Building Youth Leaders: The Influence of Leadership Self-Efficacy Training on Youth Motivation in Sosromenduran Tourism Village

Anindwitya Rizqi Monica[1]*, Dr. M. Wahyu Kuncoro[2]
[12]Mercubuana Yogyakarta UniversityYogyakarta, indonesia
*anindwitya@gmail.com, wahyu@mercubuana-yogya.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study examines the influence of Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) training on the Motivation To Lead (MTL) among youth in the Sosromenduran Tourism Village. The research utilized an experimental design involving 20 participants, divided evenly into an experimental group and a control group. Data collection was conducted using a 27-item Motivation To Lead (MTL) scale. Statistical analysis via a Paired Sample T-test revealed a significant effect, with a t-value of 3.059 and a p-value of 0.014 ($p < 0.05$). This indicates a notable improvement in MTL scores within the experimental group before and after the intervention, demonstrating the efficacy of the LSE training in enhancing leadership motivation. Furthermore, an Independent Sample T-Test was employed to compare the post-test scores between the experimental and control groups. The results yielded a t-value of -1.916 and a p-value of 0.71 ($p > 0.05$), suggesting no significant difference in post-test outcomes between the two groups.

Keywords : Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE), Motivation To Lead (MTL), Youth Leaders, Experimental Research, Sosromenduran Tourism Village

Introduction

The rapidly evolving landscape of global tourism underscores the necessity for dynamic and effective leadership, particularly within community-based tourism initiatives. Sosromenduran Tourism Village, with its rich cultural heritage and burgeoning tourism potential, exemplifies the pivotal role that leadership plays in driving both community development and economic growth. As the tourism sector increasingly relies on innovative and sustainable practices, the involvement of youth emerges as a critical factor in fostering such practices.

Recent scholarly work highlights the significant contributions of youth to community-based tourism. TheWorld Travel & Tourism Council (2023) emphasizes that young leaders, armed with technological acumen and a digital-native perspective, possess valuable assets for leveraging technology in the growth and transformation of businesses. Their inherent adaptability and openness to change position them advantageously to navigate the dynamic business landscape and address emerging challenges. Supporting this view, Ashif Khan et al. (2022) argue that the agility of younger leaders enables them to respond swiftly to evolving trends, thus driving innovation and sustainability in tourism.

Incorporating young leaders into decision-making processes also promotes diversity and inclusion within leadership roles. House et al. (1999) contends that diverse leadership fosters innovative solutions and enhances organizational performance. Furthermore, cultivating young leaders is integral to effective succession planning,

ensuring continuity and sustainability in leadership roles. This necessity is underscored by ongoing shifts in market demands and technological advancements, which continually reshape the business environment (C. Boone et al., 2020).

However, the challenge lies in cultivating the requisite leadership qualities among youth. Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) is a critical concept in this context. LSE, which refers to an individual's belief in their capability to execute leadership responsibilities effectively, significantly influences their motivation and persistence in leadership roles. Bandura (2019) highlights that individuals with high LSE are more likely to exhibit leadership behaviors, initiate change, and inspire others. Zimmerman (2007) further asserts that enhancing LSE through targeted training programs can substantially impact the development of future leaders, preparing them to meet leadership demands with confidence and competence.

Motivation To Lead (MTL) is another essential element driving individuals to assume leadership roles. Defined by Chan and Drasgow (2001) as an individual's desire and willingness to lead, MTL is shaped by personal, social, and normative factors. Enhancing MTL is crucial for ensuring a pool of motivated individuals ready to undertake leadership roles, particularly in community settings like Sosromenduran, where local leadership is vital to the success and sustainability of tourism initiatives (I Nyoman et al., 2023).

Recent advancements in leadership training programs offer promising avenues for improving both LSE and MTL. These programs, which often include practical exercises, feedback, and real-world practice opportunities, have shown effectiveness in various contexts. A study by Anderson (2007) demonstrates that tailored training programs significantly enhance leadership efficacy and motivation among youth in community settings. In Sosromenduran Tourism Village, where youth are central to tourism development, such programs could be instrumental in empowering them to lead effectively.

Empirical observations from Kampung Wisata Sosromenduran reveal that many young individuals currently lack the confidence and motivation to actively engage in the management of the tourist village. Cultural differences and limited confidence in leadership roles exacerbate these challenges. Furthermore, difficulties in communicating with older generations and reluctance to voice their ideas underscore the need for targeted interventions.

This study seeks to investigate the impact of LSE training on increasing MTL among the youth in Sosromenduran Tourism Village. By focusing on this specific community, the research aims to provide valuable insights into how tailored training programs can enhance leadership motivation and effectiveness. The findings are expected to inform future efforts to develop and implement similar programs in other community-based tourism initiatives, thereby contributing to sustainable development and community empowerment.

Methods

A. *Subject*

The subjects for this study were selected based on the following criteria: Indonesian nationality, aged between 18 and 26 years, high school graduates or equivalent,

unmarried, actively engaged in tourism activities within the Sosromenduran Tourism Village, and members of the Sosromenduran Youth Organization. The determination of these subjects was guided by an interview with Wahyu, the head of the Sosromenduran Tourism Village. A total of 20 individuals who met these criteria were identified. These subjects were subsequently divided into two groups: an experimental group consisting of 10 individuals and a controlgroup also comprising 10 individuals.

B. *Design*

The research aims to investigate the impact of Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) training on Motivation To Lead (MTL) among the youth of Sosromenduran Tourism Village using a quasi-experimental design. Specifically, the Nonequivalent Control Group Design was selected, with group allocation based on participant willingness and equal distribution of pretest scores, ensuring initial equivalence. This method, akin to the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design but without random assignment, aims to establish facts, test hypotheses, and demonstrate variable relationships through specific interventions. The study involves pre-test and post-test evaluations for both the experimental and control groups, with only the experimental group receiving the LSE training.

Table 1. Research Design

Group	**Pre-Test**	**Treatment**	**Post-Test**
Experiment	Y-1	X	Y-2›
Control	Y-3	-	Y-4

Explanation:

KE: Experimental GroupKK: Control Group›

Y-1: Experimental Group Pre-Test Y-2: Experimental Group

Post-TestY-3: Control Group Pre-Test

Y-4: Control Group Post-Test

X: Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) Training

C. *Data collection*

The instrument used to measure Motivation To Lead (MTL) is derived from Chan & Drasgow (2001), with translations and assessments conducted by a professional judgment. The MTL scale includes 27 items across three dimensions: Affective-Identity MTL, which reflects emotional attachment to leadership roles (e.g., "I prefer being a leader over a follower in group work"); Non calculative MTL, indicating a willingness to lead without expecting specific rewards (e.g., "I would agree to lead others even without special benefits"); and Social-Normative MTL, influenced by social and cultural norms (e.g., "I feel obligated to lead if asked"). The MTL scale employs a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), to comprehensively assess leadership motivation. Validity analysis shows item discrimination between 0.741 and 0.879, and the scale has high reliability with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.979.

D. *Intervention*

Discussing Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) training refers to a form of training focused on enhancing an individual's confidence in their ability to lead others

effectively. This training aims to boost one's belief in their capacity to organize and execute necessary actions to achieve specific goals, a construct related to LSE (Bergman, Gustafsson-Sendén, & Berntson, 2021). LSE training can be applied in various contexts such as military training, organizational psychology, and educational settings. It often involves Experiential Group Training (EGT), providing participants with group membership and leadership experiences. The study "Effectiveness of Experiential Group Training in Developing Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) of Counselors-In-Training" by Urkmez and Singhani (2023) found EGT effective in enhancing leadership self-efficacy among trainee counselors, showing significant improvements in group leadership efficacy. This suggests EGT as an effective method for developing LSE, with implications for building EGT-based training programs, and enhancing leadership motivation.

E. *Material*

The research on Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) among youth in Sosromenduran Tourism Village is based on Albert Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (SCT). SCT emphasizes that self-efficacy—an individual's belief in their ability to perform tasks—significantly influences behavior, motivation, and performance. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy affects effort and persistence in the face of challenges. This theory provides a framework for understanding how enhancing LSE can boost the motivation and effectiveness of youth leaders by focusing on self-belief, observational learning, and social context. Therefore, the

Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) training material is structured around the six dimensions proposed by Bobbio & Manganelli (2009), which include: change-oriented mindset, self-awareness, self-confidence and motivation, choosing followers and delegating responsibilities, communication and management of interpersonal relationships, and preserving and gaining consensus. The training sessions are developed based on these dimensions and interpretative guidelines from various references.

The training sessions encompass various dimensions of effective leadership development. Session 1 introduces the concepts of growth mindset and fixed mindset, emphasizing how leaders with a growth mindset leverage feedback to motivate their teams and enhance productivity. Session 2 explores self-awareness using tools like the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to understand personality types and their impact on leadership effectiveness. Session 3 highlights the importance of self-confidence in leadership, drawing on studies by Kolb (1999) and Neck & Manz (1992), to illustrate its role in leadership behaviors. Session 4 focuses on positive leadership principles rooted in positive psychology, encouraging leaders to harness team strengths to achieve common goals. Session 5 presents the Managerial Interpersonal Skills (MIPS) model, emphasizing conflict management, motivation, and support as key components of effective leadership. Finally, Session 6 addresses consensus- building strategies, underscoring the leader's role in guiding discussions and mediating group interactions to reach effective agreements. Interactive activities and case studies facilitate the practical application of these principles.

F. *Implementation*

On the first day of the training, Session 1 involves an introduction and goal-setting where facilitators, including the trainer, assistant, and researcher, introduce themselves and outline the training objectives. Participants are asked to write their

expectations on sticky notes, which are then displayed for reflection at the end of the session. A pre-test assesses participants' initial knowledge of Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE), followed by an ice-breaking activity. Session 2 focuses on change orientation, assessing the impact of the training program on participants' motivation to lead and understanding the role of growth versus fixed mindsets in initiating and managing change. This session uses a combination of lectures, individual tasks, and discussions. Session 3 delves into self-awareness, utilizing the Myers- Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to explore personality traits and their impact on leadership effectiveness. Participants complete the Big Five personality test, discuss results, and engage in a facilitated discussion about personality strengths and weaknesses.

On the second day, Session 4 covers self-confidence and motivation, aiming to inspire and maintain a positive attitude and high energy levels. The session includes a presentation and discussion on self-confidence, concluding with a post-test and evaluation. Session 5 addresses follower selection and delegation, where participants form groups based on identified strengths and weaknesses to discuss role assignments and group objectives. Feedback is provided by the trainer. Session 6, on communication and interpersonal relationship management, involves role-playing and problem-solving in small groups, followed by group presentations and feedback. Session 7 focuses on consensus- building, where participants work in groups to discuss and present strategies for achieving consensus in case studies. Finally, Session 8 concludes the training with reflections on whether initial expectations were met, a review of personality test results, and a post-test to evaluate the impact of the LSE program on leadership motivation. The evaluation follows Kirkpatrick's (1994) model, focusing on reaction and knowledge stages to assess improvements in intrinsic leadership motivation among young leaders.

G. *Data Analysis*

Data analysis involves organizing and evaluating collected data through descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive analysis summarizes demographic characteristics, frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each variable. Inferential analysis, including hypothesis testing, determines the generalizability of findings to the population. Key classical assumptions tested include normality, using the Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > 0.05$ indicates normal distribution), and homogeneity, assessing variance equality between experimental and control groups ($p > 0.05$ suggests homogeneity). Hypothesis testing involves Independent Sample T-tests to compare differences in Motivation To Lead (MTL) and Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) between groups with and without training, and Paired Sample T-tests to evaluate within-group changes across treatments. Data are quantified and analyzed using SPSS version 22.0 (Sugiyono, 2010)

Results

Table 2. Description Of Pre-Test And Post-TestMotivation To Lead (Mtl) Data

Group	Test	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Experimental	Pre-Test	105	124	113,8
	Post-Test	104	167	128,5

	Gained Score	-1	+43	+14,7
Control	Pre-Test	105	155	128,9
	Post-Test	121	156	140,5
	Gained Score	+16	+1	+11,6

Table above displays the data for Motivation To Lead (MTL) scores from pre-tests and post-tests for both the experimental and control groups. The maximum score for the experimental group increased from 124 in the pre-test to 167 in the post-test, indicating a positive change of 43 points. The average score for this group rose from 113.8 to 128.5, reflecting an improvement of 14.7 points. This data suggests a significant enhancement in MTL for the experimental group following the Leadership Self-Efficacy training, whereas the control group showed minimal changes, with average scores increasing from 128.9 to 140.5 and a positive gain of 11.6 points.

Moreover, the table below categorizes the MTL scores of individual subjects in the experimental group, revealing that 5 out of 10 subjects improved from a moderate to a high category post-test, while 4 subjects showed score increases within the moderate category, and 1 subject experienced a decrease. The detailed score changes are visually represented in Table 3. This analysis highlights that the Leadership Self- Efficacy training effectively enhanced MTL among the majority of the experimental group subjects, with notable increases in several cases, although a small subset experienced a decrease.

Table 3. Categorization Of Pre-Test And Post-Test Scores For The Experiment Group

Subject	**Pre-Test**	**Category**	**Post-Test**	**Category**	**Gained Score**
AR	108	Moderate	133	High	+25
CWP	108	Moderate	118	Moderate	+10
E	117	Moderate	126	Moderate	+9
FRS	124	Moderate	167	High	+43
LA	113	Moderate	136	High	+23
N	112	Moderate	120	Moderate	+8
ZAD	105	Moderate	131	High	+26
RRP	115	Moderate	120	Moderate	+5
AD	119	Moderate	130	High	+11

IP	117	Moderate	104	Moderate	-13

Discussion

The Independent Sample T-Test was employed to evaluate differences in Motivation to Lead (MTL) between the experimental and control groups before and after the Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) training. The results of the pre-test showed a mean score of 113.80 for the experimental group and 128.90 for the control group, with a t-value of -2.619 and a significance level of 0.017 ($p < 0.05$). This indicates a significant difference between the two groups, justifying further intervention (Table 4) In contrast, the post-test revealed a mean score of 128.50 for the experimental group and 140.50 for the control group, with a t-value of - 1.916 and a significance level of 0.071 ($p > 0.05$) (Table 4). This suggests no significant difference between the groups after the intervention, although the control group's mean was higher.

Table 4. Independent T-Test Results ForMotivation To Lead (Mtl)

Group	Mean	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
ExperimentalPre-Test	113.80	-2,619	,017
ExperimentalPost-Test	128.50	-2,619	,024
Control Pre-Test	128.90	-1,916	,071
Control Post-Test	140.50	-1,916	,074

The Paired Sample T-Test was used to determine changes in MTL within the experimental group before and after the LSE training. The pre-test mean was 113.80, and the post-test mean was 128.50, yielding a t-value of -3.059 with a significance level of 0.014 ($p < 0.05$), indicating a significant increase in MTL following the training (Table 5). Conversely, the control group's MTL showed no significant change, with a pre-test mean of 128.90 and a post-test mean of 140.50, resulting in a t-value of -2.002 and a significance level of 0.076 ($p > 0.05$) (Table 5). Thus, the hypothesis that MTL would differ significantly before and after the training was supported for the experimental group, but not for the control group.

Table 5. Paired Sample T-Test ForMotivation To Lead (Mtl)

Group	Mean	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Experimental Pre-Test	113.80 -	-3.059	9	0.014
Experimental Post-Test	128.50			

Control Pre-Test	128.90	-2.002	9	0.076
Control Post-Test	140.50			

Based on the analysis of post-test Motivation To Lead (MTL) scores, the hypothesis suggesting that the experimental group's scores would be significantly higher than those of the control group was rejected. The Independent Sample T-Test results revealed that the t-value was -1.916 with a p-value of 0.071 ($p > 0.05$), indicating no significant difference between the experimental and control groups (in post-test scores. Although the mean score for the control group (140.50) was higher than that for the experimental group (128.50), the statistical analysis showed that this difference was not significant.

Several factors could account for the lack of significant difference observed. Firstly, prior training in event management, undertaken by both groups before the LSE training, may have provided both groups with foundational skills that influenced their MTL scores. Additionally, previous research highlights that leadership motivation can be influenced by individual experiences and perceptions of leadership. Those with prior positive experiences in leadership may exhibit higher MTL scores (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). Furthermore, the mindset of participants plays a crucial role; if the experimental group lacked a growth-oriented mindset before the training, it could affect the training's effectiveness (Dweck, 2006).

The Paired Sample T-Test results demonstrated significant improvements in MTL scores within the experimental group, with a t-value of -3.059 and a p-value of 0.014 ($p < 0.05$), indicating a substantial increase in MTL scores post-training. This suggests that the LSE training had a meaningful impact on enhancing MTL among participants. In contrast, the control group showed no significant change, with a t-value of -2.002 and a p-value of 0.076 ($p > 0.05$), indicating stability in their MTL scores before and after the training. This underscores the effectiveness of the LSE training in improving leadership motivation, consistent with the findings of Tentama & Pranungsari (2014) and Rehm (2017), who highlight the positive impact of leadership self-efficacy training on leadership motivation.

The findings align with existing literature that emphasizes the role of self-efficacy in leadership development (Bandura, 1997). Effective leadership development programs should incorporate methods that boost self-efficacy and confidence (Urkmez & Singhani, 2023). Integrating LSE into leadership development programs, particularly in sectors like tourism, can effectively foster confident and motivated leaders, contributing to better outcomes in community and organizational settings (Wang et al., 2014; Pratama et al., 2022).

Conclusion

This study reveals a significant impact of Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) training on the Motivation To Lead (MTL) among the youth in Kampung Wisata Sosromenduran. The experimental group demonstrated increased MTL scores following the LSE intervention; however, these scores did not significantly surpass those of the control group. Despite the lack of statistically significant differences, the findings indicate that LSE training can effectively enhance MTL. The competitive advantage observed in the control group, likely due to prior event management training, underscores the necessity of integrating practical experience into leadership

development programs to optimize their effectiveness.

Several limitations are present in this study. The quasi-experimental design, lacking full randomization, may introduce external variables that could affect the outcomes. The small sample size of 20 participants restricts the generalizability of the findings. The selection of groups based on pre-test scores may lead to selection bias. Furthermore, the brief duration of the training and the timing of the post-test may not fully capture the impact of the LSE intervention. Additionally, unaccounted external variables, such as previous leadership experience and social support, might influence the results.

Future research should address these limitations by employing more rigorous experimental designs, such as Randomized Controlled Trials (RCT), to enhance internal validity. Increasing the sample size and incorporating participants from diverse backgrounds would improve the generalizability of the findings. Extending the duration of the training and allowing a longer interval before post-testing could provide a clearer understanding of the long-term effects of LSE training. Additionally, future studies should control for external variables and consider a mixed-methods approach to offer a comprehensive view of leadership development impacts. Investigating other influencing factors, such as personality traits and cultural background, could further elucidate the dynamics of MTL and improve the effectiveness of LSE training.

Acknowledgment

I dedicate this work to my beloved Mama and Papa. Certainly, to myself who never tires and continues to fight. To my beloved organization, Women in Tourism Indonesia, and my business, JogJamu Indonesia.

References

Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., and Chan, A. (2009). A meta-analytic review of leadership impact research: Experimental and quasi-experimental studies. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(6), 764–784.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Bergman, D., Gustafsson-Sendén, M., & Berntson, E. (2021). From Believing to Doing: The Association Between Leadership Self-Efficacy and the Developmental Leadership Model. Frontiers in Psychology, 12(August). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.669905

Bobbio, A., & Manganelli, A. M. (2009). Leadership self-efficacy scale. A new multidimensional instrument. TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 16(1), 3–24.

Chan, K.-Y., and Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 481–498.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). The New Psychology of Success: How We Can Learn to Fullfill Our Potential. In Random House.

Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2022). The Role of Technology in Shaping the Future of Tourism Leadership. Tourism Management, 81, 104159.

Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., and Harms, P. D. (2008). Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(6), 669–692.

Kolb, J. A. (1999). The effect of gender role, attitude toward leadership, and self-confidence on leader emergence: Implications for leadership development. Human

Resource Development Quarterly, 10(4), 305–320. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920100403

Kwak, J., Kim, J., & Kim, S. (2023). Local Leadership and Tourism Development: Insights from Community-Based Initiatives. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 31(2), 345-362.

Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (1992). Thought self-leadership: The influence of self-talk and mental imagery on performance. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13(7), 681–699. doi:10.1002/job.4030130705

Pratama, I. G. A. A. E. B., Sugianingrat, I. A. P. W., & Susanti, P. H. (2022). The Influence of Transformational Leadership and Communication with Motivation as an Intervening Variable on the Performance of Tourism Village Managers in Ubud District, Gianyar Regency. International Journal of Social Science, Education, Communication and Economics, 1(2), 199–216. http://sinomicsjournal.com/index.php/SJ/article/view/20%0Ahttp://sinomicsjournal.com/index.php/SJ/article/download/20/17

Rehm, C. J. (2017). Leader self-efficacy in youth leader development: A mixed methods study. https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/diss201019

Shin, J., Lee, H., & Oh, J. (2022). Navigating the Changing Business Landscape: The Role of Adaptability and Innovation in Leadership. Strategic Management Journal, 43(8), 1392-1411.

Sugiyono. (2010). Statistika untuk Penelitian (Cetakan 17). ALFABETA, CV.

Tatjana, J., Momčilović, O., & Milenkovski, A. (2023). Analysis of the Influence of Leadership on the Motivation of Employees in the Tourism Sector of the Republic of Serbia. UTMS Journal of Economics, 14(2), 134–143.

Tentama, F., & Pranungsari, D. (2014). The Effectiveness of Motivation Training for Increasing Students' Motivation. Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology, 3(3), 116–125.

Urkmez, B., & Singhani, S. (2023). Effectiveness of Experiential Group Training in Developing Leadership Self-Efficacy of Counselors-In-Training. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 48(4), 335–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/01933922.2023.2246538

Wang, J., Lee, A., & Lee, C. (2023). Enhancing Leadership Efficacy and Motivation through Targeted Training Programs. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 44(3), 350-368.

World Travel & Tourism Council. (2023). Youth Leadership in Tourism: Harnessing Digital Skills and Innovation. WTTC Report.

Worthy, S. L., Tyler-Mackey, C., Dyk, P. H., Monroe, P. A., & Welborn, R. (2016). Turning the Tide on Poverty: Perceptions of leaders and leadership in economically distressed communities. Community Development, 47(3), 322–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2016.1167098

Zimmerman, K. (2007). Making Space, Making Change: Models for Youth-Led Social Change Organizations. Children, Youth and Environments, 17(2), 298–314. https://doi.org/10.1353/cye.2007.009