THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INCENTIVES, VIEWS ON LEADERSHIP AND SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS, AND ASSOCIATED IMPACTS REGARDING A UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

David Nii O. Tackie ✉

College of Agriculture, Environment and Nutrition Sciences

Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL 36088, USA

dtackie@tuskegee.edu

Henry J. Findlay

Professor Emeritus

Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL 36088, USA

Joe B. Jimmeh

College of Arts and Sciences

Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL 36088, USA

Nora Gogo-Kumi

College of Agriculture, Environment and Nutrition Sciences

Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL 36088, USA

Abstract

University students' leadership training programs have different dimensions, and they may be impacted by several factors. Yet, relatively few studies have been conducted on this issue. This study, therefore, examined the relationships and impacts of specific factors regarding a university students' leadership training program. Data were collected using a questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics, including correlation, and regression analysis. Considering

the study participants, there were more females than males; more sophomores relative to other class classifications, and more participants intended to hold a college leadership position than otherwise. Furthermore, on the views on leadership, a very high proportion of the participants strongly disagreed or disagreed that leadership in an organization or a community is over-hyped (View 1), and an even higher proportion of participants strongly agreed or agreed that leadership in an organization or a community is needed depending on the type of entity (View 2). The regression results revealed that for model 1, gender, age, and incentive classification had statistically significant effects on View 1, and for model 2, none of the factors had a statistically significant effect on View 2. However, a revised version of model 2 showed that incentive classification was statistically significant. It may be that gender, age, and incentive classification are important factors in students' views on leadership.

Keywords: Incentives, Leadership Training Program, Socioeconomic Factors, University Students, Views on Leadership

INTRODUCTION

Training programs are needed in almost every organization. Such training programs allow beneficiaries to learn something new and/or acquire new skills. In the same vein, training programs are also necessary for university students. The reason is that these programs allow them to learn things outside normal instruction periods. One set of such programs is leadership training programs. University leadership training programs are important and have their uniqueness. Sometimes, to get students to participate in such programs they are given incentives; incentives are one set of factors. However, other factors may also be important in facilitating such programs. Both sets of factors may have relationships with socioeconomic factors. Several studies have indicated the necessity or benefits of incentives and other factors in training programs.

For instance, Collins et al. (2008) argued that students become interested and participate in out-of-school programs because of incentives. It stands to reason that incentives are important because they enhance participation. According to the authors, incentives are "things" used to motivate and/or reward students to participate in out-of-school programs" (p. 1). They explained that incentives could be provided as activities or rewards and indicated that incentives have three main benefits: promote attendance, provide a sense of belonging, and facilitate academic achievement. They mentioned examples of incentives, such as financial incentives, food, prizes, and special field trips. Koffarnus et al. (2013) also emphasized that monetary incentives promote positive health-related behaviors. They stated, for example, that

monetary incentives have promoted abstinence from alcohol and other drugs, medication adherence, weight loss, and use of preventive dental care. Relatedly, Seegars (n. d.) made a case for training incentives because they improve training participation. Seegars also argued that though many potential participants know that training will help them, they usually have little motivation to attend such training. Seegars' thesis is that providing incentives gives potential participants extra motivation to participate in the training. The author further cautioned that the incentives should be what the participants want or need to avoid them losing interest in the training.

What is more, for other factors that affect training, FutureLearn (n. d.), for example, stressed the factors that affect training effectiveness. These were the identification of training needs; individual differences (such as learning styles or cognitive ability); before and after interviews and discussions to explain why the training; and allowing for active participation and creative interchange to enhance learning. Also, ShiftLearning (n. d.) argued that oftentimes trainees are not able to apply new skills in the workplace, which hurts their organizations in the long run. In other words, training for training's sake is not as important as the application of what is learned. Kudus et al. (2023) emphasized that training and development programs are essential for improving participant performance, motivation, and job satisfaction. They further stressed that training and development help reduce gaps in knowledge and skills deficiencies. Furthermore, Ibrahim et al. (2020) argued that hands-on training to hone in knowledge, skills, and competencies of participants is needed for them to perform their work well, or with efficiency. Similarly, leadership training programs on university campuses need to be well-thought-out to enhance participation. One of the things to be considered is incentives, and another is how other factors affect leadership training programs. However, relatively few studies have been done in this regard.

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to examine the relationships between incentives, views on leadership and socioeconomic factors, and associated impacts regarding a university students' leadership training program. The objectives are to: (1) describe socioeconomic and other factors; (2) assess the relationships between incentives and socioeconomic factors; (3) assess the relationships between views on leadership and socioeconomic factors, and (4) ascertain if selected factors influence views on leadership.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review describes studies that assess incentives and other factors associated with training programs. They are discussed sequentially; first, incentives or incentive-related strategy, and second, other factors. For example, Koffarnus et al. (2013)

investigated the effects of monetary incentives to reinforce engagement and achievement in job-skills training programs for homeless and unemployed adults. There were three groups: "no-reinforcement group", with access to training but no incentives; "reinforcement group", with receipt of incentives based on attendance and performance; and "abstinence and training reinforcement group", with receipt of incentives based on attendance and performance. That is, for the latter group, there was an additional condition of abstinence from alcohol to have access to training. They reported that the "abstinence and training reinforcement" participants were more compliant and attended more hours of training than the "no reinforcement" participants. The authors surmised that the monetary incentives enhanced engagement and achievement in the job-skills training program.

Anghelcev & Eighmey (2013) reported that students who were promised a small monetary reward, via an advertisement, for participating in a peer mentor program experienced a drop in motivation. They were less likely to volunteer in the peer mentor program compared to their counterparts who were shown the same advertisement without an offer of monetary reward. Further, students who were shown the same advertisement with a larger monetary reward for participating in the program were more likely to volunteer than the former two groups of students.

Panagiotopoulos et al. (2018) showed that the main motivators for teachers participating in pieces of training were the theme of the program, educational development, linking theory to school reality, and contribution to future careers. The main obstacles were place of residence; location, time, and duration of program; prior obligations (such as family, professional, and financial); and non-provision of service facilities (such as licenses and time-table hours). In this case, the authors believed that to facilitate training two things should be done; that is, first, investigate the training needs of teachers who will participate in programs, and second, ask teachers about the content of training, place, time, and duration of the training.

Lee & Yeung (2021) examined how incentives; tuition waivers and tuition refunds, help or hinder the motivation for learning among students. They reported that those who received tuition refunds outperformed those who received tuition waivers. In other words, those who received tuition refunds were less likely to drop out of the learning activity compared to those who got tuition waivers. The thesis is that those paying upfront and getting their money back later were more motivated than those who did not pay upfront.

Abdelazeem et al. (2022) showed that when monetary incentives were paid and/or offered to subjects participating in research, the consent and response rates improved. Also, Liu & Liu (2022) examining the impacts of monetary incentives on workers and broader markets, found that monetary incentives had significant impacts on job performance and population health among workers in emerging economies.

Other Factors that May Affect Training

ShiftLeaning (n.d.) examined learning transfer in the workplace. According to the entity, there are three types of learning transfer, namely, previous knowledge applied to learning, old learning applied to new, and learning applied to a real-life task. The entity argued, however, that most often the application of acquired techniques to work processes does not go well. The reason is that when employees are not able to "learn and adapt" the new knowledge to current policies or procedures, it costs the organization money that the training was supposed to save in the first place. ShiftLearning suggested that the remedies are to encourage employees/trainees to (1) creatively apply material in real time; (2) encourage trainees to "internalize" material quickly; and (3) provide requisite resources and peer learning support for trainees.

Hajjar & Alkhanaizi (2018) found that training content, training environment, facilities and materials, training schedule, and presentation style had statistically significant and positive relationships with training effectiveness among employee participants. Also, the regression analysis showed that all the independent variables had statistically significant effects on training effectiveness. In other words, training content, training environment, facilities and materials, training schedule, and presentation style had "strong" impacts on training effectiveness.

Ibrahim et al. (2020) also found that manager support, motivation to learn, training content, and self-efficacy had statistically significant and positive relationships with on-the-job training (OJT) effectiveness among employee participants. Not surprisingly, in this instance also, all four variables had statistically significant and positive impacts on OJT.

Lischewski et al. (2020) examined factors that influence participation in non-formal and informal continuous vocational education and training (CVET). Non-formal CVET does not "provide recognized certificates but has explicit learning goals and a curriculum" (p. 3). Whereas, Informal CVET does not have "set objectives or learning outcomes. It is referred to as learning by experience" (p. 3), or learning on your own. The authors reported that the participation rate for the Non-formal CVET was 61%. However, the participation rate for the Informal CVET was 75%. The authors also reported that participation in Non-formal CVET is affected mainly by institutional factors: learning culture, workplace with a high degree of innovation, support of competence and autonomy, workplace climate, number of employees, and number of company locations. Furthermore, they indicated that participation in Informal CVET is mainly affected by learning biography: achieved educational level (general education), job-entry qualification (university or vocational), and self-efficacy.

Soria et al. (2020) reported that college students' participation in leadership training programs was positively related to their leadership efficacy. They believed that such programs should be continued to enhance students' leadership acumen. Further, Zulkifly (2022) assessing

the influence of training design factors on training transfer for selected academics found that perceived content validity and transfer design had statistically significant associations with training transfer. However, the said variables did not have statistically significant impacts on training transfer. Additionally, Kudus et al. (2023) also found that the effectiveness of the presenter, training evaluation, training content, employee readiness, and training method had statistically significant effects on the effectiveness of training and development.

In summary, the literature cited above, Koffarnus et al. (2013), Anghelcev & Eighmey (2013), Panagiotopoulos et al. (2018), Lee & Yeung (2021), Abdelazeem et al. (2022), and Liu & Liu (2022) deal with the effectiveness of incentives. Whereas ShiftLeaning (n.d.), Hajjar & Alkhanaizi (2018), Ibrahim et al. (2020), Lischewski et al. (2020), Soria et al. (2020), Zulkifly (2022), and Kudus et al. (2023) deal with the effectiveness of training and development. Overall, it has been shown that incentives influence participation in training programs, and therefore, it is expected that incentives will influence students' participation in leadership training programs. It is also expected that other factors will influence students' participation in leadership training programs.

METHODOLOGY

Design & Data Collection

The design of the study is cross-sectional as data were collected at specific points in time rather than over a series of periods. The instrument used to collect the data was developed by Tackie (2022). It comprised three main sections; specifically, demographic information; student perceptions of leadership in an organization or a community, and student incentive classification. Before the questionnaire was administered, it had to go through the Institutional Review Board of the researchers' Institution for assessment and approval. It was administered to a group of university students from two colleges at Tuskegee University who participated in a series of leadership development workshops in the Fall of 2022 and Spring of 2023. The data were obtained from the participating students by self-administration during the workshops. In other words, the sampling method was purposive sampling. The total number of respondents was 36, 16 in the Fall and 20 in the Spring. The sample size was considered adequate for the study.

Data Analyses

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics; specifically, frequencies and percentages; correlation analysis; and ordinal logistic regression analysis. The various analyses were done using SPSS 12.0© (MapInfo Corporation, Troy, NY). The description of the logistic

regression follows those used by Tackie et al. (2019), Tackie et al. (2020a), and Tackie et al. (2020b). Further, the aforementioned studies used a modified ordinal logistic regression model adapted from Banterle & Cavaliere (2009). The general model was stated as:

$$C_j(X_i) = \ln [P(Y>j|X_i)/P(Y \leq j|X_i)] = \beta_1 X_{i1} + \ldots + \beta_{ik} X_{ik} - \tau_j + 1 \qquad (1)$$

where $C_j(X_i)$ is the cumulative odds of being at or below category j of an ordinal variable with K categories, $1 \leq j \leq K-1$; i is the number of participants/students considered; j is the score for a category (of Y); k is the number of independent variables; Y is the dependent variable; X_{ij} represents the independent variables; β_i represents the coefficients, and τ represents the cut points between categories of the dependent variable.

As stated previously, the sample size was 36. This is acceptable insofar as the number of observations exceeds the number of independent variables (Gujarati & Porter, 2009). Two models were developed and used. The estimation model for model 1 is:

$$\ln (P\text{LNH}>j/P\text{LNH} \leq j) = \beta_1 \text{GEN} + \beta_2 \text{AGE} + \beta_3 \text{CCL} + \beta_4 \text{CLP} + \beta_5 \text{ICL} - \tau + 1 \qquad (2)$$

where $\ln (P\text{LNH}>j/P\text{LNH} \leq j)$ is cumulative odds of being at or below a "leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent that it is hyped out to be" (LHN) category; GEN is gender; AGE is age; CCL is class classification; CLP is college leadership position, and ICL is incentive classification.

Thus, estimation model 1 hypothesizes that "leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent that it is hyped out to be", View on Leadership 1, or simply View 1, and is impacted by gender, age, class classification, the intent to hold a college leadership position, and incentive classification. The overall null hypothesis is that all the regression coefficients are equal to zero or the independent variables together do not affect View on Leadership 1, or View 1. It was assumed that the hypothesized signs were not known *a priori*.

The estimation model for model 2 is:

$$\ln (P\text{LND}>j/P\text{LND} \leq j) = \beta_1 \text{GEN} + \beta_2 \text{AGE} + \beta_3 \text{CCL} + \beta_4 \text{CLP} + \beta_5 \text{ICL} - \tau + 1 \qquad (3)$$

where $\ln (P\text{LND}>j/P\text{LND} \leq j)$ is cumulative odds of being at or below a "leadership is needed in an organization or a community but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community" (LND) category; GEN is gender; AGE is age; CCL is educational classification, CLP is college leadership position, and ICL is incentive classification.

Therefore, estimation model 2 hypothesizes that "leadership is needed in an organization or a community but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community", View on Leadership 2, or simply, View 2, and is impacted by

gender, age, class classification, the intent to hold a college leadership position, and incentive classification. Again, the overall null hypothesis is that all the regression coefficients are equal to zero or the independent variables together do not affect View on Leadership 2, or View 2. Also, in this case, it was assumed that the hypothesized signs were not known *a priori*. The details of the independent variable names and descriptions used for the models are shown in the Appendix, Table 1. The criteria used to assess the models were the model chi-squares, beta coefficients, and *p* values.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the results of the socioeconomic factors. There were 31% males and 69% females; 94% were Blacks and 6% belonged to other races (particularly, Asians and Hispanics), and the mean age was 21 years (the ages ranged from 17 to 41 years; not shown in table). The dominant age was 19 years, reported by 39% of participants (not shown in table). Also, 19% of the participants were freshmen; 58% were sophomores, and 22% were juniors; 75% had college-educated parents, and 25% had less than college-educated parents. Furthermore, 75% held a high school leadership position; 61% intend to hold a college leadership position, whereas 36% do not intend to do so. Additionally, 39% were in the immediate incentives group and 61% were in the delayed incentives group. The immediate incentive participants received their incentives earlier than the delayed incentive counterparts. In summary, there were more females than males; more Blacks than other races, and more sophomores than other class classifications. Moreover, a majority of the participants had college-educated parents; held high school leadership positions, and intended to hold college leadership positions.

Table 1. Socioeconomic Factors of Participants (n = 36)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	11	30.6
Female	25	69.4
Race/Ethnicity		
Black	34	94.4
Other	2	5.6
Age		
Mean	20.8	

Class Classification		Table 1…
Freshman	7	19.4
Sophomore	21	58.3
Junior	8	22.2
Parental Educational Background		
College-educated	27	75.0
Less than college-educated	9	25.0
Did you Hold a High School Leadership Position?		
Yes	27	75.0
No	9	25.0
Do you intend to Hold a College Leadership Position?		
Yes	22	61.1
No	13	36.1
Other	1	2.8
Incentive Classification		
Immediate	14	38.9
Delayed	22	61.1

Table 2 depicts the results of views on leadership. About 39% strongly agreed or agreed that "leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent that it is hyped out to be", View on Leadership 1 (View 1) and 61% strongly disagreed or disagreed. Moreover, 89% strongly agreed or agreed that "leadership is needed in an organization or a community but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community", View on Leadership 2 (View 2) and 11% strongly disagreed or disagreed.

The finding that most of the respondents strongly disagreed or agreed with View on Leadership 1 (View 1) is not surprising as, all things equal, one would prefer leadership that is available and stable in an organization or a community. Similarly, it is not surprising that an overwhelming majority strongly agreed or agreed with View on Leadership 2 (View 2), as all things equal, the type and nature of leadership in an organization or a community is given some amount of flexibility.

Table 2. Reflection of Views on Leadership and Incentives Classification (n = 36)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent it is hyped		
Strongly agree	12	33.3
Agree	2	5.6

Disagree	9	25.0	*Table 2…*
Strongly disagree	13	36.1	
No opinion/not sure	0	0.0	
Leadership is needed in an organization or a community but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community			
Strongly agree	18	50.0	
Agree	14	38.9	
Disagree	2	5.6	
Strongly disagree	2	5.6	
No opinion/not sure	0	0.0	

Table 3 reflects the correlation results between incentive classification and selected socioeconomic factors; between views on leadership and selected socioeconomic factors, and between views on leadership indicators. The relationship between incentive classification and gender was positive but not statistically significant; the correlation coefficient was 0.089. Also, the relationship between incentive classification and age was negative and statistically significant, and between incentive classification and class classification was positive and statistically significant; the correlation coefficients were, respectively, -0.781 and 0.300.

The relationship between View on Leadership 1 (View 1), "leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent that it is hyped out to be" (LNH) and gender was positive and statistically significant; the correlation coefficient was 0.300. The relationship between LNH and age was negative and not statistically significant; the relationship between LNH and class classification was positive and not statistically significant; the correlation coefficients were, respectively, -0.100 and 0.150. Relatedly, the relationship between View on Leadership 2 (View 2) "leadership is needed in an organization or a community but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community" (LND) and gender was positive but not statistically significant; the correlation coefficient was 0.212. The relationship between LND and age was positive and statistically significant; the correlation coefficient was 0.397, and the relationship between LND and class classification was negative and not statistically significant; the correlation coefficient was -0.078.

Also, the relationship between LNH and LND was positive and statistically significant; the correlation coefficient was 0.331. Respectively, then age and class classification correlate statistically significantly with incentive classification; gender correlates statistically significantly with View 1 (LNH); age correlates statistically significantly with View 2 (LND), and View 1 (LNH) and View 2 (LND) correlate statistically significantly with each other.

Table 3. Correlation Results between Selected Socioeconomic Factors and Incentive Classification and Views on Leadership (and between Views on Leadership Indicators)

	Socioeconomic Factors		
	GEN	AGE	CCL
Incentive Classification			
ICL	0.089	-0.781***	0.300*
p	0.604	(0.000)	(0.075)
n	(36)	(36)	(36)
Views on Leadership			
LNH	0.300*	-0.100	0.150
p	(0.076)	(0.563)	(0.381)
n	(36)	(36)	(36)
LND	0.212	0.397***	-0.078
p	(0.215)	(0.017)	(0.652)
n	(36)	(36)	(36)
Between Views on Leadership Indicators			
	LND		
LNH	0.331***		
p	(0.049)		
n	(36)		

***Significant at 1%; **Significant at 5%; Significant at 10%

Table 4 reveals the estimates for model 1, socioeconomic factors and View on Leadership 1 (View 1), "Leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent that it is hyped out to be." The overall model was statistically significant (p = 0.016); that is, all the socioeconomic factors jointly explain the variation in the dependent variable, View 1. Moreover, gender had a statistically significant and positive effect on View 1. The coefficient of gender means that if a participant changes from female to male, then the expected ordered log-odds will increase by nearly two (1.844) moving from one category to the next higher category of View1, all things equal. On the flip side, age had a statistically significant and negative effect on View 1. This implies that if a participant's age increases by one unit, say one year, then the expected ordered log-odds will decrease by about half (0.534) moving from one category to the next higher category of View 1, all things equal. Also, incentive classification had a statistically significant and negative effect on View 1. This implies that if a participant's incentive classification changes from immediate to delayed, then the expected ordered log-odds will decrease by almost two (1.709) moving from one category to the next higher category of View

1, all things equal. Identical explanations are germane to the other independent variables. In this instance, gender, age, and incentive classification may be of consequence to View 1.

Table 4. Estimates for Socioeconomic Factors and their Effects on View on Leadership 1: "Leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent that it is hyped out to be."

Variable	β	p
Gender	0.1844**	0.019
Age	-0.534*	0.069
Class classification	0.406	0.352
College leadership position	-0.822	0.219
Incentive classification	-1.709*	0.082
Chi-square	14.017	
($p = 0.016$)		

**Significant at 5%; *Significant at 10%

Table 5 shows the estimates for model 2, socioeconomic factors and View on Leadership 2 (View 2), "Leadership is needed in an organization or a community, but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community." The overall model was not statistically significant ($p = 0.111$); that is, all the socioeconomic factors jointly did not fully or immensely explain the variation in the dependent variable, View 2. Moreover, none of the socioeconomic factors had a statistically significant effect on View 2. However, gender, age, class classification, and college leadership position had positive effects on View 2, and incentive classification had a negative effect. As a result, of the non-significance of the overall model, as well as none of the socioeconomic factors being significant, the factors were dropped one by one, and the model was assessed. The idea here was probably one of the factors was impacting the effects of the other factors; therefore, this needed to be ascertained.

When gender was dropped, the overall model was not statistically significant neither were any of the socioeconomic factors (Chi-square 7.123; $p = 0.130$). Following this, age was dropped; the overall model was statistically significant (Chi-square 7.936; $p = 0.094$) and incentive classification was also statistically significant ($p = 0.028$). Consequently, class classification was dropped; the overall model was statistically significant (Chi-square 8.936; $p = 0.063$) but none of the socioeconomic factors was statistically significant. After dropping the college leadership position indicator, the overall model was statistically significant (Chi-square 8.023; $p = 0.091$), but once again, none of the socioeconomic factors was statistically significant. Finally, when incentive

classification was dropped, the overall model was not statistically significant (Chi-square 6.689; p = 0.153) and none of the socioeconomic factors was significant.

Table 5. Estimates for Socioeconomic Factors and their Effects on View on Leadership 2: "Leadership is needed in an organization or a community, but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community."

Variable	β	p
Gender	0.103	0.172
Age	0.125	0.418
Class classification	0.045	0.919
College leadership position	0.644	0.354
Incentive classification	-1.344	0.131
Chi-square (p = 0.111)	8.945	

In the situation that age was dropped, it reflected the overall statistical significance of the model and at least one of the socioeconomic factors, incentive classification, being statistically significant. Therefore, it may be that age was blocking the effect of the other factors, and that moreover, incentive classification plays a crucial role. For expositional purposes, the results of age being dropped are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Estimates for Socioeconomic Factors and their Effects on View on Leadership 2: "Leadership is needed in an organization or a community but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community", with "Age" dropped.

Variable	β	p
Gender	1.075	0.182
Class classification	0.024	0.956
College leadership position	0.771	0.264
Incentive classification	-1.730**	0.028
Chi-square (p = 0.094)	7.936*	

**Significant at 5%; *Significant at 10%

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationships between incentives, views on leadership and socioeconomic factors, and associated impacts regarding a university students' leadership training program. Particularly, it described socioeconomic and other factors; assessed the relationships between incentives and socioeconomic factors; assessed the relationships between views on leadership and socioeconomic factors, and also ascertained if selected factors had an impact on views on leadership. In general, there were more female than male participants; more Black participants than other races/ethnicities; the mean age was 21 years; more sophomores than other class classifications, and more participants intended to hold a college leadership position than not. Furthermore, more participants strongly disagreed or disagreed than otherwise that leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent that it is hyped out to be. Also, more participants strongly agreed or agreed than otherwise that leadership is needed in an organization or a community, but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community. Additionally, relatively more participants were in the delayed incentive group than the immediate incentive group.

In terms of the correlation results between selected factors and incentive classification, only the coefficients for age and class classification were statistically significant. Also, considering the correlation results between selected factors and View on Leadership 1 (View 1), "Leadership is needed in an organization or a community but not to the extent that it is hyped out to be", only the coefficient of gender was statistically significant; between selected factors and View on Leadership 2 (View 2), "Leadership is needed in an organization or a community, but the extent to which it is needed depends on the type of organization or community", only the coefficient of age was statistically significant; and for the correlation between View 1 and View 2, the coefficient was statistically significant. The results of the ordinal logistic regression revealed that for model 1, the overall model was statistically significant; moreover, gender, age, and incentive classification had statistically significant effects on View 1. What is more, for model 2, the overall model was not statistically significant. However, when age was dropped from the independent variables, the model was statistically significant and incentive classification had a statistically significant effect on View 2. The contribution of this study is that it has laid down the foundation that selected factors (gender, age, and incentive classification) influence views on leadership by university students in a leadership training program.

However, there may be some limitations of the Study. First, the sample was purposive. So, it may not have the random sampling effect. Second, the sample size could be increased to probably better the overall effect. It is, therefore, recommended that further studies be done,

either by repeating the study with a different sampling technique or increasing the sample size to ascertain if the results will replicate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Abdelazeem, B., Abbas, S. K., Mostafa, A. A., El-Shahat, N. A., Malik, B., Kalantary, A. & Eltoolgy, M. (2022). The effectiveness of incentives for research participation: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PLOS ONE*, *17*(4), e0267534. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0267534

Anghelcev, G., & Eighmey, J. (2013). The impact of extrinsic incentives on students' willingness to volunteer as peer mentors: Implications for advertising education. *Journal of Advertising Education*, *Fall*, 5-16.

Banterle, A., & Cavaliere, A. (2009). The social and economic determinants of obesity: an empirical study in Italy. Presented at the 113th EAAE Seminar (September 3-6), Chania, Crete, Greece.

Collins, A. Bronte-Tinkew, J., & Burkhauser, M. (2008). Using incentives to increase participation in out-of-school programs. *Child Trends*. Publication # 2008-25.

FutureLearn. (n. d.). Factors affecting training effectiveness. Coventry University, Coventry,

England, U. K. Retrieved April 16, 2024 from https://www.futurelearn.com/info/courses/training-development-work/0/steps/89163

Gujarati, D. N. & Porter, D. C. (2009). *Basic econometrics*, 5ed. New York, New York: McGraw Hill Irwin.

Hajjar, S. T. E., & Alkhanaizi, M. S. (2018). Exploring the factors that affect employee training effectiveness: A case study in Bahrain. *Sage Open*, (April-June), 1-12. doi:10.1177/2158244018783033

Ibrahim, H., Zin, M. L. M., & Vengdasamy, P. (2020). The influence of individual characteristics, training content and manager support on on-the-job training effectiveness. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *7*(11), 499-506. doi:10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol17.no11.499

Koffornus, M. N., Wong, C. J., Fingerhood, M., Svikis, D. S., Bigelow, G. E., & Qi, Z. (2013). Monetary incentives to reinforce engagement and achievement in a job-skills training program for homeless, unemployed adults. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *46*(3), 582-591. doi:10.1002/jaba.60

Kudus, N., Sedek, M., Hasan, A., Mahadi, A., & Rahman, Z. (2023). Factors influencing the effectiveness of training, resilience factor, and development on employee performance. *Journal of Namibian Studies*, *46*(2023), 2411-2433.

Lee, Y. H., & Yeung, C. (2021). Incentives for learning: How free offers help or hinder motivation. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *39*(2022), 380-395.

Lischewski, J., Seeber, S., Wuttke, E., & Rosemann, T. (2020). What influences participation in non-formal and informal modes of continuous vocational education and training? An analysis of individual and institutional influencing factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(534-485), 1-19. Doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.534485

Liu, W., & Liu, Y. (2022). The impact of incentives on job performance, business cycle, and population health in emerging economies. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *9*(778101), 1-14. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.778101

Panagiotopoulos, G., Giantsion, C., & Karanikola, M. (2018). Incentives and obstacles: Participation in training programs for human resources in education. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, *6*(4), 34-43.

Seegars, N. (n. d.). Training incentives to improve training participation. Retrieved April 5, 2024 from https://learn.trakstar.com/blog/training-incentives-improve-participation

ShiftLearning (n. d.). Factors that affect the transfer of learning in the workplace. Retrieved April 16, 2024 from https://www.shiftlearning.com/blog/factors-that-affect-the-transfer-of-training

Soria, K. M., Kaste, K., Diekemper, K. M., Blamo, M., Belrose, M. R., & Brazelton, G. B. (2020). Enriching college students' learning efficacy. *Journal of Leadership Education*. *October*(87-98), DOI:10.12806/v19/14R7

Tackie, D. N. O., Bartlett, J. R., & Nunoo, N. I. (2019). Do socioeconomic factors matter in acreage owned and acreage farmed by small livestock producers in Alabama? *Journal of Agricultural Science, 11*(10), 1-13.

Tackie, D. N. O., Bartlett, J. R., Adu-Gyamfi, A., Perry, B. J., & Nunoo, N. I. (2020a). Do socioeconomic factors matter in acreage owned and acreage farmed by small livestock producers in Georgia? *Journal of Agricultural Science, 12*(8), 42-54.

Tackie, D. N. O., Bartlett, J. R., McKenzie-Jakes, A., Adu-Gyamfi, A., Perry, B. J., & Nunoo, N. I. (2020b). Do socioeconomic factors matter in acreage owned and acreage farmed by small livestock producers in Florida? *International Journal of Economics, Commerce, & Management, 8*(12), 56-76.

Tackie, D. N. O. (2022). Questionnaire regarding the effects of incentives and participant students' views on leadership. The George Washington Carver Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Program, Tuskegee, Alabama: Tuskegee University.

Zulkify, N. A. (2022). The influence of training design factors on training transfer: A preliminary study. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences*, *12*(12), 1252-1262. doi:10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i12/15715

APPENDIX

Table 1. Variable Definitions and Descriptions of Data for the Models (n = 36)

Variable	Description	Mean	Standard Deviation
Gender	1 = Male	0.31	0.47
	0 = Female		
Race/ethnicity	1 = Black	0.94	0.23
	0 = Other		
Age	Actual = 17-41	20.83	4.10
Class classification	1 = Sophomore	1.61	0.80
	2 = Junior		
	3 = Freshman		
	5 = post-graduate/professional		
College leadership position	1 = Yes	0.67	0.53
	0 = No		
	2 = Other		
Incentive classification	1 = Immediate	0.39	0.49
	0 = Delayed		
Leadership is needed but not to extent hyped out to be	0 = No opinion/not sure	2.36	1.29
	1 = Strongly disagree		
	2 = Disagree		
	3 = Agree		
	4 = Strongly Agree		
Leadership is needed but it depends on the type of organization	0 = No opinion/not sure	3.33	0.83
	1 = Strongly disagree		
	2 = Disagree		
	3 = Agree		
	4 = Strongly Agree		