



## The Efficacy of BRafeNHS Student Representative Coordinating Council A.Y. 2020-2021

Justin Frederick P. Abando and Arabella Mae M. Aduiso  
*De La Salle Santiago Zobel – Br. Rafael Donato FSC Night High School, Muntinlupa City*

**Abstract:** The student council serves as the voice of the student body, enabling them to be engaged in tackling academic matters (Woods, 2002). With the implementation of online distance learning, the duties of the student council should not cease even with the new factors affecting their proceedings. This study aims to find out if the BRafeNHS Student Representative Coordinating Council is still functioning effectively amidst the set-up of online distance learning what is the student body's perception of their performance, and how it differs from the student leaders' perception. Researchers disseminated a survey questionnaire to 75% of the BRafeNHS student body to rate the performance of the Executive, Legislative, and Media Committee. In evaluating the student council performance, four variables were considered in this study (authority, communication with students, implementation of school rules, and project implementation and student involvement). Interviews were also held with selected students from the council and student body to provide a more in-depth inquiry. Results showed that the BRafeNHS-SRCC is still functioning very effectively based on the student body, and they share almost the same perception on the first two variables, although the same cannot be said for the latter two. Still, the research concludes that the BRafeNHS-SRCC is functioning effectively amidst the implementation of online distance learning.

**Key Words:** student-leaders; leadership skills; online distance learning; student body; perceived performance

### 1. INTRODUCTION

According to Woods (2002), the student council is an organization serving as the representative, allowing the student body to become more involved with the school's affairs. With it, the students will have a voice. And for the student council to uphold its purpose, it will have different responsibilities and duties to perform. The responsibilities of the student council may vary from school to school, but are summarized as the following:

**Planning, Proposing, and Managing Activities.** The student council is tasked to plan and manage different events and activities that will happen in and out of the school within the school year. These activities are not limited to projects proposed by the student council itself; but also programs that are done annually and as suggested by the school management. Specifically, they will have to prepare everything needed for the program, execute the plan, and oversee the project or activity until the end, ensuring its success.

**Involvement of Students in the Activities of the Council.** The student council has the job of ensuring the participation of the student body in its activities. Such events will serve as the best way to involve the school administration and the students, therefore regularly holding it is the essential job of

the council. The student council will not be able to carry out the purpose of the activity or event if neither the students nor the school management will be involved.

**Communication with the Student Body.** The student council must establish the best way to communicate with the students from different grade levels and sections. To ensure that the student council will stay connected and updated with the student body, batch representatives are usually appointed to know the concern that has to be addressed.

**Working in Partnership with the School Administration.** Although they serve as the representative of the student body, the student council will also be working together with the administration, teachers, Association of Parents in facilitating matters that concerns the student body.

**Financial Management.** The student council projects and activities will be all covered by the budget provided by the school, which should be maximized for reasonable and worth causes. . The student council will also host different fundraising programs to gain extra money that can be either added to the council's budget or used for charitable purposes to beneficiaries.

Out of all responsibilities stated, establishing regular and effective communication with the



students is the way to a successful student council. And without effective communication between the two parties, they would not be able to perform their purpose. In the case of the BRafeNHS community, the school is under the online distance learning (ODL) for the academic year 2020-2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. With massive limitations in communication during ODL, the performance of the BRafeNHS Student Representative Coordinating Council (BRafeNHS-SRCC) would be determined by their way of implementing projects and the involvement of the student body with it, the enforcement of school rules, and their established authority.

This research will not criticize the student council as the researchers only aimed to see the performance of the BRafeNHS-SRCC during ODL based on the set variables.

## 2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Generally, this study aims to find out if the performance of the BRafeNHS-SRCC was not affected by the implementation of ODL. Specifically, it will answer the following questions:

1. What is the student body's perceived performance of the BRafeNHS-SRCC during ODL in terms of:
  1. authority;
  2. communication with the student body;
  3. implementation of school rules and regulations; and
  4. implementation of projects and student involvement?
2. How is the perception of the student-leaders on their performance during ODL different from the perception of the student body?
3. Does the BRafeNHS-SRCC continue to function effectively with the implementation of ODL for A.Y 2020-2021?

## 3. HYPOTHESIS

The following are the null and alternative hypotheses of this research.

### 3.1 Null Hypothesis

The BRafeNHS-SRCC is functioning effectively amidst the implementation of ODL for A.Y. 2020-2021, based on the perception of the student body.

### 3.2 Alternative Hypothesis

The BRafeNHS-SRCC is not functioning effectively amidst the implementation of ODL for A.Y. 2020-2021, based on the perception of the student body.

## 4. Methodology

The researchers administered a survey questionnaire to the 75% of the total population of BRafeNHS students with a 5% margin of error to know the perspective of the student body about the performance of the BRafeNHS-SRCC during ODL. Some of the respondents, selected through a direct selection method, were interviewed by the researchers for an in-depth analysis of their perspective.

The BRafeNHS-SRCC committees for this study were the Executive, Legislative, and Media. The following committees were assessed for the study due to their functions: the Executive Committee presides over the entire student council; the Legislative Committee involves the level representative who handles the concern of a batch they hold and supervise the class officers; and the Media Committee is responsible for the social media accounts and online programs of the council. The researchers believed that these leaders are in the frontlines of council activities even in ODL.

The mentioned student-leaders also answered the survey questionnaire on how they perceived their performance during online distance learning and were also interviewed by the researchers. It allowed the researchers to compare and contrast the data coming from the different groups of participants and formulate more concrete and comprehensive conclusions about the effectiveness of the student-leaders during ODL.

In analyzing the collected quantitative data, the researchers used Descriptive Statistical Analysis. The measure of central tendency (mean) constitutes a prerequisite for the t-test. The two-tail independent sample T-test showed how significant the differences between the perspective of student-leaders and student body were.

## 5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TABLE 1: PERFORMANCE OF THE STUDENT-LEADERS AS PERCEIVED BY THEMSELVES

STUDENT-LEADER	MEAN SCORES OF PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE			
	Authority	Communication with the Student Body	Implementation of School Rules and Regulations	Implementation of Projects and Student Involvement
A	3.60	3.50	3.80	4.00
B	3.60	3.67	4.00	4.00
C	3.80	3.83	4.00	4.00
D	3.40	3.83	3.60	3.75
E	3.20	3.00	2.60	2.75
F	3.80	3.83	3.00	3.00
G	3.60	3.00	2.40	4.00
H	3.00	3.33	3.60	3.00
I	2.40	3.17	1.80	4.00
J	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
K	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.00
L	3.80	3.67	4.00	3.75
M	4.00	3.83	3.80	4.00
N	3.60	3.67	3.60	3.75
O	2.80	2.67	3.00	2.75
P	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Q	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.00
R	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
S	2.80	2.83	2.20	3.25
T	3.00	3.50	3.20	3.00
U	2.00	2.00	2.40	2.00



One of the objectives of this research was to determine the perception of the student-leaders on their performance during ODL. This study considered four variables as a means to rate the student council.

The first variable, an established authority, 17 out of 21 student-leaders scored 3.00 or higher in their mean scores. Student-Leader U had the lowest mean score of 2.00, followed Student-Leader I with 2.40. Two student-leaders had a mean score of 2.80 and another of 3.00. Student-Leader D and E with a mean score of 3.20 and 3.40 respectively; four student-leaders had 3.60; three more with 3.80; and six student-leaders scored perfect 4.00. Based on this, most of the BRafeNHS-SRCC had confidence in their authority, with the latter still improving.

In the second variable, communication with the student body, 18 student-leaders scored 3.00 or higher mean score: Student-Leader U with the lowest with 2.00; followed by Student-Leader O with 2.67; then Student-Leader S with 2.83. Two student-leaders scored 3.00, Student-Leader I and H with 3.17 and 3.33 respectively, another two with 3.50 and three more with 3.67. There are six student-leaders with a score of 3.83 and three with a perfect score of 4.00. The results were very similar to the first variable, which means that the BRafeNHS-SRCC was sure that they did not neglect the student body's needs.

For the third variable, implementation of school rules, 15 student-leaders scored 3.00 or higher, with Student-Leader I having 1.80, the lowest mean score. It was followed by Student-Leader S with 2.20, next is Student-Leader G and U having 2.40, then by Student-Leader E with 2.60. Student-Leader F and O acquired 3.00, Student-Leader M attained 3.80, and eight student-leaders have 4.00. It entails that the BRafeNHS-SRCC was quite unsure if they enforced school rules enough, affected by both the new set-up and delegation of tasks.

Lastly, in project implementation and student involvement, 18 student-leaders scored 3.00 or higher: Student-Leader U scored the lowest with 2.00 while Student-Leader E and O scored 2.75. Three student-leaders scored 3.00, Student-Leader S with 3.25, another three with 3.75, and the remaining eleven officers obtained 4.00. These data confirmed that the BRafeNHS-SRCC believed they did more than enough in launching and promoting their projects.

Moreover, during the interview with the student-leaders: The Executive Committee mentioned that communication inside the council is one of their problems. They also scored the lowest on the variable of Authority and/or Implementation of Rules as they believe it was not within the scope of their responsibilities. The Legislative committee said that communicating with the student body had been a challenge as not everyone has an internet connection.

They also never exercised their authority to give violation reports during ODL. The Media Committee was overwhelmed with the number of responsibilities they have during ODL and believes that they were only efficient in implementing projects.

TABLE 2: PERFORMANCE OF THE STUDENT-LEADERS AS PERCEIVED BY THE STUDENT BODY

STUDENT-LEADER	MEAN SCORES OF PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE			
	Authority	Communication with the Student Body	Implementation of School Rules and Regulations	Implementation of Projects and Student Involvement
A	3.55	3.54	3.55	3.59
B	3.45	3.45	3.49	3.53
C	3.42	3.41	3.43	3.50
D	3.48	3.50	3.48	3.53
E	3.43	3.42	3.45	3.48
F	3.52	3.48	3.48	3.52
G	3.47	3.45	3.47	3.50
H	3.38	3.52	3.48	3.56
I	3.45	3.59	3.38	3.56
J	3.39	3.40	3.32	3.37
K	3.58	3.58	3.58	3.70
L	3.34	3.35	3.34	3.30
M	3.63	3.66	3.65	3.80
N	3.44	3.45	3.50	3.57
O	3.41	3.38	3.36	3.36
P	3.42	3.41	3.47	3.46
Q	3.68	3.65	3.68	3.66
R	3.79	3.76	3.76	3.81
S,T,U	3.46	3.45	3.44	3.51

The main objective of this research was to determine the perceived performance of the student-leaders in terms of authority, communication with the student body, implementation of school rules, and project implementation and student involvement. Student-Leader S, T, and U scored as one given that their work was not individually divided. Hence it was not rated per officer.

In the variable perceived authority, all student-leaders scored a mean score higher than 3.30, three of which scored in the range of 3.30-3.39. Ten student-leaders have scores falling between 3.40-3.49, and another three collected scores between 3.50-3.59. Student-Leader M scored 3.63, Student-Leader Q had 3.68 as the mean score, and Student-Leader R scored the highest with 3.79.

As for the variable communication with the students, all student-leaders scored higher than 3.30. Student-Leader L scored the lowest mean with 3.35, followed by Student-Leader O with 3.38. Nine student-leaders attained scores in the range of 3.40-3.49 and five student-leaders between 3.50-3.59. Student-Leader Q and M scored 3.65 and 3.66, respectively, and Student-Leader R scored 3.76, the highest among the scores.

With the variable implementation of school rules, four student-leaders scored between 3.30-3.39, nine had scores within the range of 3.40-3.49, and three student-leaders obtained scores between 3.50-3.59, two had scored between 3.60-3.69, and Student-Leader R scored the highest, with a mean score of 3.76.

In the last variable, project implementation and student involvement, three student-leaders scored within the range of 3.30-3.39, another two between 3.40-3.49, and ten student-leaders between 3.50-3.59. Student-Leader Q had a mean score of 3.66; Student-Leader K has 3.70, Student-Leader M with 3.80; and Student-Leader R scored the highest (3.81).





Moreover, during the interview, the students recognized how the BRafeNHS-SRCC implemented more projects during ODL than on face-to-face; and how the legislative committee addresses their concerns. However, they did not think that the BRafeNHS-SRCC was efficient in implementing rules and establishing authority. They also did not know who the other members of the student council are, other than the president, and their respective level representative.

The majority of the student-leaders acquired 3.40-3.49 mean scores in each variable, except on the variable of project implementation and student involvement which placed the most scores in the range of 3.50-3.59. Therefore, the researchers conclude that the BRafeNHS-SRCC is doing great in their performance during the ODL.

**TABLE 3: EVIDENCE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE STUDENT LEADERS AND STUDENT BODY**

STUDENT-LEADER	P VALUE	INTERPRETATION
A	I. 0.863	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.877	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.198	III. No Evidence
	IV. 0.000004	IV. Very Strong Evidence
B	I. 0.560	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.360	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.0000001	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.000004	IV. Very Strong Evidence
C	I. 0.131	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.054	II. Weak Evidence
	III. 0.000002	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.00001	IV. Very Strong Evidence
D	I. 0.755	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.100	II. Weak Evidence
	III. 0.452	III. No Evidence
	IV. 0.440	IV. No Evidence
E	I. 0.566	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.303	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.026	III. Moderate Evidence
	IV. 0.226	IV. No Evidence
F	I. 0.230	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.089	II. Weak Evidence
	III. 0.00000009	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.000003	IV. Very Strong Evidence
G	I. 0.433	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.0000006	II. Very Strong Evidence
	III. 0.012	III. Moderate Evidence
	IV. 0.000004	IV. Very Strong Evidence
H	I. 0.0003	I. Very Strong Evidence
	II. 0.421	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.664	III. No Evidence
	IV. 0.00001	IV. Very Strong Evidence
I	I. 0.013	I. Moderate Evidence
	II. 0.231	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.001	III. Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.00002	IV. Very Strong Evidence
J	I. 0.000002	I. Very Strong Evidence
	II. 0.000002	II. Very Strong Evidence
	III. 0.000002	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.000002	IV. Very Strong Evidence
K	I. 0.00001	I. Very Strong Evidence
	II. 0.190	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.000007	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.0001	IV. Very Strong Evidence
L	I. 0.083	I. Weak Evidence
	II. 0.196	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.000004	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.171	IV. No Evidence
M	I. 0.0006	I. Very Strong Evidence
	II. 0.335	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.0002	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.003	IV. Strong Evidence
N	I. 0.558	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.344	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.709	III. No Evidence
	IV. 0.516	IV. No Evidence
O	I. 0.180	I. No Evidence
	II. 0.086	II. Weak Evidence
	III. 0.463	III. No Evidence
	IV. 0.093	IV. Weak Evidence
P	I. 0.000002	I. Very Strong Evidence
	II. 0.000001	II. Very Strong Evidence
	III. 0.00002	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.00003	IV. Very Strong Evidence
Q	I. 0.00005	I. Very Strong Evidence
	II. 0.323	II. No Evidence
	III. 0.00002	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.003	IV. Strong Evidence
R	I. 0.0002	I. Very Strong Evidence
	II. 0.000002	II. Very Strong Evidence
	III. 0.0004	III. Very Strong Evidence
	IV. 0.003	IV. Strong Evidence
S.T.U	I. 0.0003	I. Very Strong Evidence
	II. 0.015	II. Moderate Evidence
	III. 0.013	III. Moderate Evidence
	IV. 0.003	IV. Strong Evidence

To answer the second research question, the third table shows the evidence of the relationship between the perceptions of the student body and student-leaders.

**I. Authority**  
 Very strong evidence: 8 student-leaders  
 Moderate evidence: 1 student-leader  
 Weak evidence 1 student leader  
 No evidence: 9 student-leaders

In the variable authority, nine student-leaders had no evidence that the student-leaders perceived their performance as the same as the student body. Eight student-leaders had very strong evidence; one acquired moderate evidence, and another one had weak evidence.

**II. Communication with the Student Body**  
 Very strong evidence: 4 student-leaders  
 Moderate evidence: 1 student-leader  
 Weak evidence 4 student leaders  
 No evidence: 10 student-leaders

For this variable, ten student-leaders had no evidence; four student-leaders got very strong evidence; one student-leader for moderate evidence; and four with weak evidence. The majority of BRafeNHS-SRCC had a similar perception of their performance with those of the student body.

**III. Implementation of Rules and Regulations**  
 Very strong evidence: 10 student-leaders  
 Strong evidence: 1 student-leader  
 Moderate evidence: 3 student-leaders  
 No evidence: 5 student-leaders

As for the third variable, ten student-leaders had very strong evidence; one got strong evidence; three with moderate evidence; and five for no evidence. The data showed that for this variable, the BRafeNHS-SRCC and student body had different perceptions.

**IV. Implementation of Projects and Student Involvement**  
 Very strong evidence: 10 student-leaders  
 Strong evidence: 4 student-leaders  
 Weak evidence: 1 student-leader  
 No evidence: 4 student-leaders

For the last variable, ten student-leaders obtained very strong evidence. Four student-leaders acquired strong evidence; 1 student-leader with weak evidence; and another four student-leaders got no evidence. Again, for this variable, the BRafeNHS-SRCC and student body had different perceptions.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

Although some of the student-leaders doubted their performance due to inconsistent activeness in the student council, internet connection problems, being new to ODL, and performance criticisms. The study showed that the BRafeNHS-SRCC did a great job during ODL. While working as a council, each member had their specific task assigned



to them that could affect or limit what they could do about their performance. Nonetheless, the researchers can conclude that the student body perceived the student-leaders of BRafeNHS-SRCC to be effective with their assigned tasks. Therefore, the researchers accepted the null hypothesis and rejected the alternative hypothesis.

The researchers were also able to identify, through the interpretation of the P-value, that there is no difference between the perceptions of the student-leaders and student body on the variables authority and communication with the student body. For the rules and regulations implementation and Implementation of projects and student involvement, the data entailed that the student-leaders and the student body perceived the former's performance differently.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The study showed that BRafeNHS-SRCC continued to perform effectively despite the implementation of ODL. However, the researchers still hope for improvements for the future academic years in ODL. Implementing projects that promote inclusivity and a system wherein the student council and student body can communicate despite having low or no internet connection, and projects that help the students academically and mentally. Most of the interviewees from the student body and student-leaders identified internet connection and mental health as their main challenges during ODL. Hence, communication within the student council and between the student-leaders and student body should be strengthened during ODL as it would help for the betterment of everyone and the service and leadership of the student council.

For future researchers, the researchers recommend finding a way to distribute the survey questionnaire in each section/batch equally, for more comprehensive and accurate data. It is also better to check first the delegated task of each student-leader to sense the scope and limitations of the study.

## 8. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this research could not have been possible without the participation and assistance of so many people whose names may not all be enumerated. Their contributions were sincerely appreciated and gratefully acknowledged. However, we would like to express our deep appreciation and indebtedness particularly to the following:

To Dr. Heidi Marie Padua, Mr. Jayson Mendoza, Mr. Julian Jeremy Teodoro, and Ms. Djouana Rose Manjares for their assistance and suggestions in the validation of the data-gathering instruments. Also, the other members of our group,

Mary Christine Maala and Sandra Santos, who helped us in the process of writing this manuscript.

To our research adviser, Ms. Shelica Lalucha Tan, for giving us the opportunity to do research and providing invaluable guidance throughout the research. It was a great privilege and honor to work and study under her guidance. We would also like to thank her for her motivation, sincerity, patience, friendship and great sense of humor during the discussion we had with her on research work.

To all relatives, friends, and others, who, in one way or another shared their support, either morally, financially and physically, thank you.

Above all, to the Great Almighty, the author of knowledge and wisdom, for his countless blessings.

## 9. REFERENCES

- Alviento, S. G. (2018) Effectiveness of the Performance of The Student Government of North Luzon Philippines State College. ResearchGate. doi: 10.17810/2015.67
- Badarna, L. K., & Ashour, M. H. (2016). Role of School Administration in Solving Students' Problems among Bedouin Schools within the Green Line in Palestine. Education Resources Information Center. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1092488.pdf>
- Beketova, E., Leontyeva, I., Zubanova, S., Gryaznukhin, A., & Movchun, V. (2020). Creating an optimal environment for distance learning in higher education: Discovering leadership issues. ResearchGate. doi: 10.1057/s41599-020-0456-x
- Black, R., Walsh, L., Magee, J. Hutchins, L. German N. & Groundwater-Smith, S. (2014). Student leadership: a review of effective practice. Canberra: ARACY. [https://education.nsw.gov.au/student-wellbeing/media/documents/attendance-behaviour-engagement/engagement/StudLead\\_LitReview\\_fullrpt.pdf](https://education.nsw.gov.au/student-wellbeing/media/documents/attendance-behaviour-engagement/engagement/StudLead_LitReview_fullrpt.pdf)
- Bukaliya, R. & Rupande, G. (2012). Assessing the Effectiveness of Student Representative Council in Open and Distance Learning: A Case for the Zimbabwe Open University. International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications. <https://arastirmax.com/tr/publication/international-journal-new-trends-education-and-their-implications/3/1/assessing-effectiveness-student-representative-councils-open-and-distance-learning-case-zimbabwe>
- Campaner, M. (2017). The Importance of Student Council: Bridging the Gap. yuda bands. <https://www.yudabands.org/the-importance-of-student-council/#:~:text=Being%20part%20of%20the%20student,of%20a%20chore%20or%20requirement>
- Cayabyab, M. S. K. A. & Racho, M. M. M. (2015). The Effects of Student Government in Makati High Schools. Academia. [https://www.academia.edu/15547571/Research\\_Paper\\_on\\_the\\_Effects\\_of\\_the\\_Student\\_Government\\_in\\_Makati\\_High\\_School](https://www.academia.edu/15547571/Research_Paper_on_the_Effects_of_the_Student_Government_in_Makati_High_School)
- Chapman, A. (2020). Tuckman: Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing model. BusinessBalls. <https://www.businessballs.com/team->



- management/tuckman-forming-storming-norming-performing-model/z
- Charles, K. A. (2015). Factors Influencing Effectiveness of Student Councils in Public Secondary Schools in Kirinyaga East Sub-County, Kenya. University of Nairobi Digital Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/11295/90798>
- Collie, R. J., & Martin, A. J. (2016). Adaptability: An Important Capacity for Effective Teachers. ResearchGate. doi: 10.7459/ept/38.1.03
- Crisostomo, J. L. S., Dela Cruz, J. A. J. R., Galsim, K. P., Sanchez, S. M., & Tamparong, E. M. E. (2020). The Relationship Between the Selected BRafeNHS SRCC Student-Leaders' Leadership Styles and their Perceived Performance of Academic Year 2019-2020.
- Dzivhani, M. D. (2000). The Role of Discipline in School and Classroom Management: A Case Study. CORE. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/43175949.pdf>
- Ganti, A. (2019). P-test. Investopedia. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/p-test.asp>
- Griebler, U. and Nowak, P., (2012). Student Councils: A Tool For Health Promoting Schools? Characteristics And Effects. Researchgate. doi: 10.1108/09654281211203402
- Grigoropoulos, J. E. (2020). How Can Manifesting Leadership Skills Infused with Ethos, Empathy, and Compassion Better Prepare Students to Assume Leadership Roles? International Journal of Progressive Education. 16(1), 54-66. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1245093>
- Irlbeck, S., (2002). View Of Leadership And Distance Education In Higher Education: A US Perspective | The International Review Of Research In Open And Distributed Learning. Irrodl.org. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning. <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/91/170>
- Labor, J. (2017). Filipino Student Council Heads' Leadership Frames: A Phenomenographic Inquiry. ResearchGate. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317041692\\_Filipino\\_student\\_council\\_heads'\\_leadership\\_frames\\_a\\_phenomenographic\\_inquiry](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317041692_Filipino_student_council_heads'_leadership_frames_a_phenomenographic_inquiry)
- Marcus, S., (2004). Leadership In Distance Education: Is It A Unique Type Of Leadership - A Literature Review. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration. <https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdl/spring71/marcus71.html>
- Singh, P. (2013). P Value, Statistical Significance and Clinical Significance. J Clin Prev Cardiol. 2013;2(4):202-4. <https://www.jcpcarchives.org/full/p-value-statistical-significance-and-clinical-significance-121.php>
- Toggl Track. (n.d.). 5 Stages of Team Development. toggl track. <https://toggl.com/track/stages-of-team-development/>
- Ward, S. (2020) What is Leadership? the balance smb. <https://www.thebalancesmb.com/leadership-definition-2948275#:~:text=Balance's%20editorial%20policies-,Susan%20Ward,to%20meet%20the%20company's%20needs.>
- Woods, M. (2002). Student Councils: A voice for Students. Department of Education and Science. [https://www.education.ie/en/Schools-Colleges/Information/Post-Primary-School-Policies/student\\_council\\_voice.pdf](https://www.education.ie/en/Schools-Colleges/Information/Post-Primary-School-Policies/student_council_voice.pdf)