuable part of leadership self-efficacy is the ability to “mobilize motivation and cognitive resources to successfully execute a task” (Ali et al., 2018, p. 30). This is similar to the definition of leadership subcategories that Hannah et al. (2012) defined, specifically “motivating subordinates, and coordinating resources needed to succeed” (p. 144). Both these studies discuss the importance of acknowledging the multifaceted definition of leadership self-efficacy. This has shaped the current study by promoting the investigation of the use of a multifaceted leadership self-efficacy scale.

An additional piece of information the current study deemed important to understand before data collection was recognizing and learning different styles of leadership. A perfect example of this is in Day et al. (2016) research where they compared two styles of leadership to determine which style produced the student's best test results and encouraged them to broaden their educational learning. The two styles of leadership they compared were instructional leadership, “establishing clear educational goals, planning the curriculum, and evaluating teachers” and transformational leadership, “emphasizing vision and inspiration, focusing on establishing structures and cultures that enhance the quality of teaching and learning, setting

directions, developing people within school systems” (p. 224). Their results concluded that a mixed method approach to leadership styles had more positive impact than any one specific leadership style.

Caillier (2016) also researched transformational leadership and built upon the previous study by examining how transformational leadership and goal clarity influence three constructs: self-efficacy, extra-role behaviors, and turnover intentions within U.S. government employees. Their point of view is important to keep in mind for the current study because it demonstrates that certain leadership styles can influence one’s self-efficacy. Although this is not something that will be discussed in the current research, it would be a great future study focusing on how different styles of leadership affect leadership self-efficacy.

### ***Leadership Within Different Populations***

Along with previous literature examining different styles of leadership and self-efficacy constructs, leadership self-efficacy has been researched within specific populations. Such as, a study examining how nursing students adjusted to college life which researchers predicted would show a correlation between self-leadership, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy (Jong-Im, 2018). Additionally Dugan et al. (2008) investigated the differences in leadership self-efficacy rates of commuter students living with parents or living by themselves, they concluded that commuter students living by themselves had a higher statistically significant rate of leadership self-efficacy than those living with parents or guardians. While other studies examined much larger universities/colleges while researching the students' rates of motivation to lead compared to their rates of leadership self-efficacy (Cho et al., 2015). The importance of reviewing the literature involving leadership self-efficacy helps determine areas of focus that still need to be

addressed such as a new multifaceted leadership self-efficacy scale or leadership self-efficacy sub-categories, as discussed in Hannah et al. (2012) research, and investigating a smaller and more specified college, in which Allegheny College fits the description perfectly.

## **Stress**

The study conducted by Peiró and Rodríguez (2008) researched how leadership affects the wellbeing of a whole organization, along with individuals within an organization, and how it could influence work stress. Although the current studies' focus is elsewhere, Peiró and Rodríguez (2008) definition of work stress, “a person’s subjective experience resulting from the perception of excessive or threatening demands difficult to control that may have negative consequences for him or her (p. 69)”, fits perfectly to identify the current studies’ variable, stress.

Although stress is a normal part of everyone’s life experiences, if exposed too often or to a high degree it can become both detrimental to the individuals health and wellbeing but also to their careers. This is especially prevalent to those in leadership positions due to their often increased workloads and expectations compared to their subordinate counterparts. An example of leaders experiencing higher levels of stress is demonstrated while in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic when emergency medicine responders had to respond to many emergency calls with limited support, which increased their rate of stress and anxiety levels (Rodriguez et al., 2020). Emergency medicine responders are characterized as leaders due to their selflessness and expertise in the job field while responding to disastrous situations while in the midst of a pandemic. Additional studies have investigated styles of leadership that create more focus on stress preventative leadership (Stuber et al., 2019) in order to have a more positive relationship

between leaders and staff. This study also mentioned the importance of sub-dimensions of leadership, specifically transformational leadership, because the style and sub-dimension of leadership plays a role in overall stress.

In addition to stress itself, previous studies identified both helpful and unhelpful stressors, in terms of task completion. Task completion is one of the most important aspects of a successful leader because they are the conductors of change, integration, and achievement. Travis et al. (2020) discussed two types of stressors, challenging stressors: goal-relevant and manageable, which are thought to “increase motivation, performance, and well-being”; and hindering stressors: goal-relevant but unmanageable, which are thought to “hamper performance and occasion maladaptive behaviors.” Another study conducted by Wu et al. (2019) researched challenging and hindering stressors in comparison to teacher leadership at a grade school in China along with emotional exhaustion. They found that “perceived servant leadership, the focus on prioritizing the needs of the followers while working one-on-one with them, buffers the relationship between challenge stressor and emotional exhaustion, it enhances the relationship between hindrance stressor and emotional exhaustion” (p. 2). Additionally, a study that researched stress and leadership was conducted by Grocke-Dewey et al. (2023) in which stress and different stressors were examined within agricultural workers in the United States and ways in which to prevent stress and create stress management strategies.

### **The Current Study**

In most of the previous literature the construct of ‘leadership self-efficacy’ was divided into two variables ‘self-efficacy’ and ‘leadership’ not the specific construct of ‘leadership self-efficacy’. Therefore, the current study will investigate the detailed construct of ‘leadership

self-efficacy'. There will also be the careful consideration of different dimensions of leadership self-efficacy due to the previously established importance of multiple different dimensions of the variable (Hannah et al., 2012 and Ali et al., 2018). Similarly to Peiró and Rodríguez (2008) the current study will consider the earlier definition of stress, specifically the individual's subjective experience of stress, or their perceived stress.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and stress in a small rural liberal arts college in the United States. The current study hypothesizes that lower levels of stress will be correlated with higher levels of self-efficacy and vice versa, thus a negative correlation. Additionally the current study will be investigating a relatively new scale for the leadership self-efficacy variable, the Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale by Bobbio et al. (2009).

### **Self-Determination Theory**

Previous studies have used the self-determination theory to describe the motivational framework of leadership self-efficacy in comparison to intrinsic: influences from the individual, and extrinsic factors: influences from outside of an individual. One such study described extrinsic factors with the self-determination theory as, "A framework for the relationships among the environment, motivation, and behavior" (Guan et al., 2023, p. 2). This study used the self-determination theory to help determine how the extrinsic factors mentioned above relate to leadership self-efficacy. Another study described intrinsic factors and the self-determination theory to explain the basic psychological need for satisfaction while leading others (Cho et al. 2015). Researchers in this study used the self-determination theory to explain the basic psychological need to lead with three intrinsic factors, "autonomy, competence, and relatedness

to enhance motivation” (Cho et al. 2015, p. 34). The current study used stress as a factor that can be defined as both intrinsic and extrinsic to add to the current literature. Stress can be defined as intrinsic based upon the stress individuals place on themselves. This could be a positive factor because it aids in the motivation to complete tasks, however could be negative if the individual places too much stress on themselves. On the other hand, stress could also be an extrinsic factor when stress is placed on the individual from other people, workload demand, or responsibilities. The theoretical framework of this study is based on the self-determination theory to help determine the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and stress.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

All the participants are students enrolled at Allegheny College, with a majority of the participants being psychology majors and minors. A total of 33 participants completed the study however one participant declined to agree to the informed consent form, therefore their data was removed and excluded in the results. The demographic information collected was age ( $M = 19.75$  and  $SD = 1.96$ ), gender (76% female, 18% male, 6% other), graduation year ( $M = 2026.64$  and  $SD = 1.22$ ), and major/minor combination (many different combinations however the most common three were: 1) neuroscience and psychology double majors, 2) psychology major with global health minor, 3) chemistry major with psychology minor).

### ***Sampling Procedures***

The inclusion criteria required participants to have at least one identifiable leadership position in their lifetime and was phrased as, “What leadership position have you spent the most

time serving in?” (Appendix B) Additionally, the participants were asked to “consider the leadership position they listed when answering the following questions” (Appendix B) in order to receive the most accurate responses when asked about leadership qualities and capabilities in the study. The current study used a non-probability sampling technique, volunteer sampling, and offered one SONA credit for the completion of the study. Ethical approval of the sampling technique, the form of compensation, and overall study were reviewed and permitted by the Allegheny College Institutional Review Board (IRB) before the research and recruitment were conducted.

## **Materials**

The study was created on Survey Monkey, participants also completed the study on Survey Monkey, and data was collected and analyzed confidentially through SONA. The two scales that were used for this study are: The Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale (Bobbio et al. 2009) and The Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen et al.1983).

### **The Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale**

The Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale asked participants to reflect on their perceived self-efficacy during leadership positions. It is a 21-item multidimensional scale that investigates six constructs: D1 (Dimension 1) starting and leading change processes in groups, (D2) choosing effective followers and delegating responsibilities, (D3) building and managing interpersonal relationships within the group, (D4) showing self-awareness and self-confidence, (D5) motivating people, (D6) gaining consensus of group members. An example from the list of questions from D1 is, “I am able to set a new direction for a group, if the one currently taken

doesn't seem correct to me." The responses were graded on a Likert scale ranging from meaning 1= *never*, 2= *almost never*, 3= *sometimes*, 4= *fairly often*, to 5= *very often*. The validity of the six dimensions and the scale was investigated by Bobbio et al. (2009)

using a "corrected chi-square difference test ( $\Delta\chi^2$ ), together with the AIC index (Bobbio et al., 2009)." The reliability of the six dimensions and the scale was "computed with p coefficients when using the General Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale (Bobbio et al., 2009)." The current study also investigated the reliability of the six individual dimensions and the scale in its entirety using a unidimensional reliability test which calculated a Chrobach's  $\alpha = 0.866$  which indicated good reliability for the scale.

### **The Perceived Stress Scale**

The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) is a 10-item questionnaire that measures an individual's self assessment of their perceived stress within the last month. An example from the list of questions is, 'In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and stressed?' The responses were graded on a Likert scale from 0-4: 0= *never*, 1= *rarely*, 2= *sometimes*, 3= *usually*, and 4= *always*. There are three ranges based on the sum of the scores that indicate levels of perceived stress: 0-13 is considered low stress, 14-26 is considered moderate stress, and 27-40 is considered high stress. Four items (4, 5, 7, and 8) were reversed scored before the sum of the items was calculated due to the positive phrasing of the questions. This scale has been widely used in the research community and has reported adequate criterion validity as Lee (2012) identified in their review paper analyzing the psychometric properties of the PSS. Cohen et al. (1983) reported good internal reliability and test-retest reliability in their study on college students and the community. In addition to the supported reliability constructs from the previous

research the current study also investigated the reliability using a unidimensional reliability test which calculated a Chrobach's  $\alpha$  0.866 which indicated good reliability for the scale.

## **Procedure**

This correlational design study was administered on Survey Monkey to Allegheny participants, who were all recruited through Survey Monkey. Participants ( $n = 33$ ) were given an informed consent form (Appendix A) that explicitly stated this is a completely optional study and, if at any time, they wish to stop they may do so with no penalties inflicted upon them. One participant declined to agree to the informed consent form, therefore their data was deleted and excluded from the results, adjusting the number of total participants ( $n = 32$ ).

Afterward, a brief demographic questionnaire asking the participants' age, gender, graduation year, and major/minor combination (Appendix B) was administered. A question was then presented to the participants asking, "What leadership position have you spent the most time serving in? (Appendix B)" Following the question there will be a statement asking the participants to "Please consider the leadership position they listed previously when answering the following questions (Appendix B)". The intent when asking the participants to consider the leadership position they served in the longest, is to have the most accurate results be associated with possible perceived stress when acting in a leadership role.

First, The Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale (Appendix D) was administered asking the participants all questions in order of dimensions, followed by the administration of The Perceived Stress Scale (Appendix E). After the completion of all questions, the participants were provided a debriefing form (Appendix C) with explanation of the purpose of research, extra information about the subject, and contact information to the researcher and advisor. The following screen provided participants with the option of receiving the results of the study in

their campus mailbox. Lastly, one SONA credit was granted to the participants as their compensation for completing the study.

## Results

As mentioned previously the current study hypothesized a negative correlation between all 6 dimensions, and the entirety of The Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale to The Perceived Stress Scale. A correlation test was used to find the relationship between all the hypotheses below.

*Hypothesis 1: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with (D1) starting and leading change processes in groups.*

*Hypothesis 2: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with (D2) choosing effective followers and delegating responsibilities.*

*Hypothesis 3: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with (D3) building and managing interpersonal relationships within the group.*

*Hypothesis 4: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with (D4) showing self-awareness and self-confidence.*

*Hypothesis 5: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with (D5) motivating people.*

*Hypothesis 6: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with (D6) gaining consensus of group members.*

*Hypothesis 7: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with leadership self-efficacy.*

*Hypothesis 1* was not supported because dimension 1 was not significantly correlated with stress,  $r(30) = -.037$ ,  $p = .796$ . *Hypothesis 2* was supported because dimension 2 was found to be significantly negatively correlated with stress,  $r(30) = -.354$ ,  $p = .011$ . *Hypothesis 3* was supported because dimension 3 was found to be significantly negatively correlated with stress,  $r(30) = -.441$ ,  $p = .001$ . *Hypothesis 4* was not supported because dimension 4 was not significantly correlated with stress,  $r(30) = -.196$ ,  $p = .168$ . *Hypothesis 5* was not supported because dimension 5 was not significantly correlated with stress,  $r(30) = -.232$ ,  $p = .101$ . *Hypothesis 6* was not supported because dimension 6 was not significantly correlated with stress,  $r(30) = -.220$ ,  $p = .120$ . *Hypothesis 7* was found to be significantly negatively correlated with stress,  $r(30) = -.326$ ,  $p = .020$ . Overall, three out of seven hypotheses were correct, as shown in the Correlation matrix below (Table 1).

Table 1

*Correlation Matrix Between All Leadership Self-Efficacy Dimensions and Perceived Stress*

| Variables  | PS      |
|------------|---------|
| D1         | -.037   |
| D2         | -.354*  |
| D3         | -.441** |
| D4         | -.196   |
| D5         | -.232   |
| D6         | -.220   |
| Full Scale | -.326*  |

\* or \*\* represent significant  $r$  values

## Discussion

Only three out of the seven hypotheses had any correlation. Thus, assumptions were confirmed for: *Hypothesis 2: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with (D2) choosing effective followers and delegating responsibilities, Hypothesis 3: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with (D3) building and managing interpersonal relationships within the group, and Hypothesis 7: Higher perceived stress will have a negative relationship with leadership self-efficacy.* The other *Hypothesis 1, 4, 5, and 6* failed to reach any statistical significance.

The small sample size ( $n = 32$ ) could be a cause for not finding an accurate representation of the intended population; college students in a small, rural, liberal arts school. In the future, an adjustment in the number of participants from 32 to between 50-100 would be beneficial, this is because all of the correlation coefficients are negative and many approach significance with a larger sample size. Another possible hindrance that could be the cause for very few statistical significance hypotheses is the lack of questions, and different amounts of questions, in the Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale for each dimension. For example, most of the dimensions only asked the participants 3 questions, which is not enough to get an accurate representation of their leadership self-efficacy abilities; thus in the future, as mentioned before, to off-set this issue having a larger sample size could positively affect the data received. Additionally, there are differences in the amount of questions asked between some of the dimensions: D1, D3, D5, and D6 all ask three questions, while D2 asks four questions, and D4 asks 5 questions. This could be an indicator as to why D2 had statistical significance while D1 did not. Although, this does not explain why D4 was not significant and D3 had the highest statistical significance out of all dimensions including the entire scale. However, the results do point to the importance of

considering these dimensions as separate, as they seem to be differentially related to perceived stress.

### **Limitations**

To investigate the possible reason as to why some of the hypotheses had more statistical significance than others, a unidimensional reliability test was used on each of the dimensions to determine their reliability. D1 consisted of 3 items and reported an acceptable reliability rating ( $\alpha = .627$ ). D2 consisted of 4 items and reported a slightly more acceptable reliability rating ( $\alpha = .673$ ). D3 consisted of 3 items and reported the lowest reliability rating ( $\alpha = .451$ ). D4 consisted of 5 items and also reported an unacceptable reliability rating ( $\alpha = .553$ ). D5 consisted of 3 items and reported the highest reliability rating out of all the dimensions ( $\alpha = .749$ ). D6 consisted of 3 items and reported an unacceptable reliability rating of ( $\alpha = .553$ ). The reliability test did not indicate why the possibility of some dimensions with fewer questions had more statistical significance than dimensions with more questions. The speculation that the dimensions with a higher reported statistical significance would have a higher reliability rating was also misleading. For example, D3 had the highest statistical significant correlation  $r(30) = -.441$ , although it reported the lowest reliability rating ( $\alpha = .451$ ) out of all dimensions. This is a puzzling conclusion and calls for more research to be done with the Leadership Self-Efficacy scale.

## **Future Research**

Future research should be conducted investigating the constructs of leadership self-efficacy and stress affected by different types of stressors, intrinsic and extrinsic. As mentioned previously, when discussing the self-determination theory, both internal and external stressors can indicate the likelihood of an individual's motivation level and how they will perform. Although this study did use stress as both an intrinsic and extrinsic stressor (i.e. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your (intrinsic) personal problems?) and (In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations (extrinsic) in your life?) additional research could be conducted looking at the different intrinsic and extrinsic stressors within the variable of leadership self-efficacy. Additionally, making some alterations to the Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale, by adding more questions to the dimensions and having an even amount of questions, would be beneficial to the overall applicability of the individual dimensions.

Although the current study did not gain as many statistical significance results as hoped, the investigation and use of a relatively new scale, the Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale. In most previous literature the construct of 'leadership self-efficacy' was divided into two variables 'self-efficacy' and 'leadership' not the specific construct of 'leadership self-efficacy'. Therefore, the current study used the detailed construct of 'leadership self-efficacy' with an additional variable, stress. Although with the use of a relatively new scale for the construct of leadership self-efficacy, the current study was careful to pick a well established stress scale from previously established literature to act as insurance.

The above study did not have the overall results originally hypothesized; however, it was a stepping stone on the right path for a continued need for research of leadership self-efficacy

and stress. It identified that many people are currently in, have been, or will be in a leadership role at some point in their life by the variety of leadership roles listed by the participants. As demonstrated in the study, leadership self-efficacy is an important aspect of someone's ability to create impactful and positive change for the group they are leading. Similarly, stress will occur in everyone's life, thus, showing the importance of leaders being aware of their stress and learning how to manage it. There are still many questions unanswered involving leadership self-efficacy and stress that need to be addressed, the current research hopes to have answered a few of these questions and be a starting point for future research.

## Works Cited

- Ali, H. E., Schalk, R., Van Engen, M., & Van Assen, M. (2018). Leadership self-efficacy and effectiveness: The moderating influence of task complexity. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 11(4), 21-40. <https://scholar.google.com/scholar>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.
- Bobbio, A., Manganelli, A. (2009). Leadership self-efficacy scale. A new multidimensional instrument. *TPM-Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 16(1), 3-24. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285513606\\_Leadership\\_self-efficacy\\_scale](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285513606_Leadership_self-efficacy_scale)
- Caillier, J. G. (2016). Linking transformational leadership to self-efficacy, extra-role behaviors, and turnover intentions in public agencies: the mediating role of goal clarity. *Administration & Society*, 48(7), 883-906. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399713519093>
- Cho, Y., Harrist, S., Steele, M., & Murn, L.T. (2015). College student motivation to lead in relation to basic psychological need satisfaction and leadership self-efficacy. *Journal of College Student Development* 56(1), 32-44. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2015.0005>.
- Cohen, S., Kamarch, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24(4), 385. <https://www.das.nh.gov/wellness/docs/percieved%20stress%20scale.pdf>
- Cooper, J. (2004). Leadership effectiveness. In *Encyclopedia of leadership* (Vol. 4, pp. 845-853). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://doi.org/10.4135/978141295239>

- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on students outcomes: how successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221-258.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863>
- Dugan, J. P., Garland, J. L., Jacoby, B., & Gasiorski, A. (2008). Understanding commuter student self-efficacy for leadership: a within-group analysis. *NASPA Journal*, 45(2), 282–310.  
<https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1951>
- Grocke-Dewey, M., Brennan, A., Freeman, B., Weas, H., Gutheil, J., Stallones, L., & McMoran, D. (2023). Perceived stress, stressors, and preferred stress management strategies among western agricultural producers. *Journal of Rural Mental Health*, 47(3), 152-162.  
[10.1037/rmh0000233](https://doi.org/10.1037/rmh0000233)
- Guan, Y., Wang, Y., Zhang, J., & Cao, Y. (2023). Overcome social anxiety disorder and develop visionary leadership in uncertain environments: The important role of psychological resilience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1106993>
- Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Chan, A. (2012). Leader self and means efficacy: A multi-component approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118(2), 143–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.03.007>
- Harms, P. D., Credé, M., Tynan, M., Leon, M., & Jeung, W. (2017). Leadership and stress: A Meta-Analytic Review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 178–194.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.006>
- Jong-Im, K. (2018). The effects of self-leadership, emotional intelligence, and academic self-efficacy on adjustment to college life of nursing college students. *Journal of the*

- Korea Academia-Industrial Cooperation Society*, 19(5).  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5762/KAIS.2018.19.5.253>
- Lee, E.-H. (2012). Review of the psychometric evidence of the perceived stress scale. *Asian Nursing Research*, 6(4), 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2012.08.004>
- Peiró, J. M., & Rodríguez, I. (2008). Work Stress, Leadership and Organizational Health. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 29(1), 68-82.  
<https://www2.papelesdelpsicologo.es/English/1540.pdf>
- Rodriguez, R. M., Medak, A. J., Baumann, B. M., Lim, S., Chinnock, B., Frazier, R., & Cooper, R. J. (2020). Academic emergency medicine physicians' anxiety levels, stressors, and potential stress mitigation measures during the acceleration phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 27(8), 700-707. [10.1111/acem.14065](https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.14065)
- Travis, J., Kaszycki, A., Geden, M., & Bunde, J. (2020). Some stress is good stress: The challenge-hindrance framework, academic self-efficacy, and academic outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(8), 1632-1643. [10.1037/edu0000478](https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000478)
- Wu, H., Qiu, S., Dooley, L. M., & Ma, C. (2019). The relationship between challenge and hindrance stressors and emotional exhaustion: the moderating role of perceived servant leadership. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(1), 282. [10.3390/ijerph17010282](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17010282)
- Yang, C., Li, D., Yang, Y., Hu, Y., & Zhang, L. (2023). Investigation of the status of depression and anxiety among leaders and staff in pharmacy intravenous admixture services in China. *Medicine*, 102(34). <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000034661>

## Appendices

(Appendix A)

### Informed Consent Form

What is the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and stress?

Allegheny College  
Department of Psychology

**Purpose of Research:** I aim to investigate the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and stress in undergraduate college students at a small U.S. liberal arts college. I hope to have approximately 30 participants complete an online correlational design study. I will be using The Leadership Self-Efficacy scale, which identifies six constructs within, and the Perceived Stress Scale to investigate this relationship. I hypothesize a negative relationship between each construct of leadership self-efficacy and stress. I will use Pearson's  $r$  to find each of the correlations. I understand that the expected results will have some limitations due to the lack of diversity at small schools.

**Method/Procedure:** I understand that I will be asked to answer a demographic questionnaire, answer a fill in the blank question, and honestly answer any remaining questions. I understand the study will end with a debrief explaining the study and an opportunity to receive the results when completed.

**Length of Participation:** I understand that the questionnaires will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

**Risks to the Individual:** I understand that there will be no more risk other than what is normally experienced in everyday life.

**Benefits of the Research:** I understand that this research will add to the literature on leadership self-efficacy and stress and explore a population that has never been studied before, a small rural liberal arts college.

**Compensation:** I understand that I may receive 1 SONA credit for the completion of this study.

**Confidentiality, Recording Information, and Data Security:** I understand that all the data will be collected through Survey Monkey anonymously. All the demographic information collected from participants will remain anonymous. All the information collected on Survey Monkey will be deleted a year after the completion of the comp.

**Voluntary Nature of Participation:** I understand that I do NOT have to participate in this research project. Furthermore, I may choose to withdraw my participation at any time without penalty. I understand that I may skip any individual questions that I do not wish to answer, and I may choose not to participate in any part of the study without being questioned.

**Results of Research Project:** I understand that I am entitled to a copy of the results once this study is completed through my campus mailbox.

**Contact Information:** If I have any questions about this research project, I can contact Lydia Sleeman at [sleeman01@allegheny.edu](mailto:sleeman01@allegheny.edu) or the research advisor, Dr. Ryan Pickering at [rpickering@allegheny.edu](mailto:rpickering@allegheny.edu). If I have questions or concerns about the treatment of research participants in this IRB-approved project, I can contact the Chair of the Allegheny Institutional Review Board (IRB) at [IRB@allegheny.edu](mailto:IRB@allegheny.edu).

I understand by clicking the button below that I am at least 18 years or older at the time of my participation in this study, and that I have read the above informed consent form. I have carefully read and understood the information on this form and all of my questions thus far have been answered.

I agree to participate in the study. ☐

(Appendix B)

### **Questions I Asked the Participants**

#### **Demographic Questionnaire**

Please list your age. \_\_\_\_\_

Please list your gender. \_\_\_\_\_

Please list your graduation year. \_\_\_\_\_

Please list your major/minor combination. \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Fill in the Blank Question**

What leadership position have you spent the most time serving in? \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Asking the participants to consider the following**

There will be a statement asking the participants to please consider the leadership position they listed when answering the following questions.

(Appendix C)

### Research Participation Debriefing Form

What is the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and stress?

Allegheny College

DEBRIEFING

Department of Psychology

**Purpose of Research:** This study hoped to gain valuable information about the relationship between each of the six constructs of leadership self-efficacy and stress and the overall relationship between the two variables in a population that has yet to be researched. I hope to gain valuable information about these two variables to help those in leadership positions manage stress better and have a better life overall. I hypothesize that there will be a negative correlation between each of the constructs of leadership self-efficacy and stress and the overall relationship between the two variables. I hypothesize these results because I believe that as the self-efficacy of an individual's leadership abilities rises the lower the individual's stress will become.

**Compensation:** Some students may receive extra credit from their professors for their participation if the course allows it. Participants are credited 1 SONA credits for completing this study.

**Confidentiality:** The data you provided for this research project will be confidential and your name will never be associated with your results. Furthermore, when your data is no longer needed, it will be deleted.

**To Learn More:** For further information about this topic, please consult the following sources:

-Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.

-Travis, J., Kaszycki, A., Geden, M., & Bunde, J. (2020). Some stress is good stress: The challenge-hindrane framework, academic self-efficacy, and academic outcomes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 112(8), 1632-1643. [10.1037/edu0000478](https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000478)

**Contact Information:** If you have any questions about this research project, please consult the information below:

Experimenter: Lydia Sleeman E-mail: [sleeman01@allegheny.edu](mailto:sleeman01@allegheny.edu)

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Ryan Pickering E-mail: [rpickering@allegheny.edu](mailto:rpickering@allegheny.edu)

IRB Committee Chair: Dr. Amelia Finaret E-mail: [afinaret@allegheny.edu](mailto:afinaret@allegheny.edu)

Counseling Center (Schultz Hall, Winslow Health Center) - [wellness@allegheny.edu](mailto:wellness@allegheny.edu) or calling 814-332-2782

---

**Separate Survey**

If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study when finished, fill in your campus mailbox number below.

Box # \_\_\_\_\_

(Appendix D)

**Items of the Leadership Self-Efficacy Scale**

(The responses are on a likert scale from 0-4. 1= *never*, 2= *almost never*, 3= *sometimes*, 4= *fairly often*, to 5= *very often*.)

| Dimensions                                                       | Items                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Starting and leading change processes in groups.              | <p>1. I am able to set a new direction for a group, if the one currently taken doesn't seem correct to me</p> <p>2. I can usually change the attitudes and behaviors of group members if they don't meet group objectives</p> <p>3. I am able to change things in a group even if they are not completely under my control.</p> |
| 2. Choosing effective followers and delegating responsibilities. | <p>4. I am confident in my ability to choose group members in order to build up an effective and efficient team.</p> <p>5. I am able to optimally share out the work between the members of a group to get the best results.</p> <p>6. I would be able to delegate the task of accomplishing specific goals to other</p>        |

|                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                        | <p>group members.</p> <p>7. I am usually able to understand to whom, within a group, it is better to delegate specific tasks.</p>                                                                                                                                         |
| 3. Building and managing interpersonal relationships within the group. | <p>8. Usually, I can establish very good relationships with the people I work with.</p> <p>9. I am sure I can communicate with others, going straight to the heart of the matter.</p> <p>10. I can successfully manage relationships with all the members of a group.</p> |
| 4. Showing self-awareness and self-confidence.                         | <p>11. I can identify my strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>12. I am confident in my ability to get things done.</p> <p>13. I always know how to get the best out of the situations I find myself in.</p> <p>14. With my experience and competence I</p>                    |

|                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                        | <p>can help group members to reach the group's targets.</p> <p>15. As a leader, I am usually able to affirm my beliefs and values.</p>                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 5. Motivating people.                  | <p>16. With my example, I am sure I can motivate the members of a group.</p> <p>17. I can usually motivate group members and arouse their enthusiasm when I start a new project.</p> <p>18. I am able to motivate and give opportunities to any group member in the exercise of his/her tasks or functions.</p> |
| 6. Gaining consensus of group members. | <p>19. I can usually make the people I work with appreciate me.</p> <p>20. I am sure I can gain the consensus of group members.</p> <p>21. I can usually lead a group with the consensus of all members.</p>                                                                                                    |

## (Appendix E)

**Items for the Perceived Stress Scale**

(The responses will be on a likert scale ranging from meaning 0-4: 0= *never*, 1= *rarely*, 2= *sometimes*, 3= *usually*, and 4= *always*)

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and stressed?

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?

\_\_\_\_\_ 5. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?

\_\_\_\_\_ 6. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?

\_\_\_\_\_ 7. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?

\_\_\_\_\_ 8. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?

\_\_\_\_\_ 9. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?

\_\_\_\_\_ 10. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?