

Students' Leadership Styles among Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the Province of La Union**Allan Hil B. Pajimola, Ph.D.**

Faculty, College of Management

Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University – Mid La Union Campus

Ace T. Ceremonia, MATE

Faculty, College of Education

Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University – Mid La Union Campus

Abstract

Leaders are not born, they are developed; but as to kind of leadership they will exemplify is dependent on so many variables. This research is just one of so many million attempts to investigate what are the variables that affect leadership styles. This descriptive-correlation research describes the profile and leadership styles of the 96 student leaders from 12 higher education institutions in the Province of La Union through standardized leadership style questionnaire. This endeavor is finding the significant relationship of the 6 identified profile variables (gender, honor received, type of high school graduated, type of HEI enrolled, ordinal position in the family and religion) to the leadership styles using chi-square test for independence. The vital finding revealed that only ordinal position in the family has significant relationship with the leadership generating p value of 0.030.

Key Words: Leadership Style, Student-Leaders, Profile, Democratic, Directive, Delegative**Introduction**

Extracurricular involvement is a key tool in this personal development. For the majority of college and university students, involvement in extracurricular activities plays an integral role in the collegiate experience. Students become involved in extracurricular activities not only for entertainment, social, and enjoyment purposes, but most important, to gain and improve skills (Tenhouse, 2014). One of the most widespread types of extracurricular experience available on college campuses is student government. Students involved in governance organizations, such as student government and residence hall government, are typically elected by their peers to function as the "official voice" of students to university administration. These government participants often serve on campus-wide committees in an effort to represent the ideas and concerns of their fellow students (Whipple, 2006).

Students develop skills specific to their career path and imperative for future job success. Students have opportunities to improve their leadership and interpersonal skills while also increasing their self-confidence. Extracurricular involvement allows students to link academic knowledge with practical experience, thereby leading to a better understanding of their own abilities, talents, and career goals (Kuh, 2005). Pilgrim (2013) added that students who are

involved in extra-curricular pursuits tend to improve their academic grades as well. This may be due to increased self-esteem, motivation and better time management. They become better organized in the classroom. They demonstrate a reduction of at-risk behavior and a heightened sense of belonging, resulting in better behavior.

Franklin (2015) opined that there are many different ways to look at student leadership development. Many youth workers choose to use the team approach. This can be powerful because of the natural struggles that come from students working together. These struggles lead to tough decision making, personal conflict and communication breakdowns. All of these situations become a leadership laboratory allowing the adult developer to challenge students on many different fronts.

The advantage of understanding the leadership style is that it will understand one's strengths and weaknesses. Students can be proactive and more effective as a leader by strategically using their strengths and counteracting their weaker areas. One's style defines their values and perspective, and being aware of it will aid their communication with those they work with (Raine, 2014). A leadership style is a leader's style of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people (Foster, 2010). All leaders do not possess same attitude or same perspective. All of the leaders do not get the things done in the same manner. Their style varies. The leadership style varies with the kind of people the leader interacts and deals with (Management Study Guide, 2014).

Most personal leadership styles have both advantages and drawbacks. If one knows their leadership style, one can use its advantages to maximize the results that members achieve. One can also make adjustments to compensate for the drawbacks of their leadership style. The ultimate goal is to make the environment conducive for all so that one can succeed as a leader and members enjoy working for him (Bianca, 2014).

There are four kinds of leadership styles according to Chand (2014). These are autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire and paternalistic styles. An autocratic leader centralizes power and decision-making in himself. He gives orders, assigns tasks and duties without consulting the employees. The leader takes full authority and assumes full responsibility. Participative or democratic leaders decentralize authority. It is characterized by consultation with the subordinates and their participation in the formulation of plans and policies. He encourages participation in decision-making. The laissez-faire or non-interfering type of leader passes on the responsibility for decision-making to his subordinates and takes a minimum of initiative in administration. He gives no direction and allows the group to establish its own goals and work out its own problems. Under this management style the leader assumes that his function is fatherly or paternal. Paternalism means papa knows best. The relationship between the leader and his group is the same as the relationship between the head of the family and the members of the family. The leader guides and protects his subordinates as members of his family.

Conveniently, leaders can work effectively at all levels of an organization. Sometimes they are "on stage" and sometimes they work quietly behind the scenes. In order for one to become an effective leader, it is important to get to know their own personal leadership style, what their values are and what motivates them (Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, 2014).

University or college life is considered to be the most exciting part to one's student life. Aside from the fact that is the gateway towards the fulfillment of their future career, it is where they develop their potentials for a lifelong process. Shelton (2013) shared that the union offers firsthand experience in citizenship and educates students in leadership, social responsibility, and

values. These models of college union governance foster student/staff partnerships that form the foundation for student development and leadership training. In Philippine universities, student councils are seen to be the avenue for their political consciousness, to be assertive of their rights as students. Particularly in universities in Manila, student activism is so much alive that any issues redound to the disadvantage of students will spur interest to pursue protests and petitions among student welfare advocates. After all, the 1987 Constitution guarantees students of their freedom of expression and freedom to join associations as long as it within the ambit of the legitimate parameters.

There are 15 HEIs in the Province of La Union, 1 state university with 3 campuses and the rest are private colleges. While these higher education institutions continue to pursue their mission, vision, goals and objectives, not to be left behind is the student development. As enshrined in the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum No. 21, series of 2006, HEI should institutionalize student government where students can develop their leadership potentials and good governance skills. The Student Affairs and Services will take charge of this extra-curricular activity of students to ensure its proper implementation and monitoring.

This study described the leadership styles of student-leaders using a standardized questionnaire. It also correlated their profile with the leadership style imbued. Thus, this gave a bigger picture on how they manage their student government. The researchers believe that leadership requires competence in establishing purpose, working collaboratively, and managing conflict. Institutions can initiate opportunities to study leadership and to experience a range of leadership-related activities designed to intentionally promote desired outcomes of student leadership learning.

Review of Literature

There are many theories on leadership that points out its importance to human development in a civilized society. These theories shed light in the conceptualization of this study.

An early leadership theory is the Great Man Theory, which purports that only a small number of individuals are born natural leaders and others cannot learn to fill leadership roles. This theory also assumes that when a leader is needed, the right person would rise to the occasion based on genetically determined skills. This early leadership theory is no longer commonly accepted, as it is based on early studies that only examined the lives of people who were already considered great leaders. These individuals were generally wealthy white men in the aristocracy, which facilitated the perception that being a great leader was linked to genetics. Thus, this approach excluded women and other diverse individuals as potential leaders.

Another early leadership theory is Trait Theory, which assumes people born with certain traits that, in combination, result in the ability to be a good leader. Research focused on discovering traits of successful leaders and assumed that others with similar inherited characteristics could also become great leaders. In contrast to trait theories, Behavioral Theories assume leaders can be made. Underlying this theory is the idea that leadership is based on definable behaviors that anyone can learn, so it is important to focus on what leaders do so others can learn from and adopt these behaviors. Eventually research evolved to include examining situational factors that also affect leaders.

Situational Leadership Theory assumes that a successful leader does not implement a single style of leadership, but instead considers situational factors such as the skills and attitudes

of followers in any given circumstance. An increasing focus on the role of followers grew in studying leadership, along with emphasizing the importance of the relationship between leaders and followers. For example, servant leadership is a guiding philosophy of leaders who share power by putting others first and facilitating greatness in followers. Similarly, participatory leadership occurs when a leader involves followers in the decision-making process, which is assumed to create increased buy-in for accomplishing goals, including fostering a more collaborative environment.

Transactional Leadership Theory assumes people are motivated by reward and punishment based on performance, which is passed down through a clear chain of command. Transactional leaders function by creating a clear structure of expectations for followers, including identifying rewards for successfully completing expectations. A different view on leader and follower relationships is seen in transformational leadership, where a charismatic leader inspires followers. Passion, enthusiasm, and positivity are key elements for leaders to exhibit in moving a group to accomplish lofty goals. Transformational leaders genuinely care about their work and the people around them, and they want everyone to succeed in accomplishing goals that are facilitated through trust and excitement. The importance of a positive leader/follower relationship is also seen in James Kouzes and Barry Posner's popular resource, *The Leadership Practices Inventory*. The authors asked people about the top things they look for, admire, and willingly follow in a leader, and they found that people prefer the following five characteristics: honesty, forward-looking, competent, inspiring, intelligent, and fair-minded. Kouzes and Posner also identify five actions for successful leadership: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart. These positive, collaborative views of leadership relate to leadership models developed specifically with college students in mind.

A 1993 U.S. Department of Education grant was awarded to prominent leadership educators to revolutionize how college students learned about leadership. The goal of this work was to "enhance student learning and development of leadership competence" and "to facilitate positive social change," according to the resulting text, *Leadership for a Better World*. Based on work from this grant, the 1996 Social Change Model of Leadership came into focus. This model "approaches leadership as a dynamic, collaborative, and values-based process grounded in relationships and intending positive social change," authors Susan Komives and Wendy Wagner wrote. Focused on college students, the model is a framework for personal development and for working with others to create positive change for society. Underlying assumptions of the model are that leadership is collaborative, is a process versus a position, and is values-based. Other key themes are that all students are potential leaders, regardless of holding formal leadership positions, and that service is an important way any student can develop leadership skills.

In 1998, another important contribution to the literature evolved as Komives and fellow leading scholars Nance Lucas and Timothy McMahon applied relational leadership to a variety of college students interested in developing as leaders. The book *Exploring Leadership* resulted as authors investigated relational leadership, or when leadership is viewed as "a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change." This model does not describe how leadership is practiced, but rather offers how a healthy, ethical, effective group can be developed and supported through the five elements of being inclusive, empowering, purposeful, ethical, and process-oriented.

Another frame for examining college student leadership is the Leadership Identity Development Theory, which Komives and colleagues introduced in a 2009 *Journal of Leadership*

Education. This grounded theory explores how college students develop the social identity of being collaborative, relational leaders who interdependently engage in leadership as a group process. In this model, student leadership development is viewed as an intersection between relational leadership and student development theory. The leadership identity development theory includes psychosocial and cognitive stages to development in establishing leadership identity. There are six stages with transitions of increasing complexity that individuals experience, resulting in students reflecting on their roles of doing leadership in groups, and expanding their views of leadership. Since its inception, the theory has been used in various studies on college student leadership.

The classification of leadership styles into autocratic, democratic and delegative can be traced in the research conducted by Kurt Lewin in 1939. Based on his theory, he concluded that they have different sets of characteristics. This early study was very influential and established three major leadership styles.

In autocratic leadership style, a leader has complete command and hold over their employees/team. The team cannot put forward their views even if they are best for the team's or organizational interests. They cannot criticize or question the leader's way of getting things done. The leader himself gets the things done. The advantage of this style is that it leads to speedy decision-making and greater productivity under leader's supervision. Drawbacks of this leadership style are that it leads to greater employee absenteeism and turnover. This leadership style works only when the leader is the best in performing or when the job is monotonous, unskilled and routine in nature or where the project is short-term and risky.

The laissez faire leadership style, the leader totally trusts their employees/team to perform the job themselves. He just concentrates on the intellectual/rational aspect of his work and does not focus on the management aspect of his work. The team/employees are welcomed to share their views and provide suggestions which are best for organizational interests. This leadership style works only when the employees are skilled, loyal, experienced and intellectual.

While in democratic or participative leadership style, the leaders invite and encourage the team members to play an important role in decision-making process, though the ultimate decision-making power rests with the leader. The leader guides the employees on what to perform and how to perform, while the employees communicate to the leader their experience and the suggestions if any. The advantages of this leadership style are that it leads to satisfied, motivated and more skilled employees. It leads to an optimistic work environment and also encourages creativity. This leadership style has the only drawback that it is time-consuming.

As to legal mandate, the 1987 Constitution is very explicit with regards to youth development. The State recognizes the vital role of the youth in nation building. CHED Memorandum No. 26, series of 2006 mandates HEIs to look into the student affairs and services ensuring that the needs and concerns of students as to co-curricular and extra-curricular be addressed. Section 4 of the said memorandum declares that an education institution seeks to form individuals who can later become productive citizens of the country and the world. Its responsibility is not only confined in teaching and development of job skills, but also to the acquisition of life skills and values. The individuals produced by the educational institution should be able to contribute positively to the progress of his or her country and to the upliftment of human conditions. Student Affairs and Services (SAS), therefore must systematically and deliberately address this end objective of producing citizens suited to the aims of the country and of humanity. Higher education institutions must provide a set of student centered activities and

services in support of academic instruction intended to facilitate holistic and well-rounded student development for active involvement as future responsible citizens and leaders.

Methodology

Research Design

This study used the descriptive research design. As the name implies, descriptive research methods are used when the researcher wants to describe specific behavior as it occurs in the environment. There are a variety of descriptive research methods available, and the nature of the question that needs to be answered drives which method is used. Traditionally, descriptive research involves three main categories: observation, case studies, and surveys. In this particular research, it made use of survey. Descriptive research design is the most appropriate one because it described both the profile of the respondents and their leadership style. It also used to describe the relationship exist between these two variables.

Data Sources

The list of Higher Education Institutions was taken from the CHED Regional Office. As of 2015, there are 15 HEI recognized by the government to operate in the province of La Union.

The respondents of the study were the student-leaders of their highest governing body. The nomenclatures used to these bodies vary from one school to another. There are schools used University Student Council, Supreme Government Council or simply Student Body Organization. The researchers surveyed the positions per organization. Normally, the positions filled-up are President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, Auditor, Business Manager, Public Information Officer and Peace Officer. Thus, there were eight respondents per HEI.

A letter of request to the University or College President and attention to the adviser of the SBO was prepared by the researchers requesting for the administration of survey questionnaires to the respondents. Upon approval, the researchers administered the questionnaire and retrieved immediately after completing the information needed.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

Survey questionnaire served as the primary data gathering tool of this study which consists of two parts. First part dealt on the profile of the respondents. It was an easy-to-answer checklist type of questionnaire. The second part dealt on the leadership style of the respondents. A standardized questionnaire was adopted to determine their leadership style entitled "Leadership Style Questionnaire". This was formulated by the Emergency Field Coordination Training of the United States of America (2005) and was accessed through their official website. Pilot testing of the instrument was employed by the researchers at Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College, Tagudin, Ilocos Sur and able to arrive with a value of the Cronbach alpha ($\alpha = 0.72$) which is acceptable in nature. The questionnaires were presented to the Research Committee for their critic and suggestion for the betterment of the data gathering tool. Moreover, this adopted questionnaire provided the mechanisms as to the interpretation of the findings. Hence, the researchers tallied the responses, analyzed the results and consequently interpreted in the light of the matrix presented.

Data Analysis

Profile of the respondents was tallied through frequency count, percentage, and mode. Leadership style of the student-leaders was determined based on the manual given in the adopted questionnaire. For the test of relationship, chi-square test for independence and Cramer's V were used.

Findings

Profile of the Respondents

Gender

Generally, there are more male (59) than female student-leaders (37) in the HEIs in the province of La Union as shown in Table 2. While student leadership does not require any specific gender as both are capable of doing the tasks, it can be appreciated that both gender are given equal chances to experience this extra-curricular in their school. The trend is true to all HEIs except for the case of La Union College of Science and Technology where female student-leaders outnumbered the male student-leaders. Based on their enrolment for school year 2015-2016, there are more female than male.

Table 2.

Respondents' Profile in terms of Gender

Higher Education Institutions	M	% (N=96)	F	% (N=96)
AMA College of La Union	5	5.21	3	3.13
Central Ilocandia College of Science and Technology	5	5.21	3	3.13
Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University	4	4.17	4	4.17
La Finns Scholastica	5	5.21	3	3.13
La Union College of Science and Technology	3	3.13	5	5.21
Lorma Colleges	5	5.21	3	3.13
Northern Philippines College for Maritime Studies and Technology	7	7.29	1	1.04
Polytechnic College of La Union	5	5.21	3	3.13
Saint Louis College	4	4.17	4	4.17
Sea and Sky College	6	6.25	2	2.08
South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology	5	5.21	3	3.13

STI College of La Union	5	5.21	3	3.13
Total	59	61.46	37	38.54

Honors Received

In terms of honors received, it can be observed in Table 3 on page 18 that majority of the student-leaders received honors (70) as compared to student-leaders who did not receive any honors in their schooling years (26). It is interesting to point out that in Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University and Northern Philippine College for Maritime Studies and Technology, all of their student-leaders were honor students. While in Lorma Colleges, AMA College of La Union and Polytechnic College of La Union, there is equal distribution of student-leaders who were honor students and who were not honor students.

Table 3.
Respondents' Profile in terms of Honor Received

Higher Education Institutions	With Honors	% (N=96)	Without Honors	% (N=96)
AMA College of La Union	4	4.17	4	4.17
Central Ilocandia College of Science and Technology	6	6.25	2	2.08
Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University	8	8.33	-	-
La Finns Scholastica	6	6.25	2	2.08
La Union College of Science and Technology	6	6.25	2	2.08
Lorma Colleges	4	4.17	4	4.17
Northern Philippines College for Maritime Studies and Technology	8	8.33	-	-
Polytechnic College of La Union	4	4.17	4	4.17
Saint Louis College	7	7.29	1	1.04
Sea and Sky College	6	6.25	2	2.08
South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology	6	6.25	2	2.08
STI College of La Union	5	5.21	3	3.13

Total	70	72.92	26	27.08
-------	----	-------	----	-------

Type of High Schools They Graduated

Table 4 shows that more student-leaders are graduates of public high schools (65) than student-leaders who are graduates of private high schools. In Northern Philippine College for Maritime Studies and Technology, none was a graduate of private high schools while Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University, La Union College of Science and Technology and South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology has 1 each from private high schools. This is different in the case of AMA College of La Union where most of their student-leaders are graduates of private high school.

Table 4.
Respondents' Profile in terms of Type of High Schools They Graduated

Higher Education Institutions	Public High Schools	% (N=96)	Private High Schools	% (N=96)
AMA College of La Union	3	3.13	5	5.21
Central Ilocandia College of Science and Technology	4	4.17	4	4.17
Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University	7	7.29	1	1.04
La Finns Scholastica	5	5.21	3	3.13
La Union College of Science and Technology	7	7.29	1	1.04
Lorma Colleges	5	5.21	3	3.13
Northern Philippines College for Maritime Studies and Technology	8	8.33	-	-
Polytechnic College of La Union	5	5.21	3	3.13
Saint Louis College	5	5.21	3	3.13
Sea and Sky College	4	4.17	4	4.17
South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology	7	7.29	1	1.04
STI College of La Union	5	5.21	3	3.13
Total	65	67.71	31	32.29

Type of HEI They Enrolled In

Table 5 reveals that almost all student-leaders are enrolled in private higher education institutions (88) as compared to only 8 student-leaders who are enrolled in a public higher education institution which is DMMMSU. In La Union, there is only one state university chartered through a legislative enactment. All other HEIs are privately owned by non-stock corporations. Except for La Union College of Science and Technology, Polytechnic College of La Union and South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology, all private HEIs are located in the City of San Fernando, the capital city of the province. DMMMSU has three campuses, the North La Union Campus which is found in Bacnotan, South La Union Campus in Agoon and Mid-La Union Campus in the City of San Fernando. The seat of the University Student Council is located at the North La Union Campus which happens to be the main campus of the university.

Table 5.
Respondents' Profile in terms of Type of HEI They Enrolled in

Higher Education Institutions	Public HEI	% (N=96)	Private HEI	% (N=96)
AMA College of La Union	-	-	8	8.33
Central Ilocandia College of Science and Technology	-	-	8	8.33
Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University	8	8.33	-	-
La Finns Scholastica	-	-	8	8.33
La Union College of Science and Technology	-	-	8	8.33
Lorma Colleges	-	-	8	8.33
Northern Philippines College for Maritime Studies and Technology	-	-	8	8.33
Polytechnic College of La Union	-	-	8	8.33
Sea and Sky College	-	-	8	8.33
South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology	-	-	8	8.33
STI College of La Union	-	-	8	8.33
Total	8	8.33	88	91.67

Ordinal Position in the Family

Table 6 discloses that most of the student-leaders are the youngest in the family (39), followed by being the middle child (33) and being the eldest child (24). It is interesting to point

out that in Lorma Colleges, Northern Philippine College for Maritime Studies and Technology and STI College of La Union, there is no student-leader being born as eldest in the family. Majority of the student-leaders from South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology are born being the eldest while majority of student-leaders from Lorma Colleges are born as middle child. This is different in the case of student-leaders from Northern Philippine College for Maritime Studies and Technology, Sea and Sky College and STI College of La Union in which majority are born as youngest in the family.

Table 6.
Respondents' Profile in terms of Ordinal Position in the Family

Higher Education Institutions	E	%	M	%	Y	%
		(N=96)		(N=96)		(N=96)
AMA College of La Union	3	3.13	3	3.13	2	2.08
Central Ilocandia College of Science and Technology	3	3.13	3	3.13	2	2.08
Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University	2	2.08	3	3.13	3	3.13
La Finns Scholastica	3	3.13	4	4.17	1	1.04
La Union College of Science and Technology	3	3.13	1	1.04	4	4.17
Lorma Colleges	-	-	5	5.21	3	3.13
Northern Philippines College for Maritime Studies and Technology	-	-	3	3.13	5	5.21
Polytechnic College of La Union	2	2.08	3	3.13	3	3.13
Saint Louis College	2	2.08	3	3.13	3	3.13
Sea and Sky College	1	1.04	2	2.08	5	5.21
South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology	5	5.21	1	1.04	2	2.08
STI College of La Union	-	-	2	2.08	6	6.25
Total	24	25.00	33	34.38	39	40.63

Legend: E – eldest ; M – middle ; Y – youngest

Religion

Table 6 discloses that a great majority (67) of the student-leaders are Roman Catholic while only 29 belongs to different congregation not belonging to Roman Catholic denomination.

It is notable to emphasize that Saint Louis College, which is sectarian-Catholic HEI has student-leaders who are 100% Roman Catholic. Contrastingly, Polytechnic College of La Union has more non-Catholic student leaders (5) than Catholic ones (3).

Table 7.
Respondents' Profile in terms of Religion

Higher Education Institutions	Catholic	% (N=96)	Non-Catholic	% (N=96)
AMA College of La Union	6	6.25	2	2.08
Central Ilocandia College of Science and Technology	6	6.25	2	2.08
Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University	5	5.21	3	3.13
La Finns Scholastica	5	5.21	3	3.13
La Union College of Science and Technology	5	5.21	3	3.13
Lorma Colleges	6	6.25	2	2.08
Northern Philippines College for Maritime Studies and Technology	6	6.25	2	2.08
Polytechnic College of La Union	3	3.13	5	5.21
Saint Louis College	8	8.33	0	0.00
Sea and Sky College	5	5.21	3	3.13
South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology	6	6.25	2	2.08
STI College of La Union	6	6.25	2	2.08
Total	67	69.79	29	30.21

Leadership Styles

It can be gleaned in Table 8 that 51% of the respondents have democratic style of leadership; 26% have directive leadership style and 23% have non-directive leadership style. It is notable that in AMA College and Northern Philippines for Maritime Studies and Technology has no delegative type of student-leaders.

Table 8.

Leadership Styles of HEI students

Higher Education Institutions	Directive	Democratic	Delegative
AMA College of La Union	3	5	-
Central Ilocandia College of Science and Technology	2	4	2
Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University	3	4	1
La Finns Scholastica	1	4	3
La Union College of Science and Technology	3	3	2
Lorma Colleges	1	6	1
Northern Philippines College for Maritime Studies and Technology	1	7	-
Polytechnic College of La Union	3	2	3
Saint Louis College	1	5	2
Sea and Sky College	2	4	2
South Ilocandia College of Arts and Technology	2	2	4
STI College of La Union	3	3	2
Total	25	49	22

According to Emergency Field Coordination Training of the United States of America (2005), a directive leader initiates action, structures activities, motivates others, delegates responsibility, and praises or reprimands subordinates. A democratic leader gets results by leading discussions, asking questions to involve others, encouraging others to volunteer for responsibilities, confirming commitments, and asking for a vote to get a consensus decision or a majority decision. A non-directive leader refuses to make decisions for others, uses silence until someone in the group speaks out, gives non-verbal support to others who show positive leadership, and gradually fades out of a group when others in the group show an ability and a willingness to take over.

With the identified leadership styles, the researcher correlated these with their profile. The results were shown in Table 9.

Table 9.
Relationship of Profile of the Respondents and Leadership Style

Profile Variable	Computed p Value of Interpretation
------------------	------------------------------------

	Chi-square statistic	
Gender	0.078	Independent
Honor Received	0.085	Independent
Type of High School Graduated	0.128	independent
Type of HEI Enrolled	0.652	independent
*Ordinal Position	0.030	dependent
Religion	0.272	independent

*significant level at < 0.05

Gender. The chi-square statistic is 5.0901. The p-value is .078437. The result is not significant at $p < .05$. Therefore, gender and leadership styles of students are independent variables. In the study of Elsevier (2015), it was found out that negative relationship between authoritarian leadership and subordinate performance is stronger for female than for male leaders and that the positive relationship between benevolent leadership and subordinate performance is stronger for male than for female leaders.

Honor Received. The chi-square statistic is 4.928. The p-value is .0851. The result is not significant at $p < .05$. Therefore, honors received during high school and leadership styles of students are independent variables. As to the study of Kilbert (2013), it was concluded that the honors received is one of the factors that affects the leadership styles of students. However, the correlation is weak and minimally acceptable.

Type of HS Graduated. The chi-square statistic is 4.110. The p-value is .1281. The result is not significant at $p < .05$. Therefore, the type of HS during high school and leadership styles of students are independent variables. Jigger (2011) stated that the type of high school is not a factor that affects the leadership styles of students in the tertiary education in South Kinabalu. On the other hand, Philips (2013) found out that it is one of the minimally acceptable factors that affect student leadership styles.

Type of HEI Enrolled. The chi-square statistic is 0.855. The p-value is 0.6521. The result is not significant at $p < .05$. Therefore, the type of HEI enrolled in and leadership styles of students are independent variables.

Ordinal Position. The chi-square statistic is 10.653. The p-value is 0.0308. The result is significantly related at $p < .05$ and these variables are dependent to each other. To measure the strength of relationship, Cramer's V was applied and generated a value of 0.2355 which stands for moderate and acceptable association of the two variables. According to Collins (2013), birth order plays a substantial role in a child's life because the family is the first social system to which a child is exposed. Thus, analysis revealed that there is statistically significant data regarding the relationship between the developed leadership styles of an individual and the order

of birth. This only means that ordinal position is one of the indications as to what type of leadership styles the student-leaders possess. However, Jade (2013) stated that the ordinal position is in weak correlation with the styles of leadership a leader has.

Religion. The chi-square statistic is 2.604. The p-value is 0.2720. The result is not significant at $p < .05$. Therefore, the type of HEI enrolled in and 56 leadership styles of students are independent variables.

Conclusion

1. Gender is not a criterion for student leadership. Students who have been recipients of awards and honors are inclined in leading his constituents.
2. The principles of democracy are practiced in student leadership.
3. The kind of leadership styles are manifested whether one is being the eldest, middle or youngest in the family.

Suggestions and Recommendations

1. Student leadership as part of the extra-curricular activities in the tertiary level should be promoted irrespective of the profile of the students.
2. Student body organization advisers should continuously guide their student-leaders in upholding the virtues of democratic leadership.
3. In-depth research should be conducted in order to determine further which of the ordinal positions in the family manifest democratic, directive or non-directive leadership styles.
4. A more comprehensive research undertaking on student leadership should be conducted to come up with an output for their development.

References

- Bianca, Audra (2014). *The Advantages of Knowing Your Leadership Style*. Retrieved from: <http://yourbusiness.azcentral.com/advantages-knowing-leadership-style-2536.html>
- Chand, Smriti (2014). *4 Different Types of Leadership Styles*. <http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/business-management/4-different-types-of-leadership-styles/2550/>
- Collins, C. (2013). *The Relationship between birth order and leadership styles, career choice and profession*. Retrieved from: http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1012&context=socialwrk_students
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED) (2006). *CMO Number 21, Series of 2006*.
- Foster, D.E. (2010). *A Method of Comparing Follower Satisfaction with the Authoritarian, Democratic, and Laissez-faire Styles of Leadership*. Communication Teacher

- Franklin, Doug (2015). *Types of Student Leadership Teams*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.leadertreks.org/types-of-student-leadership-teams/>
- Jade, K.H. (2013). *The Leadership styles and its affecting factors* .Retrieved from:
http://www.educleadership.com/help_factors
- Jugger, K.P. (2011). *Factors affecting Leadership Styles*. Retrieved from:
http://www.leader.com.ph/educ_leadership
- Kendra, C. (2014). *Leadership Styles*. Retrieved from:
<http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/a/leadstyles.htm>
- Kilbert, V. (2013). *Leadership Styles of Honor Pupils in South Morocco*. Retrieved from:
http://www.developmentsyle.com/leadership_style_of_honor_pupils//207;
- Kuh, George (2005). *The Other Curriculum: Out-of-Class Experiences Associated with Student Learning and Personal Development*. *Journal of Higher Education* 66:123–155.
- Management Study Guide (2015). *Leadership Styles - Important Leadership Styles*. Retrieved from: <http://www.managementstudyguide.com/leadership-styles.htm>
- Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (2014). *Who are You as a Leader?*
<http://www.gpslifeplan.org/century/leadership/index.php?link=who-know-yourself>
- Philips, T.R. (2013). *Leadership Styles and Its Factors*. Retrieved from:
http://www.hilprob.com./lead_factors/
- Pilgrim, Trevor (2013). *Extra-curricular Activities Are Important For Students*. Retrieved from:
<https://eduflow.wordpress.com/2013/08/26/extra-curricular-activities-are-important-for-students/>
- Raines, Stephanie (2014). *The Advantages of Knowing Your Leadership Style*.
<http://smallbusiness.chron.com/advantages-knowing-leadership-style-18924.html>
- Shelton (2013). *Student Development Theory Series: Leadership Development*. *The Bulletin*: Volume 81. Retrieved from:
<https://www.acui.org/publications/bulletin/article.aspx?issue=41799&id=21775>
- Tenhouse, Amy (2014). *College Extracurricular Activities - Impact on Students, Types of Extracurricular Activities - Organizations, University, Development, and Involvement - StateUniversity.com*. Retrieved from:
<http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1855/College-Extracurricular-Activities.html#ixzz3Zk4Zxogf>

Whipple, Edward G. 2006. *Student Activities.* " *In Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education*, 2nd edition, ed. Audry L. Rentz and Associates. Springfield, IL: Thomas.