

---

## Forging a Leader: An Analysis of Birth Order and Aggression as Determinative Factors of Leadership Styles

MARIA KRISTINA S. ALFONSO

ELENA TESORO

ELAINE T. DABU

ASHLEY TIMOTHY B. BROSOLO

CATHLEEN C. GAMBOA

PAULA S. SANTOS

MAUREEN I. VIRAY

Don Honorio Ventura Technological State University  
Pampanga, Philippines

### Abstract:

*This study aimed to determine the predictive capacity of birth order and aggression to leadership style of university and college student council officers in selected Universities in Pampanga. A total of 175 respondents participated in the study. Majority of respondents were female comprising 54% of total respondents. The highest numbers of the respondents are eldest born. The researchers used predictive-correlation specifically focusing on multiple regression to test the relationships of the variables given. Personal Data Sheet, the Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire, and the Leadership Style Questionnaire were used as instruments in collecting the data. Results indicated that respondents obtained the highest score in terms of verbal aggression and rated the lowest in terms of physical aggression. In leadership style, on the average, the respondents scored the highest in terms of democratic leadership and scored the lowest in terms of laissez faire leadership. Pearson chi-square test for association revealed a significant association between birth order and*

*authoritarian leadership whereas Pearson product moment correlation illustrated that verbal aggression significantly correlated with all three leadership styles. Implications, limitations, and recommendations were conferred.*

**Key words:** Birth order, Aggression, Leadership Styles, University Student Council Officers

## INTRODUCTION

Leadership is often experienced by people in all aspect of their everyday lives. Thoughts on what its core definition is and how the leader and the existence of the latter baffles humans from centuries passed and up to the present moment. It is, after all, an inexhaustible area for research and theories about it has been in existence since decades ago.

Stogdill (1974) has made known how the word leadership is similar to the words love, peace, and democracy because it has multitude of definitions presented by different individuals who have been trying to make sense of the concept. Granting that people in general have a notion of what leadership and leader mean, it cannot be denied that each individual will always have a different meaning for the words. Rost (1991) investigated materials about leadership from 1900 to 1990 and found around 200 diverse meanings and definitions (as adapted by Northouse, 2013).

From 1900-1929, the focus of leadership was control and power centralization with the theme domination. Moore (1927) gave an example wherein people who attended a convention on leadership defined it as “*the ability to impress the will of the leaders on those led and induce obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation*”. In the 1930’s leadership was defined in terms of traits. Domination was replaced by influence where both the

leader and those who belong to the group can significantly change the attitude of the other. Hemphill (1949) related how group approach became the norm in the 1940's where the focus is on behavior of a person while in a group trying to direct specific activities; Copeland (1942), at that time, was also keen to see how people are differentiating leadership by persuasion and leadership by coercion.

During the 50's, leadership definition focused on three themes: (1) continuance of group theory where leadership is akin to what leaders do in a group, (2) relationship that develops shared goals describing leadership in terms of leader behavior, and (3) effectiveness where the leadership is evaluated on the merits of instigating influence to the effectiveness of the group as a whole. Seeman (1960) emphasized leadership as "*acts by persons which influence other persons in a shared direction*". It was during this decade in which though the world was fraught with unrest, researchers on leadership all agreed on the premise presented by Seeman.

Group focus gave way to organizational behavior approach in the 70's. In here, leadership was viewed as "*initiating and maintaining groups or organizations to accomplish group or organizational goals*". What Burns (1978) presented however became the most pivotal in the decade where leadership was viewed as a shared understanding between the leader and the followers to realize goals either independently and/or mutually.

Still, scholarly research on leadership flourished the following decade. It was during this time that leadership was brought to not only the academe but also in the public awareness. With the dawn of the concept in the consciousness of the laypeople, leadership definitions became yet again abundant. Nonetheless, the concepts held before were reiterated accompanied with re-emerging themes from the past decades. Doing what the leader wishes, influence, traits (Peters

and Waterman, 1982), transformation (Burns, 1978) are the key definitions prevalent in the 80's.

After several decades of trying to come up with a unifying definition of leadership, the 21<sup>st</sup> century began to agree that common characterization of leadership is quite impossible. Scholars and researchers agreed to disagree and many of them realized that leadership is quite multifaceted and intricate, which in turn makes it ever-changing for whoever wish to understand its complexity.

People continue to gain interest in leadership because it influences group of people coming together to achieve a common goal. It has been observed that certain characteristics play an essential role in managing and handling people. Over the past century, researchers (e.g. Babiak, Bajcar, & Nosal, 2017; Phaneuf, Boudrias, Rousseau, & Brunelle, 2016; Yoon & Bono, 2016; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) have studied how different factors can lead to development of personality and behavior which in turn affects how people develop certain leadership styles.

Leadership style is defined by Northouse (2012) as behaviors exhibited by leaders. Basically, it focuses on what leaders do and how they act. Part of what is known as leadership style are the actions that leaders take in connection to their relationship with their subordinates. Newstrom and Davis (1993) also defined it as a method whereby the leader is tasked to deliver a direction for the subordinates, implementing plans for the group, and motivating those who belong in it. Organization members often see it as the totality of how their leader acts, explicitly or implicitly, for the benefit of the whole group.

Kurt Lewin, a German-American psychologist, was the first to focus on leadership style in his seminal work in 1939 along with his colleagues Lippitt and White. He led these researchers to look into the different leadership styles exhibited

by leaders. Until now, his work is still a vital study in leadership styles in that he and his team were able to identify the three leadership styles that are still known and recognized until today.

The three leadership styles discovered by Lewin et.al are (1) authoritarian or autocratic where the leader mainly tells the members what to and how to do whatever task is at hand without asking for the opinion or ideas of the group members, (2) democratic or participative in which the leader takes into account the opinion of the group members when decision making is at hand, though the leader will ultimately make the final decision, and (3) laissez-faire (free-rein) or delegative where the members are free to make decisions though responsibility for decisions made still falls into the leader.

Northouse reiterated that these styles of leadership are not separate, rather, they occur in a continuum. The influence of the leader ranges from high to moderate to little. Consequently, though one leadership style may appear to be dominant, it must be noted that they are not permanent and may vary on the circumstances that the group or organization is experiencing.

Researches on leadership have come up with different theories which yielded different leadership styles. For the study at hand, the theory most associated to the leadership styles discussed is the Theory X and Theory Y which was underscored by Douglas McGregor, a social psychologist from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in 1960. In here, he explained motivations that members have in accomplishing their tasks. He believed that the motivations which compels a member to work affects how the leader will handle the group. The leader's behavior is significantly affected by the work behaviors of the members.

Several studies (e.g. Barchiesi, et. al, 2007; Berson, et al. 2003; Bunmi, 2007) focused on leadership styles and how it

affects organizations and organizational leaders. Certain behaviors and factors are given credit as to what affects an individual's leadership style. One variable which is speculated to have a significant impact on leadership styles is birth order.

### **Birth Order, Leadership, and Leadership Styles**

A large part of an individual's personality is said to be a result of the orders in which one is born. Sulloway (1996) presented a concept of how birth order affects personality. He pointed out how differences in birth order causes siblings to have different outlooks of their family environment while growing up. Moreover, how parents deal with the children in the family significantly affect how siblings develop unique ways and strategies on how they can attain parental favor, the latter being an inherent need among siblings. While these siblings grow up, they all develop strategies to adopt within their own family depending on their place in the household.

Consequently, as siblings move out of the house, the strategies they have developed are modified in accordance to the new environment they live in. However, the role they take outside the home will make visible the ways in which their order in the family has shaped his/her personality. This speculation has been initially introduced by Alfred Adler, who is considered to be the pioneer on studies about birth order.

According to Liebernau (2005), birth positions in the family entail diverse set of personality among the siblings. Firstborns, for example, are more likely to be the leaders, high-achievers, conforming, and ambitious individuals in the family, while the lastborns are the children who grow up to be spoiled. Middle children, on the other hand, are seen to be the children experiencing the most difficulty in terms of getting parental attention. Unlike the position enjoyed by the only born wherein he/she is solely the recipient of parental love and attention, later born-middle and last- are well aware of the esteemed

status of the first born, hence, they are more likely to find other and better ways to get their parents' attention (Sun Ha and Tam, 2011).

Adler further explained that first born children are more neurotic and needy based in their "dethronment" upon the birth of proximal children. The oldest then strives throughout life to regain the central role, making them driven and higher achieving than their younger siblings. He also hypothesized that the second born gets to enjoy the hard work of the oldest without having any pressure for success, making them more likely to have initiative and drive later in life when out on their own (Marini and Kurtz, 2011).

Adlerian birth order research from 1981 to 1991 revealed that achievement motivation varies according to birth order. Adler (1946; Ansbacher & Ansbacher 1956) theorized that psychological birth order is a significant contributor to a child's lifestyle development. Traditionally, first born children are usually responsible, rule oriented and dependable, seeking to please parents and adults in socially appropriate way. They tend to be leaders and trail blazers. Second born children will often seek to find their place of significance in different or even contrasting ways from first born. Their alternative approaches may be quite functional but they may be expressed also as rebellion and opposition of the rule-oriented. (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956; Gfoerer, et al. 2003). Middle children share unique and complex position within the family. According to Dreikurs and Stoltz (1964) middle children may feel discouraged and that life is equitable (Ansbacher & Ansbacher 1956; Gfoerer et al. 2003) however Dreikurs and Stoltz (1964) noted that an encouraged middle child might emerge as a peacemaker and seeker of justice. Salmon (2013) also stipulated in her groundbreaking book how middle children are the most misunderstood and less studied of the birth order and that

when given proper avenues for growth, middle children grow up to be well-rounded contrary to common notion.

On the other hand, Sulloway, in 1996 proposed a five-factor model for personality development that is influenced by the position a child takes in the family. Every child has varying levels of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience. These personalities of certain individual based on their position in the family may have an effect on their leadership style on the group they may belong to.

Chemers (1970) did find out that birth order has a significant relationship with leadership styles. However, he did reiterated that though sample size was quite big, the diversity of respondents was lacking which led him to speculate that culture may also play an important part in leadership styles when birth order is taken into account.

Bass (1960) related other studies which shows that the oldest child has a propensity to be *“more socially maladjusted, more conservative, less aggressive, less self-confident, more introverted, and less inclined toward leadership than other children.”* Hurlock (1956) with her work on child development, discovered how the oldest child often lacks self-confidence and leadership qualities.

Bass believed that one possible reason as to why firstborns suffer from so many difficulties which hinder leadership is that parents of firstborns are still inexperienced and still less secure as far as marriage and finances are concerned. Another reason is that older children have to adjust to decreased attention. Overprotectiveness of the parents and anxiety about their child being sick are other potential causes for the insecurity experienced by firstborns as stipulated by Hurlock.

These findings are contrary to what previous researches as well as what most people view regarding firstborns as more



geared toward success and achievement when compared to laterborns. This desire to achieve or to succeed may not be an integral part of leadership when compared to other characteristics such as the ability to deal with subordinates or nonconformity in certain situations.

Bass concluded that *"all other things being equal, we expect the younger siblings to attempt more leadership as an adult than the older siblings to some slight extent."* It is also paramount to note that birth order alone or any single characteristic or ability does not, in any way, define or ensure leadership capability. This is simply one in a many combination of qualities that make leadership possible. Being in any of the birth order should not impede a person from pursuing leadership positions if they believe to have the ability to become an effective leader.

### **Aggression, Leadership, and Leadership Styles**

Another factor that may affect leadership style of certain individual is aggression. According to Escobar-Chavez and Anderson (2008), aggression refers to a person's behavior intended to harm others. Scholars (e.g., Little, Jones, Henrich, & Hawley, 2003; Prinstein & Cillessen, 2003) who specialize in development and aggression emphasized the importance of differentiating between the forms of aggression, or what it is and function or why it is being manifested by individuals. The common forms of aggression are (a) physical aggression where the person wants hurt or cause harm by using force as such punching, kicking, or biting (b) verbal aggression or communicating to someone with the intention of causing psychological pain like writing hurtful or saying bad words (Vissing, Strauss, Gelles & Harrop, 1991) and (c) relational where expression of aggression is indirectly manifested such as when the person do not want to approach or invite someone

intentionally, or someone creates a malicious song to be spread by someone else or when a person one gossips about another.

Relational aggression can also be exhibited verbally or nonverbally (Nelson, Springer, et al., 2008). Crick and Grotpeter (1995) theorized it to be to be concomitant with various social goals specifically pertaining to physical and relational aggression. Furthermore, still focusing on the latter, they, along with other researchers (e.g. Crick, Ostrov, & Kawabata, 2007; Ostrov & Godleski, 2010) uncovered how they are related to several risk factors and developmental outcomes.

Dodge and Schwartz (1997) believe that when taken in a theoretical view, there are typographical and functional subtypes of aggression. This view needs to be considered in that it explains and show the multidimensional nature of aggression and how when they are combined with diverse physiological and mental development, the aggression created can have an idiosyncratic form.

Liu (2006) presented three typologies of aggression. The instrumental versus hostile aggression wherein instrumental is seen to produce some kind of advantage or positive reward on the aggressor which is not relevant to the uneasiness experienced by the victim whereas hostile aggression has the aim to induce injury or pain on the victim. The second typology is positive versus negative aggression wherein Ellis (1976) described positive aggression as healthy and productive when considered in the context of rudimentary value of survival and the like. Other researchers (e.g. Gupta, 1983; Romi & Itskowitz, 1990) further explained that positive aggression is necessary in the development of autonomy and identity during childhood and adolescence. Moreover, to a certain degree, positive aggression is essential to enable engagement in competition and cooperation among peers. Negative aggression, on the other hand, is seen to be an act that results to personal injury or property destruction as stipulated by Bandura (1973).

The last typology existing about aggression is the male versus female aggression. In here, the distinct forms of aggression are manifested differently depending on sex. Males are more physical or are direct in their expression of aggression. Females are more likely to express what is called relational aggression. This is a more indirect form of aggression such as exclusion and defamation (Crick, 1995; Crick, Grotpeter, & Bigbee, 2002; Hadley, 2003; Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter, & Silva, 2001). Researchers (e.g. Quinsey et. al, 2004) also explain how males are more likely to engage in serious deeds of aggression as compared to females. The latter are seen to mask their aggression in other ways and manifest it in other behaviors such as manipulation which can, in later times, become detrimental because it can cause depression and other problems (Jack, 1999).

In an attempt to look at the importance of aggression in prosocial behaviors, Waasdorp, Baker, Paskewich, and Leff (2013) looked at the relationship of aggression to leadership. They yielded results wherein aggression is significantly associated with increase in popularity, decrease in social preference, and increase in perceived leadership in an urban environment context where there is high risk. The authors emphasized the need to investigate further on youth leadership and aggression. Leff, Baker, Waasdorp, Vaughn, Bevans, Thomas, Guerra, Hausman, and Monopoli (2014) attempted to study further on aggression of high-risk minority youth. They found out that youths who endorse greater leadership efficacy tend to be less aggressive.

Bekiari (2014) made a study as well relating aggressiveness specifically verbal and leadership styles among sports instructors and how it is related to intrinsic motivation of athletes under their care. The results of the study showed that verbal aggression of coaches has a significant positive relationship with anxiety and autocratic style of mentoring and

has a significant negative association with enjoyment, effort, and democratic style of mentoring.

It is reiterated by researchers interested in the study of aggression and leadership style that further investigations be done in relating these constructs in that they will be beneficial in terms of coming up with interventions that can lower negative repercussions and outmost utilization of positive outcomes where leadership styles and aggression is taken into consideration.

Some researchers in the Philippines also tapped into topics of leadership and leadership styles. Gelacio's research (1999) focused on educational administration and supervision as a means of opening a passage of cooperative interactions among human beings. A school leader who brings unity among diverse people with different ideas is said to be efficient. He also stated that leadership promotes the highest interactive process. Abraham (2001) in the Division of Nueva Ecija, discovered that the leadership styles of principal affected the teaching performance ratings of teachers. In a study by Anders (1995), a good leader trusts the abilities of his subordinates; hence, he may delegate his authority. Godoy (1997) conducted a study on leadership style of elementary school administrators and its effect on teachers' motivational needs and found the administrators' leadership style has no significant bearing with the motivational needs of the teachers.

According to Sagun (2012), the Leadership styles of school heads were perceived by the respondents to be moderately democratic which were also high in both consideration and initiating structures of leadership. They were not conceited and demanding leaders but humanitarian and development-oriented. Agustin (2001) conducted a study on the leadership style and decision making practices of public elementary school principals and its implication to teacher performance rating. Eleven factors were found to be significant

determinants of teacher's performance ratings in his study as follows 1. Age of principal, 2. Age of teacher, 3. Sex of principal, 4. Sex of teacher, 5. Civil status of principal, 6. Civil status of teacher, 7. Educational qualification of principal, 8. Leadership behavior of principal, 9. Principals decision making practice, 10. Salary, 11. Position of teachers.

Though there seems to be numerous studies on leadership styles, research on student leaders appears to be sparse.

With the growing number of competitive teens graduating from universities, knowing their leadership styles and how their birth order and level of aggression can impact the way they look for jobs and for companies where these jobs they seek can be found. Successful match with leadership styles in connection to birth order and aggression in institutions will benefit both the employee and the employer especially in terms of job productivity, management of colleagues, and relational aspects with bosses and other co-worker. It will help these future employees who have started out in school as student leaders to aim for leadership positions and make use of the knowledge gained to become the most appropriate and competent leader in the organization.

Accordingly, the study at hand aimed to explore the predictive capacity of two variables namely, birth order and aggression, to the leadership styles of university student council officers in selected universities in Pampanga. The researchers hypothesized that birth order and aggression are significant predictors when leadership style is concerned.

## **METHOD**

This study used a predictive-correlation method specifically focusing on multiple regression. The latter was done employing leadership styles as the criterion and birth order and

aggression as contributory factors to determine if leadership styles could be determined as a function of the aforementioned variables. The analysis was hypothesized to be statistically significant and that given variables are good predictors of leadership styles as will be reflected by the  $F$  and the  $p$  value.

The researchers collected the data needed from University Student Council (USC) officers coming from selected Universities in Pampanga. The researchers considered a minimum sample size of 138. The said sample size was computed using the statistical software GPower v.3.1.9.2 with a given alpha probability of 0.05 and an actual power of 95%.

The sampling method used was purposive sampling. The respondents were selected following the criteria set by the researchers. These are: a) must be a bonafide student of the selected Universities; b) can be male or female; c) elected as a USC officer for the A.Y 2016-2017. The person was not considered as a respondent when given criteria was not met.

The Buss & Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ, 1992 ) is a 29-item scale that measures four aspects of human aggression. Participants were asked to rate each item 1 (uncharacteristic of me) to 5 (very characteristic of me) scale. The scale was found to have moderate to high reliability, both from internal consistency estimates and test-retest correlations over a period of seven months. The scales also appear to have convergent validity with other self-report measure of aggression.

Leadership Styles Questionnaire (LSQ)) is a tool presented by Peter Northouse (2012). Its purpose is to identify the respondent's style of leadership and for the former to examine how personal leadership style is related to other styles of leadership. It is a Likert-type scale wherein the respondent is asked to choose from 1-5 (1-strongly disagree and 5-strongly agree). By scoring the questionnaire, the respondent gains a general leadership style profile.

## RESULTS

Around 54% (N=95) of the respondents' are female while 46% (N=80) were male. Majority of the respondents were 4<sup>th</sup> year (N=64) and 3<sup>rd</sup> year (N=61) students. Only three (3) of the respondents were in 1<sup>st</sup> year. The biggest number of the respondents are eldest in terms of birth order where N=65 (37.10%), followed by the middle with N=51 (29.10%), and the youngest with N=25 (20%). Only 24 of them were only child (13.70%).

**Table 01. Frequency Distribution of the Respondents' Gender, Year Level, and Birth Order**

Sex	Frequency	%
Male	80	45.70
Female	95	54.30
Total	175	100.00
Year	Frequency	%
1st Year	3	1.70
2nd Year	37	21.10
3rd Year	61	34.90
4th Year	64	36.60
5th Year	10	5.70
Total	175	100.00
Birth Order	Frequency	%
Eldest	65	37.10
Middle	51	29.10
Youngest	35	20.00
Only Child	24	13.70
Total	175	100.00

The respondents obtained the highest score in verbal aggression wherein they were described with average aggression (M=2.80, SD=0.81). Next is in terms of hostility wherein they rated with low aggression (M=2.48, SD=0.91). The respondents rated the lowest in terms of physical aggression with low aggression as a rating (M=2.30, SD=0.63).

Maria Kristina S. Alfonso, Elena Tesoro, Elaine T. Dabu, Ashley Timothy B. Brosola, Cathleen C. Gamboa, Paula S. Santos, Maureen I. Viray- **Forging a Leader: An Analysis of Birth Order and Aggression as Determinative Factors of Leadership Styles**

**Table 02. Mean and SD of the Respondents' Level of Aggression**

Aggression	Mean	SD	Description
Physical Aggression	2.30	0.63	Low Aggression
Verbal Aggression	2.80	0.81	Average Aggression
Anger	2.39	0.67	Low Aggression
Hostility	2.48	0.91	Low Aggression
Total Aggression	2.49	0.59	Low Aggression

On the average, the respondents scored the highest in terms of democratic leadership with a high description rating (M=23.75, SD=3.42). They scored the lowest in terms of laissez-faire leadership with a moderate description rating (M=19.19, SD=3.82, Moderate).

**Table 03. Mean and SD of the Respondents' Leadership**

Leadership Style	Mean	SD	Description
Authoritarian Leadership	20.42	2.83	Moderate
Democratic Leadership	23.75	3.42	High
Laissez-faire Leadership	19.19	3.82	Moderate

**Table 04. Association between Respondents' Gender, Year, Birth Order and Leadership Style**

Chi-Square Tests	Pearson Chi-Square	DF	Sig.	Interpretation	Decision
Authoritarian leadership * Year	70.816a	64	0.26	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Authoritarian leadership * Birth Order	76.306a	48	0.006**	Significant	Reject Ho
Authoritarian leadership * Sex	19.222a	16	0.26	Not Significant	Accept Ho
democratic leadership * Year	74.253a	68	0.28	Not Significant	Accept Ho
democratic leadership * Birth Order	60.115a	51	0.18	Not Significant	Accept Ho
democratic leadership * Sex	21.533a	17	0.20	Not Significant	Accept Ho
laissez-faire leadership * Year	101.943a	80	0.05	Not Significant	Accept Ho
laissez-faire leadership * Birth Order	40.256a	60	0.98	Not Significant	Accept Ho
laissez-faire leadership * Sex	27.050a	20	0.13	Not Significant	Accept Ho

Note: \*\*Correlation significant at 0.01

Pearson Chi-square test for association shows that at  $\chi^2(48) = 76.31$ , where sig. value is less than 0.05, there is a significant association between the university student council officers' Birth Order and Authoritarian leadership. Cross tabulation also shows that Eldest are more likely to practice authoritarian leadership. The decision therefore is to reject the null. The rest of the correlation reveals no significant association as sig. value is greater than 0.05.



Pearson r results, on the other hand, shows that Verbal aggression significantly correlated with all three leadership styles at  $r(175) = 0.161$  to  $0.25$ , where sig. value is less than  $0.05$ . This shows that an increase in their verbal aggression will yield a corresponding increase in their leadership level in all three styles. The decision then is to reject the null. Likewise, hostility significantly correlated with authoritarian leadership. This means that as their hostility increase, so does their authoritarian level. The rest of the pairing yielded no significant relationship as sig, value is greater than  $0.05$ .

**Table 05. Pearson r Correlation between Respondents' Aggression and Leadership Style**

Correlations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Physical Aggression	1	.335**	.635**	.580**	0.126	0.016	0.14
2. Verbal Aggression	.335**	1	.322**	.433**	.250**	.182*	.161*
3. Anger	.635**	.322**	1	.622**	0.068	-0.053	-0.016
4. Hostility	.580**	.433**	.622**	1	.188*	0.127	0.045
5. Authoritarian leadership	0.126	.250**	0.068	.188*	1	.498**	.419**
6. Democratic leadership	0.016	.182*	-0.053	0.127	.498**	1	.235**
7. Laissez-faire leadership	0.14	.161*	-0.016	0.045	.419**	.235**	1

Note: \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Looking into the correlation results, multiple regression was employed for variables with significant relationship. Analysis reveals that verbal aggression significantly predicts authoritarian leadership at  $B(175) = 0.15$ , where sig. value is less than  $0.05$ . This indicates once verbal aggression is present in a leader, it can be subsumed that they have a high probability of engaging or manifesting authoritarian leadership.

Year level was the highest predictor of democratic leadership at  $B(175) = 0.45$ , where sig. value is  $<0.05$ . Likewise, verbal aggression also significantly and positively predicted democratic leadership style at  $B(175) = 0.14$ , sig. value is  $<0.05$ . Anger came out as a negative predictor at  $B$

(175) = -0.16. This means that a mark decrease in anger may be able to predict a mark increase in democratic leadership level. Lastly, hostility also yielded to be a significant positive predictor at B (175) = 0.11, sig. value < 0.05. Physical aggression yielded as the sole predictor of laissez-faire leadership at B (175) = 0.159, sig. value is < 0.05. The accounted shared variances of the predictor variables estimating leadership styles are as follows: 7.8 % for verbal aggression predicting authoritarian leadership; 7.1% for year level, verbal aggression, hostility, and anger; 2.9% for physical aggression and laissez-faire leadership.

**Table 06. Predictors of Leadership Styles**

Dependent Variable: Authoritarian Leadership	B	SEB	$\beta$	t	Sig.
(Constant)	16.04	1.59		10.09	0.00
Year	0.45	.23	.14	1.90	0.06
Birth Order	-0.22	.20	-.083	-1.10	0.27
Sex	0.55	.42	.10	1.30	0.20
Physical Aggression	0.02	.05	.033	.33	0.74
Verbal Aggression	0.15	.06	.22	2.64	0.009*
Anger	-0.07	.06	-.12	-1.11	0.27
Hostility	0.06	.04	.17	1.59	0.12
<b>R<sup>2</sup> = .078</b>					
Dependent Variable: Democratic Leadership	B	SEB	$\beta$	T	Sig.
(Constant)	19.83	1.93		10.27	0.00
Year	0.72	.28	.19	2.51	0.013*
Birth Order	-0.08	.25	-.03	-.33	0.74
Sex	0.41	.51	.06	.79	0.43
Physical Aggression	-0.02	.06	-.03	-.31	0.76
Verbal Aggression	0.14	.07	.17	2.06	0.041*
Anger	-0.16	.08	-.22	-2.08	0.039*
Hostility	0.11	.05	.23	2.22	0.028*
<b>R<sup>2</sup> = .071</b>					
Dependent Variable: Laissez-faire Leadership	B	SEB	$\beta$	t	Sig.
(Constant)	15.703	2.21		7.12	0
Year	-0.075	.33	-.02	-.23	0.82
Birth Order	0.248	.28	.07	.88	0.38
Sex	0.425	.59	.06	.73	0.47
Physical Aggression	0.159	.07	.24	2.30	0.023*
Verbal Aggression	0.157	.08	.17	1.10	0.05
Anger	-0.163	.09	-.20	-1.89	0.06
Hostility	-0.012	.06	-.02	-.21	0.84
<b>R<sup>2</sup> = .029</b>					

## DISCUSSION

Considering the results of the study at hand, the researchers will explicate what each reflected outcome means and their implications. First off, in terms of respondents' sex, majority of them are female, comprising 54% of the total sample taken. Bearing in mind that most people view leadership roles to be stereotypically male hence more opportunity for males to be leaders as reflected on different studies (e.g. Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, Makhijani, Klonsky, 1992), it can be understood that this trend may slowly be dissipating given that most leaders chosen were females.

Taking into account the year level most of the students belong to, it can be said that more senior students are entrusted with leadership roles. The researchers attribute this occurrence with maturity, in that, people who vote for leaders would bear in mind the experience as well as the age of the candidate prior to voting. However, as stipulated in the study of Acher, Rosing, & Frese (2011), as people age and assume leadership roles, they tend to have lower legacy beliefs which affects their ability to be more motivating as leaders. Regardless, it can be said that people still hold notions of "*the older, the better*" when it comes to assuming leadership roles. This is in contrast to the study made by Gilbert, Collins, & Brenner (1991) wherein age does not contribute to leadership effectiveness from perspectives of follower in that, culture and other factors, are more contributory to how effective a leader becomes.

Given that majority of the officers are eldest born, the research finding may be supported by Adler's (1870-1937) postulation. First borns are more inclined to leadership positions compared to later borns which can be attributed to the unique position they have in the family as eldest among the siblings. Firstborn children are typically directive, rule-

conscious, and may become authoritarian or strict later in their life, which are common attributes of leaders in general.

In terms of aggression, it was anticipated by the researchers that verbal aggression would most likely be prevalent among the respondents in that, other facets of aggression, if detected to be present among candidates during elections, would not entice voters to support for them. Those who run for office typically rely on their ability to influence voters by talking to them. With that, upon assumption of office, with the very tool they used to attract voters to support them, the elected officers would most likely engage in verbal activities sometimes bordering on aggression, when dealing with subordinates. Furthermore, this finding is also stipulated to reflect the women majority leaders as respondents relate to verbal aggression. As some studies relate (e.g. Bjorkqvist, 1994), since women are physically weaker compared to men, they learn to avoid engaging in physical aggression. With this, women find other aggressive avenues, often, verbal in nature. An example of expressions of verbal aggression includes character attacks.

Democratic leadership style was seen to be most predominant among the respondents. This could be attributed to cultural context, in that, Filipinos who grew up in an environment of democracy and whose history is marked by revolutions against tyranny, would most likely produce generations of people who adhere to democratic ways. As a consequence, when these people assume leadership roles, they tend to emulate what they have been taught in terms of governance. Furthermore, given that majority of the respondents were female, if the study of Maseko and Proches (2013) is taken into consideration, females are more geared to practice a democratic style of leadership.

In light of these profile generated, relationships and predictors which emerged are also discussed. Birth order and

authoritarian leadership was seen to be associated with authoritarian leadership. With the profile of the respondents, it can be said that eldest children, as stipulated by Adler, are likely to observe authoritarian leadership style. Restating attributes Adler emphasized, eldest born are likely to become authoritarian in later life.

Interestingly, three (3) facets of aggression were predictors of democratic leadership style namely verbal aggression and hostility as significant positive predictors and anger as a significant negative predictor whereas verbal aggression is also a significant positive predictor of authoritarian leadership style. Physical aggression was a significant positive predictor of laissez-faire leadership style. Analyzing this, it can be viewed that once leaders are seen to possess or manifest verbal aggression, the propensity that they are following or observing either democratic or authoritarian leadership style is also high. In retrospect, it can also be speculated that leaders who are highly verbally aggressive may be (a) masking the fact that they are authoritarian by trying to show their esteem for democratic style of leadership, (b) their manner of motivating their constituents is akin to coaches who adopt a verbal aggressive manner of motivating their players. Bekiari (2014) obtained this result. Her study suggested that coaches do this to counterbalance the demands of contacts sports. Similarly, when leaders need to make sure that constituents need to be pushed because of workload demands, they are prone to act verbally aggressive which can border to hostility from the perspective of both the leader and member. However, this hostility and verbal aggression do not necessarily translate to manifestations of anger. Leaders may be aware that anger will not make their subordinates act accordingly, hence, anger is kept in check.

Certain limitations are to be noted with regard to the variables and results of the study. Because the number of

participants in terms of gender are not equal. It can suggest a various result regarding gender balance of the participants. A second limitation is the number of university schools chosen to participate in the school. A wider and more choices of school can be done for the future study for more diverse and broader study.

Providing the positive correlation of birth order and aggression has on leadership styles, Stress Management and Assertiveness Training/Seminars for student leaders are recommended for council leaders. This can help leaders when dealing a lot of stress because of the workload demands. To add assistance to this, educators can inform them how to improve teachers to flourish more in the field and become more responsible. This can also be a benefit for clinicians coming up with appropriate therapies/treatment outcomes when they are working with leaders or students. Lastly, For Future Researcher they can look at relationship between birth order and aggression and see if each of these variables affected the relationship with the criterion variable which is leadership style. By itself, this study would be very informative to develop and examine further the paradigm of leadership style among student leaders and to replicate the findings related to leadership styles for the future studies.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Ansbacher, H. L., & Ansbacher, R. R. (1956). The individual psychology of Alfred Adler.
- 2 Babiak, J., Bajcar, B., & Nosal, C. S. (2017). Heterogeneity of Leadership Styles as Behavioral Units: The Role of Personality in Searching for Leadership Profiles. In *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management,*

- Training and Education* (pp. 107-120). Springer International Publishing.
- 3 Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
  - 4 Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
  - 5 Bekiari, A. (2014). Verbal aggressiveness and leadership style of sports instructors and their relationship with athletes' intrinsic motivation. *Creative Education, 5*(2), 114.
  - 6 Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
  - 7 Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 452- 459.
  - 8 Chemers, M. M. (1970). The relationship between birth order and leadership style. *The Journal of social psychology, 74*(1), 1-10.
  - 9 Copeland, N. (1942). *Psychology and the soldier*. Harrisburg, PA: Military Service Publications.
  - 10 Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child development, 66*(4), 710-722.
  - 11 Dreikurs, R., & Stoltz, R. N. (1964). *Children the challenge*. New York: Hawthorne Brooks Inc.
  - 12 Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 111*(1), 3.
  - 13 Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological review, 109*(3), 573.
  - 14 Escobar-Chaves, S. L., & Anderson, C. A. (2008). Media and risky behaviors. *The Future of Children, 18*(1), 147-180.
  - 15 Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: The case of a sales manager. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(2), 290-303.

- Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The leadership quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- 16 Gfroerer, K. P., Gfroerer, C. A., Curlette, W. L., White, J., & Kern, R. M. (2003). Psychological Birth Order and the BASIS-A Inventory. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 59(1).
- 17 Gilbert, G. R., Collins, R. W., & Brenner, R. (1990). Age and leadership effectiveness: From the perceptions of the follower. *Human Resource Management*, 29(2), 187-196.
- 18 Hemphill, J. K. (1949). Situational factors in leadership. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research.
- 19 Hurlock, Elizabeth B. (1956) *Child Development*: Mt. NewYork: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- 20 Leff, S. S., Baker, C. N., Waasdorp, T. E., Vaughn, N. A., Bevans, K. B., Thomas, N. A., & Monopoli, W. J. (2014). Social cognitions, distress, and leadership self-efficacy: Associations with aggression for high-risk minority youth. *Development and psychopathology*, 26(03), 759-772.
- 21 Latu, I. M., Mast, M. S., Lammers, J., & Bombari, D. (2013). Successful female leaders empower women's behavior in leadership tasks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(3), 444-448.
- 22 Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-299.
- 23 Marini, V. A., & Kurtz, J. E. (2011). Birth order differences in normal personality traits: Perspectives from within and outside the family. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(8), 910-914.
- 24 Maseko, B. M., & Proches, C. N. G. (2013). Leadership styles deployed by women project managers. *Gender & Behaviour*, 11(2), 5663.



- 25 McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 26 Newstrom, J.W., Davis, K. (1993). *Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 27 Northouse, P. G. (2012). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- 28 Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 29 Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. New York: Warner Books.
- 30 Phaneuf, J. É., Boudrias, J. S., Rousseau, V., & Brunelle, É. (2016). Personality and transformational leadership: The moderating effect of organizational context. *Personality and Individual Differences, 102*, 30-35.
- 31 Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.
- 32 Seeman, M. (1960). *Social status and leadership*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research.
- 33 Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 12*(1), 80.
- 34 Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- 35 Sun Ha, T., & Lian Tam, C. (2011). A Study of Birth Order, Academic Performance, and Personality. In *2011 International Conference on Social Science and Humanity* (Vol. 5). Singapore: IPEDR.
- 36 Vissing, Y. M., Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J. W. (1991). Verbal aggression by parents and psychosocial problems of children. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 15*(3), 223-238.

- 37 Waasdorp, T. E., Baker, C. N., Paskewich, B. S., & Leff, S. S. (2013). The association between forms of aggression, leadership, and social status among urban youth. *Journal of youth and adolescence, 42*(2), 263-274.
- 38 Watson, C., & Hoffman, L. R. (2004). The role of task-related behavior in the emergence of leaders. *Group & Organization Management, 29*(6), 659–685.
- 39 Yoon, D. J. & Bono, J. E. (2016). Hierarchical power and personality in leader-member exchange. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(7), 1198-1213.
- 40 Zacher, H., Rosing, K., & Frese, M. (2011). Age and leadership: The moderating role of legacy beliefs. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(1), 43-50.