

Leadership Development: Perspective of Student Leaders in Pangasinan State University

Randy F. Soriano, PhD¹, Vanessa P. Benito², Ronalyn E Dela Rosa³, Durante J. Rique Jr.⁴,
Pangasinan State University

Abstract – This study was conducted to determine the student Extent of Leadership Development Perspective in terms of Leadership Mentoring and Management, Leadership Recognition, Leadership Development Program, Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by Student Leaders, and the relationship between the Extent of the Leadership Development to the respondents' profile. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to address the research problem. Survey questionnaires through google forms were disseminated to the 44 Supreme Student Council (SSC) respondents which was determined through Convenience Sampling. The data and information gathered were treated with frequency percentage, average weighted mean, and Pearson correlation. Findings revealed that the indicators in the Extent of Leadership Development Perspective in terms of Leadership Mentoring and Management, Leadership Recognition, and Leadership Development Programs are outstanding as manifested to its overall weighted mean of 4.34. The Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders in terms of Leadership Mentoring and Management, Leadership Recognition, and Leadership Development Programs are Neutral as manifested by the weighted mean of 3.33. Moreover, it was determined that there is no significant relationship between the perceived Extent of the Leadership Development Perspective and the Profile of the Respondents namely age, sex, course, year level, and position in the organization.

Keywords – Development, Leaders, Leadership, Management, Perspective

INTRODUCTION

Effective organizations are driven by leadership. For organizations to be vital and viable, leadership is essential for helping create an innovative vision for what they can be and to mobilize the organization to pursue their objective. Leaders spearhead organizational improvements that develop individual confidence and allow them to look for creative approaches to problems. They create to get around reluctance to change future perspectives that inspire assurance in and mastery of emerging organizational techniques (Bennis, n.d.).

A leader is "...someone who influences people with diverse gifts, abilities, and skills. These individuals are focused on the mission and objectives of the organization, causing them to devote spiritual, emotional, and physical energy enthusiastically and passionately in a determined, coordinated effort. The leader exerts this influence by simply sharing a predictive outlook that resonates with the members' ideas and values in a way that allows them to comprehend and translate the future into immediate action steps..." (Patterson, 2017). According to Kotter

(2013), youth leaders, like students, must enhance their leadership abilities to impact society. Youth, as the hope of the nation, should develop these kinds of abilities. Young individuals such as student leaders who have attended leadership development programs sometimes have a deep commitment to an initiative that is conversely rooted in a level of satisfaction with their lack of control over the organizations, they are a part of (Carroll, 2020).

Moreover, the need for leadership development seems to be high. Many schools and universities across the country offer leadership courses, curricular programs, and co-curricular programs to their students to strengthen their formal understanding of leadership. These also serve as an avenue to develop students as leaders and practice leadership (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Although some college students come into universities with already-developed leadership skills, students begin to develop or increase their leadership skills during their years in college as they become part

of a more diverse society (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2015).

As enshrined in the Philippine Constitution, stated in Article 2 Section 13, "the State recognizes the vital role of the youth in nation-building and shall promote and protect their physical, moral, spiritual, intellectual, and social well-being. It shall inculcate in the youth patriotism and nationalism and encourage their involvement in public and civic affairs." Thus, in 1995, the Republic Act 8044 was enacted. It is otherwise known as Youth in Nation-Building Act; it aims to hone young people's capabilities, knowledge, and interests while refocusing their vision, ingenuity, and wellspring of zeal and hopes for the emancipation of our people from fear, starvation, and injustice.

Relatively, the Pangasinan State University-Lingayen Campus (PSU-LC) has various accredited student organizations from different colleges that hone leadership abilities of the students. Most of these organizations are functioning well as young leaders spearhead them. The Supreme Student Council (SSC) is recognized as the highest governing student body of all accredited student organizations (Article 1 Section 5). The organization consists of the president, four (4) vice presidents, two (2) business managers, two (2) press relation officers, an auditor, treasurer, governor, and vice governor (CBL, Article VII section 2a and Article II Section 2). All positions are occupied through a systematic election that is conducted annually.

On the other hand, under the CBL Article VII Section 2b, the appointed officials were screened and approved by the council, such as the executive secretary, deputy secretary and sub-treasurer.

With the supervision of the Coordinator of Student Services and Alumni Affairs, the Supreme Student Council office is tasked to ensure the overall welfare of students, regulate, and supervise the establishment, operation, and activities of other duly credited student organizations, such as the provision of guidance in attaining their goals and objectives as stated in their Constitution and by-laws.

Relative to the above premise, this study was intended to determine the student leaders' perspectives on Leadership Development in Pangasinan State University Lingayen Campus. Understanding the perspectives of student leaders can provide insights into how to enhance leadership development in the

institution with an effective and comprehensive approach.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This research study was conducted to determine the perspective of student leaders on Leadership Development in Pangasinan State University Lingayen Campus. It sought to answer the following questions in relation to the study.

1. What is the profile of respondents in terms of:
 - a. Age;
 - b. Sex;
 - c. Course;
 - d. Year Level; and
 - e. Position in the Organization?
2. What is the extent of Leadership Development perspectives of student leaders in Pangasinan State University Lingayen Campus in terms of:
 - a. Leadership Mentoring and Management;
 - b. Leadership Recognition; and
 - c. Leadership Development Programs?
3. What is the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by the student leaders in terms of:
 - a. Leadership Mentoring and Management;
 - b. Leadership Recognition; and
 - c. Leadership Development Programs?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of Leadership Development to the respondents' profile?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, the researchers utilized a descriptive-correlational method to pursue the main research question, "What are the Perspectives of Student Leaders on Leadership Development at the Pangasinan State University Lingayen Campus?"

A descriptive-correlational research design describes the variables and the relationships that occur naturally between and among the variables. Thus, it focuses on understanding the link between variables, which always ends up with two findings: having a significant or not significant correlation (Walker, 2005).

Furthermore, the study employed a survey questionnaire checklist as the primary tool for gathering the necessary information for the study to gather information needed for the study to describe the Perspectives of student leaders on Leadership Development at the Pangasinan State University Lingayen Campus, which was determined through the responses from the questionnaires.

The forty-four (44) respondents, answered a five (5) points Likert scale questionnaire checklist which is composed of 3 parts. The Likert scale is a prevalent rating scale used to measure behaviors and attitudes quantitatively. It consists of choices that range from one extreme to another, from where respondents choose a degree of their opinions. It is the best tool for measuring the level of opinion (Prieto et. al, 2017).

Part I of the questionnaire focuses on the profile of the respondents, specifically the age, sex, course, year level, and position in the organization.

Part II involves the perspectives of student leaders on Leadership Development in Pangasinan State University Lingayen Campus in terms of the following, Leadership Mentoring and Management, Leadership Recognition, and Leadership Development Programs. In this part of the survey the respondents checked on the appropriate columns with the rating scale: 5-Outstanding-Leadership development is greatly appropriate and effective for the student leaders, 4-Very Good-Leadership Development is very appropriate and effective for the student leaders, 3-Good-Leadership Development is appropriate and effective for the student leaders, 2-Fair-Leadership Development is slightly appropriate and effective for the student leaders, and 1-Poor-Leadership Development is inappropriate and ineffective for the student leaders.

Part III is composed of questions regarding the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by the student leaders. Thus, the respondents checked on the appropriate columns with the rating scale of: 5-Extremely Serious-The problem is always encountered, 4-Very Serious-The problem is very often encountered, 3-Neutral-The problem is sometimes encountered, 2-Slightly Serious-The problem is rarely encountered, and 1-Not at all Serious-The problem is never encountered.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. Respondents' Profile

Table 1.A. Respondents' Profile in Terms of Age

Variable	Category	f	%
Age	17-20	15	34.1%
	21-24	28	63.6%
	25-28	1	2.3%
		44	100%

In Table 1.A, most of the respondents of this study were aged 21-24. Among the 44 respondents, 28 of them were aged 21-24, which constituted 66.3 percent. The respondents who said they were aged 17-20 were 15, which has a range of 34.1 percent. Lastly, only one respondent was aged 25-28 and earned the least percentage, equivalent to 2.3 percent.

Table 1.B. Respondents' Profile in Terms of Sex

Variable	Category	f	%
Sex	Female	25	56.8%
	Male	19	43.2%
		44	100%

Table 1.B revealed that there were more female student leaders than males. Of the total of 44 respondents, 25 were female, which obtained 56.8 percent, and 19 were male, earning 43.2 percent.

Tablet 1.C. Respondents' Profile in Terms Of Course

Variable	Category	f	%
Course	BSEd	9	20.5%
	ABEL	6	13.6%
	BSHM	6	13.6%
	BS SW	1	2.3%
	BSND	2	4.5%
	BS BIO	2	4.5%
	BSBA	2	4.5%
	BPA	2	4.5%
	BS MATH	2	4.5%
	BA ECON	3	6.8%
	BTVTed	1	2.3%
	BSTM	1	2.3%
	BSIT	4	9.1%
	BSCS	2	4.5%
	BTLEd	1	2.3%
		44	100%

Based on Table 1.C, it could be seen that the most number of respondents who responded were enrolled in BSEd, which obtained 9 out of 44 respondents with an equivalent percentage of 20.5%. This was directly followed by ABEL and BSHM, which obtained 6 out of 44 respondents, each with an equivalent percentage of 13.6%. Meanwhile, 4 respondents are BSIT students obtaining a percentage of 9.1%. Then, 3 respondents are BA ECON students with an equivalent of 6.8%. On the other hand, BS BIO, BSND, BSBA, BPA, BS MATH, and BSCS gathered 2 respondents each with an accumulated percentage of 4.5%. In reference to the aforementioned findings, the least number of respondents are the BSSW, BSTM, BTVTed, and BTLEd with 1 out of 44 with an accumulated percentage of 2.3%.

Table 1.D. Respondents' Profile in Terms of Year Level

Variable	Category	f	%
Year Level	First Year	4	9.1%
	Second Year	7	15.9%
	Third Year	26	59.1%
	Fourth Year	7	15.9%
		44	100%

Based on table 1.D, it could be seen that the most number of students responding was third-year students which obtained 26 out of 44 respondents with an equivalent percentage of 59.1%. This was directly followed by second-year and fourth-year. In a total number of 44 respondents 7 of them are second year students which obtained an equivalent percentage of 15.9%. Likewise, fourth year respondents also obtained an equivalent percentage of 15.9%, with 7 respondents out of 44 total respondents. On the other hand, 4 out of 44 respondents are first-year students with an accumulated percentage of 9.1%.

Table 1.E. Respondents' Profile in Terms of Position in the Organization

Variable	Category	f	%
Position in the Organization	President	1	2.3%
	Vice President	4	9.1%
	Business Manager	2	4.5%
	Press Relation Officer	2	4.5%
	Auditor	1	2.3%
	Treasurer	1	2.3%
	Sub-treasurer	1	2.3%
	Secretary	2	4.5%
	House Speaker	2	4.5%
	Governor	4	9.1%
	Vice Governor	5	11.4%
	Mayor's League	1	2.3%
	Organizational President	18	40.9%
		44	100%

In Table 1.E, it can be seen that many of the respondents are Presidents of various Organizations. Out of 44 respondents, 18 of them are Organizational Presidents, with a range of 40.9 percent. The position of Vice Governor, with 5 respondents, has the next highest range constituting 11.4 percent. Additionally, 4 respondents from each position, Vice President and Governor, have the range of 9.1 percent each. Likewise, four positions, namely Business Manager, Press Relation Officer, Secretary, and House Speaker have 2 respondents each with a range of 4.5 percent each. Lastly, the least range, with an accumulated percentage of 2.3 percent, was under the positions of President, Auditor, Treasurer, Sub-Treasurer, and Mayors' League Chairperson, with 1 respondent each.

II. Extent of Leadership Development Perspectives

Table 2.A. The Extent of Leadership Development Perspectives of Student Leaders

Leadership Mentoring and Management	MEAN	DR
1. Providing adequate mentoring for student leaders.	4.34	Outstanding
2. Administering individual sessions for directing and personal guidance for self-enhancement.	4.11	Very Good
3. Managing and guiding student leaders in their leadership roles.	4.36	Outstanding
4. Conducting organizational leadership programs that contribute to the development of student leaders' leadership skills.	4.30	Outstanding
5. Providing opportunities for student leaders to receive feedback on their leadership performance.	4.34	Outstanding
6. Commending help for student leaders to promote communication and collaboration.	4.32	Outstanding
7. Promoting a culture of mentorship and moral support among student leaders.	4.36	Outstanding
Weighted Mean	4.31	Outstanding
Legend: 4.21-5.00 Outstanding 3.41-4.20 Very Good 2.61-3.40 Good 1.81-2.60 Fair 1.00-1.80 Poor		

Evidently, table 2.A shows the extent of the Leadership Development Perspectives of Student Leaders under the Leadership Mentoring and Management.

Under this variable, the indicator "Managing and guiding student leaders in their leadership roles" and "Promoting a culture of mentorship and moral support among student leaders" garnered the highest average weighted mean of 4.36 which entails an Outstanding descriptive rating. This finding could be compared to the journal of Dzikowski (2013), stating that the immense influx of new knowledge and today's technology-based society make leadership development essential. The best and most successful leaders have dependable mentors. Developing existing and future

leaders' leadership abilities through mentoring has become popular. To meet the requirements of their mentees, mentors adopt a variety of positions and change them as necessary. These roles are as coaches, supporters, counsellors, educators, and sponsors. Mentors and mentees can reap a wide range of advantages, including improved self-worth, awareness, insight, professional abilities, and stress reduction.

However, "Administering individual sessions for directing and personal guidance for self-enhancement" garnered the lowest average weighted mean of 4.11. Relative to the findings. Cocco (2016), stated that a collaborative process strengthens leadership development and occurs among students who are encouraged to lead within the interactive nature project-based work. These activities permit non-hierarchical governance, inclusive participation, and a sense of community.

Table 2.B. The Extent of Leadership Development Perspectives of Student Leaders

Leadership Recognition	MEAN	DR
1. Recognizing and appreciating the contributions of student leaders for the students and institutional welfare.	4.41	Outstanding
2. Providing formal recognition and rewards for student leaders' leadership achievement.	4.16	Very Good
3. Valuing and celebrating the efforts of student leaders in the campus community.	4.23	Outstanding
4. Providing various motivating programs to student leaders to further develop their leadership skills.	4.34	Outstanding
5. Encouraging student leaders to showcase their leadership abilities through various platforms.	4.52	Outstanding
6. Motivating student leaders in brainstorming various concepts and programs for the benefit of the student body.	4.30	Outstanding
7. Inspiring student leaders to efficiently perform their individual roles.	4.39	Outstanding
Weighted Mean	4.40	Outstanding
Legend: 4.21-5.00 Outstanding 3.41-4.20 Very Good 2.61-3.40 Good 1.81-2.60 Fair 1.00-1.80 Poor		

Visibly, Table 2.B shows the extent of Leadership Development Perspectives of Student Leaders in terms of Leadership Recognition.

It could be seen from the table that the indicator "Encouraging student leaders to showcase their leadership abilities through various platforms" obtained the highest average weighted mean of 4.52 and constituted an Outstanding descriptive rating. This finding could be compared to the study of Ahlquist, J. (2014) that examined social media applications as a tool to foster social change. Such social media platforms are

becoming progressively more an integral component of our daily lives, breaking global boundaries in terms of responsibilities and even possibilities. Reflecting on online self-awareness and congruence, addressing the controversies surrounding cyber civility, and learning how to be a digital citizen equipped to influence constructive social change are all necessary components of digital leadership.

In the study of Adams (2014) he examined the San Diego State University (SDSU) Quest for the Best award program. Former winners were asked to rate the degree to which they gained intrinsic and extrinsic benefits using a 35-question survey. The highest scoring intrinsic effects were pride and recognition for involvement, affirmation of their impact on campus, an increase in leadership capabilities and self-confidence, a deeper connection to their faculty or staff, and a stronger affinity for SDSU. Winners benefited more intrinsically than extrinsically from receiving the award. The most significant extrinsic advantages were having the award listed on their resume, wearing medals at commencement, and helping with admission to graduate school. Relatively, "Providing formal recognition and rewards for student leaders' leadership achievement" plays a vital role in molding a well-equipped 21st-century student leader. However, it is evident that this indicator obtained the least average weighted mean of 4.16, constituting a Very Good descriptive rating.

Table 2.C. The Extent of Leadership Development Perspectives of Student Leaders

Leadership Development Programs	MEAN	DR
1. Creating diverse leadership seminars and training.	4.41	Outstanding
2. Catering various leadership programs in developing strategies on how to be a great leader.	4.16	Very Good
3. Involving and offering student leaders the opportunity to participate in national and international leadership development programs.	4.23	Outstanding
4. Conducting micro-mentoring at different levels of leadership development.	4.34	Outstanding
5. Ensuring the availability of leadership development plan for develop future uncertainties.	4.52	Outstanding
6. Enhancing leadership development for aspirant leaders in the future.	4.30	Outstanding
7. Presenting programs with quality sessions and sustainable impact.	4.39	Outstanding
Weighted Mean	4.31	Outstanding
Legend: 4.21-5.00 Outstanding 3.41-4.20 Very Good 2.61-3.40 Good 1.81-2.60 Fair 1.00-1.80 Poor		

Table 2.C, evidently shows the extent of Leadership Development Perspectives of Student Leaders in terms of Leadership Development Programs.

"Ensuring the availability of leadership development plan for developing future uncertainties" garnered the highest average weighted mean of 4.52. The said findings support to the study of Obrero (2013), he states that promoting and sustaining services contributes to developing students' leadership. It serves as an executor of the programs and projects of the Student Council and other student organizations. It initiates or supervises the conduct of leadership pieces of training, seminar workshops, and community projects. The student leadership development program can be enhanced by mentoring the practitioners, conducting regular training workshops for seasoned and emerging student leaders and expanding students' involvement in various activities.

Moreover, "Catering various leadership programs in developing strategies on how to be a great leader" with the lowest average weighted mean of 4.16. This finding could be compared to the study of Java et al., (2017) which ascertain the awareness and attitudes towards leadership training seminar offered by the institutional university and the perceived influence of this training in the lives of student-leaders. The study concluded that with the influence of the Leadership Training Seminar as one of leadership program, the respondents felt that they became improved leaders in their organization and inside the classroom; disciplined and better persons now serving without expecting in return and now have the heart to serve and trust God. The study suggested that the LTS program be continued, improved, and strengthened—moreover, the use of technology in promoting and disseminating information is relevant.

In addition, the study by Konuk and Posner (2021), concluded that the student leadership program was implemented for one-hour sessions spread over seven weeks to enhance the students' leadership abilities. It also discovered that, with the aim of fostering student leadership, the program generally met its goals. The skill and application of different leadership characteristics can be developed and improved in students.

Table 2.D. Summary of the Extent of Leadership Development Perspectives

Indicators	MEAN	DR
Leadership Mentoring and Management	4.31	Outstanding
Leadership Recognition	4.40	Outstanding
Leadership Development Programs	4.31	Outstanding
Weighted Mean	4.34	Outstanding

Table 2.D shows the overall weighted mean of the Extent of Leadership Development perspectives of student leaders.

Above all, the three indicators accumulated an overall weighted mean of 4.34 and have an Outstanding descriptive equivalent. Consequently, the findings from the respondents directly signify that the Extent of Leadership Development is outstanding. Thus, Leadership Development of Pangasinan State University is greatly appropriate and effective for the student leaders.

III. Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders

Table 3.A. The Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders

Leadership Mentoring and Management	MEAN	DR
1. Lack of guidance in conducting organizational programs.	3.14	Neutral
2. Insufficient time to accomplish tasks and projects.	3.39	Neutral
3. Conflict schedule between academic pursuits and leadership roles.	4.02	Very Serious
4. Limited moral and financial support for actual mentoring and management matters.	3.64	Very Serious
5. Incapacity to communicate effectively between university management and fellow student leaders.	3.36	Neutral
Weighted Mean	3.51	Very Serious

Legend: 4.21-5.00 **Extremely Serious** 3.41-4.20 **Very Serious** 2.61-3.40 **Neutral** 1.81-2.60 **Slightly Serious** 1.00-1.80 **Not at all Serious**

The Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders in terms of Leadership Mentoring and Management is shown on Table 3.A.

The indicator "Conflict schedule between academic pursuits and leadership roles" garnered the highest weighted average mean of 4.02. The said findings of this study could be compared to the study of Abad et al.,

(2013), which found that the most common problem encountered by student leaders was insufficient time, and the least common problem was improper file organization. Likewise, they recommend that the university may give the maximum support to developing various programs for the students, especially the aspiring student leaders, to develop the time management character of students as province's and nation's future leaders.

Also, the finding of this study is similar to the study of Murage et al., (2019), which analyzed the challenges faced by student leaders in managing student affairs in public universities in Kenya. The study concluded that major challenges facing the student leaders were identified to be conflict between academic pursuits and leadership roles, lack of teamwork among student leaders and students' inadequate knowledge of university policies and statutes. Hence, the study recommends that student leaders may be assisted to solve internal problems that may affect the effective discharge of their duties as a way of addressing unrests in public universities.

However, "Lack of guidance in conducting organizational programs." garnered the lowest average weighted mean of 3.14 among the indicators. In the study conducted by Cabuang et al., (2010), it was concluded that each leader always stands for the proper welfare of the student body as the most effective area in the leadership practices of the student leaders. Thus, student leaders are involved in tasks such as advocacy, student events, and representation which was found to be the problem of the student leaders. The study recommended that proper coordination between student leaders, students and organizational coordinators may be established for more efficient communication of ideas and activities.

Also, the study of Alviento (2018), it is stated that the school's administrators, staff, and faculty members should be aware of how student leaders fight to improve the lives of those they serve. With this, they should have a greater comprehension of the issues and be a source of help and guidance by the student leaders, which will benefit them in various parts of their performance and leadership roles.

Table 3.B. The Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders

Leadership Recognition	MEAN	DR
1. Pressure from university, students, management, and policies and statutes.	3.39	Neutral
2. Demotivated and lack of encouragement to work on tasks and achieve particular goals.	3.09	Neutral
3. Providing inappropriate and unconstructive criticism on their leadership performance.	3.27	Neutral
4. Illogical biases and stereotyping within the organization.	3.30	Neutral
5. Numerous requirements and lengthy process in availing incentives.	3.39	Neutral
Weighted Mean	3.29	Neutral
Legend: 4.21-5.00 Extremely Serious 3.41-4.20 Very Serious 2.61-3.40 Neutral 1.81-2.60 Slightly Serious 1.00-1.80 Not at all Serious		

Table 3.B portrays the Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the student leaders in terms of Leadership Recognition.

It is evident that most of the respondents answered "Numerous requirements and lengthy process in availing incentives" and "Pressure from university, students, management, and policies and statutes" in relation to the study of Obiero (2013), it was found that most of the decisions the students made had to be vetted by the university authorities as they were seen to lack qualification to have the final say on decisions made in the university. Lack of adequate consultation between the student leaders and the university administrators can lead to frequent student complaints.

In contrast, "Demotivated and lack of encouragement to work on tasks and achieve particular goals" is the least mean, as shown in the table. According to the article of Agnihotri (2018), students are demotivated by the structure and allocation of rewards. The reward system is a major contributor to encouraging or discouraging students to put effort and be motivated. The structure and allocation of the reward influence motivation. The difference between excellent and poor performance also determines the motivation level.

Table 3.C. The Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders

Leadership Development Programs	MEAN	DR
1. Lengthy process of planning and accomplishing specific tasks, activities, and projects.	3.32	Neutral
2. Mismanagement of organizational budget.	2.98	Neutral
3. Deficient strategies to improve leadership development programs.	3.02	Neutral
4. Limited opportunities for student leaders to participate in various leadership programs nationwide.	3.30	Neutral
5. Limited training opportunities for campus organization advisers.	3.39	Neutral
Weighted Mean	3.20	Neutral
Legend: 4.21-5.00 Extremely Serious 3.41-4.20 Very Serious 2.61-3.40 Neutral 1.81-2.60 Slightly Serious 1.00-1.80 Not at all Serious		

Table 3.C shows the Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the student leaders in terms of Leadership Development Programs.

Based on the findings, "Limited training opportunities for campus organization advisers" constituted a Neutral descriptive rating with an average weighted mean of 3.39, the highest average weighted mean. As stated by King (2020), "to ensure that academic advisers are prepared to address these factors and to work with students effectively, a comprehensive and ongoing adviser training program is essential".

In addition, it is widely held that increasing leadership management and development standards is the key to enhancing educational institutions. It is increasingly related to training and developing leaders for demanding positions (Bush, 2018).

Meanwhile, the indicator that gained the least average weighted mean was "Mismanagement of organizational budget", which gained an average weighted mean of 2.98. According to Ezeugo (2016) administering the school budget must be the primary concern to ensure that the results achieved by the school system, justify the financial outlay. The extent to which accurate financial forecast have been made when the budget is evaluated. Therefore, the findings of this study imply that mismanagement of organizational budget is not a serious problem within the organization because it is systematically outlay and evaluated with the help of school administration.

Table 3.D. Summary of the Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders

Indicators	MEAN	DR
Leadership Mentoring and Management	3.51	Very Serious
Leadership Recognition	3.29	Neutral
Leadership Development Programs	3.20	Neutral
Weighted Mean	3.33	Neutral

Table 3.D shows the overall weighted mean of the Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders.

Above all, the three indicators accumulated an overall weighted mean of 3.33 and have a Neutral descriptive equivalent. Accordingly, the findings from the respondents directly imply that the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by the student leaders is neutral. Thus, the problems indicated in each variable are sometimes encountered by the student leaders.

IV. Significant Relationship Between the Leadership Development Perspective and the Respondents' Profile

Table 4. Significant Relationship between the Leadership Development Perspective and Profile

Leadership Development	Profile Variables	R-Value	Significance Level	Interpretation
Leadership Mentoring and Management	Age	0.020	0.900	Not significant
	Sex	0.027	0.863	Not significant
	Course	-0.073	0.637	Not significant
	Year Level	-0.246	0.107	Not significant
	Position in the Organization	-0.080	0.606	Not significant
Leadership Recognition	Age	0.070	0.653	Not significant
	Sex	-0.163	0.290	Not significant
	Course	-0.085	0.584	Not significant
	Year Level	-0.052	0.739	Not significant
	Position in the Organization	-0.017	0.911	Not significant
Leadership Development Programs	Age	0.109	0.479	Not significant
	Sex	-0.098	0.525	Not significant
	Course	-0.030	0.847	Not significant
	Year Level	-0.025	0.874	Not significant
	Position in the Organization	-0.017	0.911	Not significant

Variables

****Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

It can be gleaned from the table that there is no statistically significant relationship between age, sex, course, year level, and position in the organization to the Extent of Perceived Leadership Development

Perspective in terms of Leadership Mentoring and Management, Leadership Recognition, and Leadership Development Programs.

Therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between the extent of leadership development to the respondents' profile is accepted.

The above findings entail that there is no direct pattern that can be drawn from the responses of student leaders in the extent of Leadership Development Perspective in Pangasinan State University. Accordingly, the findings from the respondents directly imply that the university equitably provide adequate leadership development to all student leaders regardless of their demographic differences.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the thorough review and analysis, the following are therefore concluded:

The respondents are mostly aged 21-24 years old, female, third year students, enrolled in Bachelor of Secondary Education and organizational presidents.

The indicators in the Extent of Leadership Development Perspective in terms of Leadership Mentoring and Management, Leadership Recognition, and Leadership Development Programs are OUTSTANDING. It implies that Leadership Development in Pangasinan State University-Lingayen Campus is greatly effective and appropriate for the student leaders.

The findings revealed that the Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by the Student Leaders in terms of Leadership Mentoring and Management, Leadership Recognition, and Leadership Development Programs are NEUTRAL. It entails that the problems are sometimes encountered by the student leaders.

There is NO significant relationship between the Perceived Extent of Leadership Development Perspective and the profile of the respondents namely age, sex, course, year level, and position in the organization.

In view of the foregoing findings and the conclusion drawn, the following recommendation are hereby formulated:

The University may continue to ensure the availability of leadership development plan for student leaders. The organization may administer individual sessions between coordinators and student leaders for time management and self-enhancement. Coordinators and advisers may give adequate guidance to student leaders in improving their time management skills and self-enhancement for the success of their academic and leadership performance.

The University may help student leaders with internal issues that interfere with performing their role. The university may organize programs that provide strategies for becoming great leaders.

Lastly, it is recommend that future researchers maximize the scope of their respondents and may not only focus on one school, municipality, and/or year level.

REFERENCES

- Abad, P., Manaoat, J., & Ibasan, E. (2013). *Time management of student leaders in Pangasinan State University*.
- Adams. (2014). *An empirical look at recipient benefits associated with a university-issued student leadership award* (Publication No. 831) [Doctoral dissertation].
- Agnihotri, D. (2018). *Structure, rewards, efforts and demotivation*. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/structure-rewards-efforts-demotivation-deepak-agnihotri>
- Ahlquist, J. (2014). Trending now: Digital leadership education using social media and the social change model. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(1), 57–60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21332>
- Alviento, S. (2018). *Effectiveness of the performance of the student government of North Luzon Philippines State College*.
- Bennis, W. (n.d.). *Leadership resource*. <http://coachjacksonspages.com/44.pdf>
- Bush, T. (2018). *Leadership and management development in education*. SAGE Publications.
- Cabuang, P., Bernardo, K. J., De Leon, A., & Decena, A. A. (2010). *Leadership practices of student leaders of the College Student Council at Pangasinan State University, Lingayen Campus*.
- Carroll, B., & Firth, J. (2020). Leadership development as identity work: A systematic review and future directions. *Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620917849>
- Cocco, S. (2016). *Student leadership development: The contribution of project-based learning* [Master's thesis]. Library and Archives Canada. <https://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/obj/theses/canada/vol2/002/MR17869.PDF>
- Collins Dictionary. (2019, November 29). Perspective. In *Collins English Dictionary*. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/perspective>
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study*. National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Dziczkowski, J. (2013). Mentoring and leadership development. *The Educational Forum*, 77(3), 315–360.
- Ezeugo, B. (2016). *Budgeting in educational management*. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/budgeting-educational-management-basil-ezeugo>
- Java, M., Morales, A., & Java, A. A. (2017). *Perceptions of student leaders on the influence of the CPU Leadership Training Seminar in their lives*.
- King, M. C. (2020). Designing effective training for academic advisors. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & Associates (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 289–297). Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S. R., & Dugan, J. P. (2014). Student leadership development: Theory, research, and practice. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199755615.013.039>
- Koontz, H. (n.d.). *What is management?* Management Study Guide. https://www.managementstudyguide.com/what_is_management.htm
- Kotter, J. P. (2013). Management is still not leadership. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Kotter, J. P., & Cohen, D. S. (2014). *Change leadership: The Kotter collection*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Murage, L. M., Njoka, J., & Gachahi, M. (2019). *Challenges faced by student leaders in managing student affairs in public universities in Kenya*.



- Obiero, N. A. (2013). *The involvement of student leaders in the governance of universities: An implication of shared leadership* [Master's thesis, University of Oslo]. DUO Research Archive.
<https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/35488/Julaix19.52.docxcorrectedxversion.docxLatest.pdf>
- Obrero, M. D. (2013). *Student leadership development in the University of Northern Philippines: Program implementation, outcomes, and highlights*.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2015). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2015). *The effects of an introductory leadership course on socially responsible leadership, examined by age and gender*.
- Reysio-Cruz, M. (2020, January 5). More women in high school, college than men in PH, says report. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*.
<https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1206375/more-women-in-hs-college-than-men-in-ph-says-report>
- The Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines, art. II, § 13 (1987).
- Walker, W. (2005). The strengths and weaknesses of research designs involving quantitative measures. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 10(5), 571–582.

PLEASE INCLUDE CONTACT INFORMATION:

NAME: Dr. Randy F. Soriano or Ms. Vanessa P. Benito

CONTACT NO: 09812892571, 09394908144

EMAIL ADDRESS: randysoriano.lingayen@psu.edu.ph
vbenito_20ln0399@psu.edu.ph