

# 學生領袖的領導統御風格研究-以菲律賓宿霧市西南大學為例

陳淑芬

中華醫事科技大學通識教育中心 台南市仁德區文華一街 89 號

## 摘要

本研究旨在探討菲律賓宿霧省西南大學學生領袖的領導態度和技巧。本研究採用量性與質性方法，研究對象為西南大學學生組織的領袖。研究結果顯示，學生領袖在吸引力、資訊分享和對成員的掌控等態度顯示良好特質；但未顯出良好的參與感。大部分的學生領袖具備合作的風格，與授權的特質未呈現顯著相關；但與資訊分享 和專斷獨行有顯著相關。

**關鍵詞：**學生領袖、領導統御風格

## STUDENT LEADERSHIP AT SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY CEBU CITY, PHILIPPINES

Chen, Shu-Fen

General Education Center, Chung Hwa University of Medical Technology

### Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between participatory leadership attitudes and skills of student leaders at Southwestern University, Cebu City during the SY 2009-2010. This study utilized the descriptive-correlational design. The results showed that, generally, student leaders were good in their capacity, information sharing and control components in their participatory leadership attitudes. Nevertheless, they were fair in the participation component. Majority of the student leaders have collaborative leadership styles. There was a significant relationship between the information sharing attitudes and autocratic style of leadership. However, no significant relationship between the capacity and empowering leadership style of the student leaders was showed.

**Key words:** student leaders, student leadership

## **Rationale of the Study**

Students are customers of any academic institutions. They are not only recipients of knowledge but they are also human elements to be molded so that they will become better citizens of their country in the future. Providing an atmosphere that will hone their knowledge, talents, and skills is an important goal of any schools across levels and across the globe.

Student leadership is a skill needing practice. Student organizations and councils are avenues for developing their talents and skills. Their communicative competence and interpersonal intelligence are honed when they are given responsibilities as leaders or point persons in various co-curricular activities in school throughout the school year.

Historically, student leadership in Southwestern University has stumble upon various challenges which include rallies, boycotts and massive walkouts from classes either to protest tuition fee increase in school or expression of discontentment on a government policy. Political exercises have created an atmosphere of learning and strengthening leadership skills through school-based governance and journalism. The later part of martial law era, early 1980s and during the Ramos administration, student activism were headed by student leaders from different private and public colleges and universities, Southwestern University included.

Student leaders come and go. Their idealism has permeated throughout the decades of existence of Southwestern University. Their active involvement in student governance and various student related activities has armed them with much confidence, clarity of purpose, development of their communication skills and love of country and school.

These hidden advantages and benefits have prepared them in the real world of leadership, either in public service, private practice or family life. It is in this premise that the researcher is interested in determining the relationship between participatory leadership attitudes and skills of student leaders at Southwestern University, Cebu City during the SY 2007-2008.

## **Theoretical Background**

This study is anchored on the models of participative effects. These are cognitive participative effects, affective models of participative effects and contingency models of

participative effects. Cognitive models of participation propose that participation leads to increases in productivity through bringing high-quality information to decisions and through increasing knowledge at times of implementation. Such models predict that: (1) the effects of participation on an individual's productivity will be the strongest for decision that draw on the individual's expertise; (2) there will not be a direct influence of participation on job satisfaction. Rather, the effect of participation on productivity will mediate this effect and (3) participation in specific decision is necessary for increases in productivity and satisfaction; working in a participative climate is not adequate (Miller, 2006).

Affective models suggest that participation will satisfy higher-order needs of workers and that, as these needs are satisfied, workers will be more satisfied with their jobs. Such models predict that: (1) working in a participative climate is adequate for increasing workers' productivity. It is not necessary that works participate in decision on which they have special knowledge. (2) There is no direct link between participation and productivity. Rather, improved attitudes reduce resistance to change and increase motivation through the satisfaction of needs. (3) Participation may provide more noticeable increases in satisfaction for employees who are not having higher-order needs fulfilled from other aspects of their jobs (Miller, 2006).

Contingency models of participation suggest that no single model of participation is appropriate for all employees in all organizations. Instead, various contingency models predict that: (1) Employees with high needs for independence and personalities with low authoritarianism will be the most positively influenced by participation. (2) Some decisions are more appropriate for participation than others. Appropriateness depends on requirements for the quality or acceptance of a decision (Vroom and Yetton, 1973), or on its complexity. (3) Employees who value participation will be the most positively influenced by it, and these are likely to be higher-level employees, or individuals working in research or service industries (Miller, 2006).

Miller and Monge (2006) support some current wisdom about the effects of participation and extend our knowledge of the participative process in organizations in important ways. First, the meta-analysis provides some support for the conclusions reached by Locke and Schweiger (1979). Participation has an effect on both satisfaction is somewhat stronger than its effect on productivity. This meta-analysis allowed us to be more explicit about these effects. We can now quiet precise statements about the

magnitude of the effect of participation on satisfaction and productivity. In addition, strong evidence exists for a consistent and substantial effect of research setting in these studies, because consideration of this methodological variable considerably reduces the variance among studies. Finally, our analysis indicates specific organizational factors that may enhance or constrain the effect of participation. For example, there is evidence that participative climate has a more substantial effect on workers' satisfaction than participation in specific decision, and it appears that participation in goal setting does not have a strong effect on productivity.

McGregor's theory X and Y is also the basis of this study. Theory X, which many managers practice, management assumes employees are inherently lazy and will avoid work if they can. They inherently dislike work. Because of this, workers need to be closely supervised and comprehensive systems of controls developed. A hierarchical structure is needed with narrow span of control at each and every level. According to this theory, employees will show little ambition without an enticing incentive program and will avoid responsibility whenever they can. According to Michael J. Papa, if the organizational goals are to be met, theory X managers rely heavily on threat and coercion to gain their employee's compliance. Beliefs of this theory lead to mistrust, highly restrictive supervision, and a punitive atmosphere. The Theory X manager tends to believe that everything must end in blaming someone. He or she thinks all prospective employees are only out for themselves. Usually these managers feel the sole purpose of the employee's interest in the job is money. They will blame the person first in most situations, without questioning whether it may be the system, policy, or lack of training that deserves the blame. A Theory X manager believes that his or her employees do not really want to work, that they would rather avoid responsibility and that it is the manager's job to structure the work and energize the employee. One major flaw of this management style is it is much more likely to cause Diseconomies of Scale in large businesses (en.wikipedia.org).

Theory Y, management assumes employees *may be* ambitious and self-motivated and exercise self-control. It is believed that employees enjoy their mental and physical work duties. According to Papa, to them work is as natural as play. They possess the ability for creative problem solving, but their talents are underused in most organizations. Given the proper conditions, theory Y managers believe that employees will learn to seek out and accept responsibility and to exercise self-control and self-direction in accomplishing objectives to which they are committed. A Theory Y manager believes

that, given the right conditions, most people will want to do well at work. They believe that the satisfaction of doing a good job is a strong motivation. Many people interpret Theory Y as a positive set of beliefs about workers. A close reading of *The Human Side of Enterprise* reveals that McGregor simply argues for managers to be open to a more positive view of workers and the possibilities that this creates. He thinks that Theory Y managers are more likely than Theory X managers to develop the climate of trust with employees that is required for human resource development. It's here through human resource development that is a crucial aspect of any organization. This would include managers communicating openly with subordinates, minimizing the difference between superior-subordinate relationships, creating a comfortable environment in which subordinates can develop and use their abilities. This climate would include the sharing of decision making so that subordinates have say in decisions that influence them ([en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)).

Students participation and rights to organized themselves is guaranteed by the Philippine Constitution Article III Section 8, to wit: the right of the people, including those employed in the public and private sectors, to form unions, associations, or societies for purposes not contrary to law shall not be abridged. Thus, House Bill 2584 is filed to uphold rights of students by Congresswoman Riza Honteveros-Baraquel. The bill seeks to protect and promote the following rights and freedoms: Right against discrimination on the basis of several grounds. - Discrimination takes place when there is denial of admission, expulsion from an educational institution, punishment with disciplinary action, including mandatory counseling, or denial of welfare services, scholarships and other privileges based on grounds protected by the UN (sex, gender, ethnicity, disability, etc.); Right to competent instruction and relevant quality education. - Schools are compelled to allow students to evaluate the content of the curriculum and the performance of their teachers at the end of the semester; Right to organize. - The right to organize of students shall be protected and promoted: the accreditation of orgs shall be administered by the school, but the guidelines shall be crafted by the students and students have representation in the accreditation committee ([www.akbayan.org](http://www.akbayan.org)).

The above theories and literatures serve as bases in the development of problem, methodology and in the interpretation of the findings.

## **The Problem**

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study will assess and determine the relationship between participatory leadership attitudes and skills of student leaders at Southwestern University, Cebu City during the SY 2009-2010. The results of this study will be the bases for a proposed student leadership training program.

Specifically, this study will answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of participatory leadership attitudes of students with reference to:
  - 1.1 Capacity;
  - 1.2 Information sharing;
  - 1.3 Participation; and
  - 1.4 Control?
2. What is the level of leadership skills of students as perceived by their members and by themselves?
3. What are the greatest leadership strengths possessed by the students as perceived by their members and by themselves?
4. What are the leadership skills that they need to work on and improve?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the participatory leadership attitudes and skills?
6. Is there a significant difference between the perceived leadership skills of the members and by themselves?
7. What student leadership program can be proposed based on the findings of this study?

### **Significance of the Study**

Student leadership is always significant in all schools and levels in this country and the world. The findings will always be significant to all school stakeholders. Specifically this study will be beneficial to the following:

## **Methodology**

### **Research Design**

This study will utilize the descriptive-correlational design to determine the relationship between participatory leadership attitudes and skills of student leaders at Southwestern University, Cebu City during the SY 2007-2008

### **Research Respondents**

Using the purposive sampling procedures, all the Supreme Student Government Officers and Collegiate Council Officers will be chosen as respondents of this study. Respondents should sign on the informed consent form.

### **Research Instruments**

This study will utilize the standardized self-assessment tool on participatory leadership attitudes taken from the book *Managerial Thinking: An International Study* by Haire, Ghiselli and Porter, 1966. It has eight questions to be answered with the strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree.

These questions on leadership, according to Haire, Ghiselli and Porter (1966), are focused on attitudes that pertain to a somewhat unilateral, autocratic approach to management at one extreme and a more group-oriented, team, participatory approach at the other. The questions are intended to capture beliefs in “the capacity of sub-ordinates,” and views on “the efficacy of participation, of sharing information, and of providing opportunities for internal self-control on the job.”

A high score (4 and greater) for each of the four attitudes and in the aggregate would reflect a “favorable” disposition toward subordinates (followers), their capacities, and their involvement in organizational activities. A score of 2 and less might reflect a hesitancy toward the full and active involvement of followers in the leadership context (i.e., a propensity toward leader control as opposed to a participatory style of leadership). The high score might be reflective of McGregor’s vision of the Theory Y leader, while the low score is reflective of Theory X.

## **Research Procedures**

### **Gathering of Data**

An approval for the conduct of the survey will be secured from the President of the Supreme Student Government of Southwestern University. Simultaneously, after a short conference the instruments will be distributed to the target respondents. The data will be tallied, grouped, analyzed and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools.

### **Treatment of Data**

This study will assess and determine the relationship between participatory leadership attitudes and skills of student leaders at Southwestern University, Cebu City during the SY 2007-2008. The results of this study will be the bases for a proposed student leadership training program.

Specifically, this study will answer the following questions:

To determine the level of participatory leadership attitudes and leadership skills of students, the weighted mean will be used.

Qualitative Analysis will be utilized to determine the data on leadership strengths and leadership skills that the students need to work on and improve.

To determine the significant relationship between the participatory leadership attitudes and skills, the Pearson-r coefficient of correlation will be utilized.

To determine the significant difference between the perceived leadership skills of the members and by themselves, the t-test of independent samples will be utilized.

### **Presentation, Analysis And Interpretation of Data**

This chapter presents the data. They are analyzed and interpreted using the theories and literatures cited in the preceding chapter.



### Level of participatory leadership attitudes of student leaders

Table 1 presents the level of participatory leadership attitudes of the student leaders at Southwestern University during the school year 2010-2011. It can be gleaned in the table that student leaders' participatory leadership attitudes on capacity has a mean of 3.45 interpreted as good. the student leaders' information sharing has a mean of 3.8 which is interpreted as good. their participation is 3.2 which is interpreted as fair. The variable on control has a mean of 3.62 which is interpreted as good. The student leaders' level of participatory leadership attitudes is good. This finding mean that the student leaders are generally good in their participatory leadership attitudes. However, they are fair in the participation component.

**Participative Leadership.** The classic study of leader behavior conducted at the University of Michigan by Kurt Lewin and his students, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White, during 1939 and 1940 stimulated an interest in looking at the relative effectiveness of three leadership styles- authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire- on group and individual behavior. Among some of the results from their investigation was the suggestion that leader behavior has a number of different effects on member reactions. Among some of their major observations are the following: (a) laissez-faire and democratic leadership are not the same; (b) democratic leadership can be efficient; (c) greater hostility, aggression, and discontent arise under autocratic than democratic leadership; (d) autocratic leadership produces more dependence and less individuality; (e) there is more group-mindedness and more friendliness under democratic leadership; and (f) groups with democratic leaders are more productive even when the leader is not present.

**Table 1 Level of participatory leadership attitudes of student leaders**

participatory leadership attitudes	Mean	Interpretation
Capacity	3.45	Good
Information sharing	3.8	Good
Participation	3.2	Fair
Control	3.62	Good
Average Mean	3.51	Good

1.0-1.8 - Very Poor      1.81-2.6 - Poor                      2.61-3.4 - Fair

3.41-4.2 - Good                      4.21-5.0 - Very Good

## **Leadership styles of the student leaders**

Table II presents the leadership styles of the student leaders. It can be gleaned in the table that majority of the students have collaborative leadership styles. These are 20 or 58.83% of the students are collaborative; 11 or 32.35 are autocratic and only 3 or 8.82% are empowering. Majority, therefore, of the student leaders are found to be collaborative.

Student organizations that are thriving have discovered that the old hierarchal structure is evolving into a vertical model. In order to survive, organizations must get students working together in a more collaborative approach to solve the challenges. Placing a focus on teams and groups to ensure the best ideas surface and are implemented is proving to be a more efficient way of working. The requirement to work lean and mean, with fewer student officers is the new leadership mantra.

Student organizations have created a culture where collaboration becomes the catalyst for achieving greater business results, leaders have learned: How to influence the behaviors of others to ensure their contributions achieve high performance results; How to communicate in a manner that people find engaging and inspirational.

Influencing the behaviors of others for the purpose of achieving greater collaboration requires leaders to first demonstrate the behaviors they desire. Effective role model as a leader in this area students have been willing to openly and confidently share your ideas without concern for getting immediate credit; open to opportunities to help someone else take on a leadership role; cognizant of finding opportunities to actively engage others to share their insight.

Communication remains the number one weakness of most leaders today. Collaborative leaders understand that their communication style must inspire others to want give more. The ability to engage others in a manner that creates synergy and teamwork is so needed. As good collaborative communicator, student leaders in an out what matters most to your staff regarding their career aspirations; find ways to demonstrate that you understand how to engage with all types of people and find opportunities to discuss the real world challenges your organization faces in a manner that is authentic and inspiring

**Table II Level of leadership styles of the student leaders**

Styles	Frequency	Percentage
Autocratic	11	32.35
Collaborative	20	58.83
Empowering	3	8.82
	34	100

**Leadership strengths possessed by the student leaders**

The following are the common responses of the respondents about the strengths of student leaders at Southwestern University.

1. Student leaders believed that all students have a right to live, work, and play in a safe campus environment. The vast majority of students either abstains from alcohol or uses it responsibly and abstains from other drugs.

2. The university being awarded by the Commission on Higher Education as the best implementer for a drug-free campus, students and parents are aware that student organizations through their leaders are developing their fellow students about awareness on drug use and abuse.

3. The campus and community environment influences students' use of drugs. This environment includes the beliefs and behaviors of other students, including perceptions of norms and what constitutes acceptable behavior.

4. Student leaders invited resource speakers to serve as fully participating members of any campus task force or committee focused on social and cultural activities.

5. Student leaders solicit and respectfully respond to the independent voices of a variety of student leaders.

6. Student Organizations sponsor events where students can discuss their views on sports vent, cultural, environmental drug prevention, generate constructive ideas to tackle the problem, and offer feedback on proposed initiatives.

7. Student leaders remain open to unique and innovative prevention approaches proposed by students.

8. Student officers provide training, guidance, and support to student leaders that will help them meet their educational goals.

Leadership skills are based on leadership behavior. Skills alone do not make leaders - style and behavior do. If you are interested in leadership training and development - start with leadership behavior ([www.businessballs.com](http://www.businessballs.com)).

### **Leadership skills that they need to work and improve on**

The following are the perceptions of the respondents about the skills related to leadership that the students need to work on at Southwestern University.

1. Student leaders may not be role models at times but they work on as they experience leading other students to serve as a positive example to other students.

2. University student leaders are epitomes of values. Therefore, they represent the values and concerns of the majority of responsible students which is anchored on Filipino and Christian Values.

3. Relationship is very important in leading people. Student leaders should develop relationships with diverse members of the student body to gain a sense of where different students stand on the issue of alcohol and other drugs; hear various students' preferences and program changes on campus; accurately report concerns and preferences of diverse student groups.

4. Student leaders have to work on exploring common ground shared by administrators, staff, and students regarding prevention goals, objectives, and activities.

5. Student leaders are the mouthpiece of those who are too shy or afraid to speak out. Therefore, they should speak out when university administrators, faculty, students, or community representatives misrepresent the responsible attitudes and behaviors of the students.

6. There are times that leaders cannot answer queries from students. They are, at times, not knowledgeable about issues in the school. Therefore, they have to speak from the facts and research-based knowledge and not on the basis of personal opinion or anecdotal impressions.

7. They should responsibly report to their peers regarding progress, outcomes, and new initiatives proposed by school administrators which affect the welfare and rights of the students.

8. Student leaders' presence at peak "social hours" can have a positive influence on health and safety behaviors within a group.

Leadership skills improvement of leaders within an organization is becoming increasingly important. Leaders who are able to perform their jobs better and work toward the goals of the organization can improve productivity with fewer "people problems," increased employee retention and greater profits ([www.businessballs.com](http://www.businessballs.com)).

### **Relationship between the participatory leadership attitudes and styles**

Table 3 presents the test of relationship between participatory leadership attitudes and leadership styles of the student leaders at Southwestern University. It can be gleaned in the table that capacity variable under the participatory leadership attitudes have a computed chi-square of 3.690 and a p-value of 0.450. Thus, the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between participatory leadership attitudes in capacity and autocratic style of the student leaders. Capacity and collaborative styles have a computed chi-square value of 5.998 and a p-value of 0.199. Thus, the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between the capacity and collaborative leadership style of the student leaders.

Capacity and empowering leadership style have a computed chi-square of 21.63 and a p-value of 0.042. Thus, the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between the capacity and empowering leadership style of the student leaders.

Information sharing attitude and autocratic leadership style have a computed chi-square of 15.214 and a p-value of 0.019. Thus, the rejection of the null hypothesis. therefore, there is a significant relationship between the information sharing attitudes and autocratic style of leadership.

Information sharing and collaborative leadership style have a computed chi-square of 5.609 and a p-value of 0.468. Thus, the acceptance of null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between information sharing attitudes and collaborative leadership styles of the student leaders.

Information sharing and empowering leadership style have computed chi-square value of 21.633 and a p-value of 0.693. Thus, the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between information sharing and empowering leadership style.

Participation attitudes of the student leaders and autocratic leadership style have a computed chi-square of 5.305 and a p-value of 0.505. Thus, the acceptance of the null hypothesis. therefore, there is no significant relationship between participation attitude and autocratic leadership style of the students.

Participation and collaborative leadership style of the students have a computed chi-value of 7.405 and a p-value of 0.285. Thus, the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Therefore, there is no significant relationship between participation attitude and collaborative leadership style of the students.

Participation and empowering leadership style of the students have a computed chi-square of 13.089 and a p-value of 0.786. Thus, the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between participation attitude of the students and their empowering leadership style.

Based on the above presentation, it can be implied that capacity leadership attitude of the student leaders has an influence in their empowering leadership. This means that their leadership attitude on capacity contribute to their empowering leadership.

Information sharing component of their leadership participatory attitude has influenced their autocratic leadership style. The student leaders' developing attitude in information sharing has a learning on their autocratic leadership style.

### **Participative Leadership**

The classic study of leader behavior conducted at the University of Michigan by Kurt Lewin and his students, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White, during 1939 and 1940 stimulated an interest in looking at the relative effectiveness of three leadership styles- authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire- on group and individual behavior. Among some of the results from their investigation was the suggestion that leader behavior has a number of different effects on member reactions. Among some of their major observations are the following: (a) laissez-faire and democratic leadership are not the same; (b) democratic leadership can be efficient; (c) greater hostility, aggression, and discontent arise under autocratic than democratic leadership; (d) autocratic leadership produces more dependence and less individuality; (e) there is more group-mindedness and more friendliness under democratic leadership; and (f) groups with democratic leaders are more productive even when the leader is not present.

Leadership styles Leadership style is the manner and approach of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people. Kurt Lewin (1939) led a group of researchers to identify different styles of leadership. This early study has been very influential and established three major leadership styles. The three major styles of leadership are: a) **Authoritarian or autocratic**. This style is used when leaders tell their employees what they want done and how they want it accomplished, without getting the advice of their followers. Some of the appropriate conditions to use it is when they have

all the information to solve the problem, they are short on time, and their employees are well motivated. b) **Participative or democratic.** This style involves the leader including one or more employees in the decision making process (determining what to do and how to do it). However, the leader maintains the final decision making authority. Using this style is not a sign of weakness, rather it is a sign of strength that their employees will respect. c) **Delegative or Free Reign.** The leader allows the employees to make the decisions. However, the leader is still responsible for the decisions that are made. This is used when employees are able to analyze the situation and determine what needs to be done and how to do it. They cannot do everything! They must set priorities and delegate certain tasks ([www.nwlink.com](http://www.nwlink.com)).

**Table 3 Test of Relationship between the participatory leadership attitudes and leadership styles**

Variables	Computed chi-square	df	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Capacity and Autocratic	3.690	4	0.450	Accept Ho	No significant relationship
Capacity and Collaborative	5.998	4	0.199	Accept Ho	No significant relationship
Capacity and Empowering	21.633	12	0.042	Reject Ho	Significant relationship
Information Sharing and Autocratic	15.214	6	0.019	Reject Ho	Significant relationship
Information Sharing and Collaborative	5.609	6	0.468	Accept Ho	No significant relationship
Information Sharing and Empowering	22.944	18	0.193	Accept Ho	No significant relationship
Participation and Autocratic	5.305	6	0.505	Accept Ho	No significant relationship
Participation and Collaborative	7.405	6	0.285	Accept Ho	No significant relationship
Participation and Empowering	13.089	18	0.786	Accept Ho	No significant relationship

## **Summary of Findings, Conclusions And Recommendation**

This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations.

### **Summary of Findings**

#### **Level of participatory leadership attitudes of student leaders**

Student leaders' participatory leadership attitudes on capacity has a mean of 3.45 interpreted as good. the student leaders' information sharing has a mean of 3.8 which is interpreted as good. their participation is 3.2 which is interpreted as fair. The variable on control has a mean of 3.62 which is interpreted as good. The student leaders' level of participatory leadership attitudes is good. This finding means that the student leaders are generally good in their participatory leadership attitudes. However, they are fair in the participation component.

#### **Level of leadership styles of the student leaders**

Majority of the students have collaborative leadership styles. these are 20 or 58.83% of the students are collaborative; 11 or 32.35 are autocratic and only 3 or 8.82% are empowering.

#### **Leadership strengths possessed by the student leaders**

Student leaders believed that all students have a right to live, work, and play in a safe campus environment. The vast majority of students either abstains from alcohol or uses it responsibly and abstains from other drugs.

The university being awarded by the Commission on Higher Education as the best implementer for a drug-free campus , students and parents are aware that student organizations through their leaders are developing their fellow students about awareness on drug use and abuse.

The campus and community environment influences students' use of drugs. This environment includes the beliefs and behaviors of other students, including perceptions of norms and what constitutes acceptable behavior.

#### **Leadership skills that they need to work and improve on**



Student leaders may not be role models at times but they work on as they experience leading other students to serve as a positive example to other students.

University student leaders are epitomes of values. Therefore, they represent the values and concerns of the majority of responsible students which is anchored on Filipino and Christian Values.

Relationship is very important in leading people. Student leaders should develop relationships with diverse members of the student body to gain a sense of where different students stand on the issue of alcohol and other drugs ; hear various students' preferences and program changes on campus ; accurately report concerns and preferences of diverse student groups.

### **Relationship between the participatory leadership attitudes and leadership styles**

Capacity and empowering leadership style have a computed chi-square of 21.63 and a p-value of 0.042. Thus, the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between the capacity and empowering leadership style of the student leaders.

Information sharing attitude and autocratic leadership style have a computed chi-square of 15.214 and a p-value of 0.019. Thus, the rejection of the null hypothesis. therefore, there is a significant relationship between the information sharing attitudes and autocratic style of leadership.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that:

Student leaders are generally good in their capacity, information sharing and control components in their participatory leadership attitudes. However, they are fair in the participation component. Majority of the student leaders have collaborative leadership styles. There is no significant relationship between the capacity and empowering leadership style of the student leaders. There is a significant relationship between the information sharing attitudes and autocratic style of leadership.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusions, it is recommended that:

1. The proposed leadership training plan be adapted and implemented among the student organizations in Southwestern University;
2. Student leaders' conference be held regularly so that concerns may be fresh out during the conference;
3. Student leaders should also hold conference with members to identify the immediate concerns of the students.
4. Some policies for all student organizations in Southwestern University should be reviewed like holding of off and on campus activities to improve empowerment and ensure higher level of participation and involvement.
5. Student Development Program should be in place to address the training needs of the students and student leaders.
6. The following titles are recommended for future research endeavors:

The Student Development Program and Student Involvement of Southwestern University Student Development Program and Training Needs of Student Leaders Student Services and Community Extension Program of Southwestern University. The Leadership Competence and Effectiveness of Student Leaders Communication and Human Relations of Local and Foreign Students

## **Reference**

Brown, Brain B. (2005). Change Management. New Delhi. Infinity Books.

Corpuz, Crispina Rafol (2006). Human Resource Management. Manila: Rex Book Store, Inc.

Covey, Stephen R. (1990).Principle-Centered Leadership. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc.

Covey, Stephen R. (2004).The 8<sup>th</sup> Habit: From Effectiveness to Greatness. New York: Free Press.

Covey, Stephen R. (2004).The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People. New York: Free Press.

- Gibbs, Eddie (2005). Changing Leaders in a Changing Culture. Parañaque City: Acts 29 Publishing.
- Drucker, Peter F. (2006). The Effective Executive. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Halan, YC (2005). Managing Leadership. India: New Dawn Press Inc.
- Ivancevich, John M. et al (2005). Organizational Behavior and Management (7<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Jones, Gareth R. and Jennifer M. George (2003). Contemporary Management (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kinicki, Angelo and Robert Kreitner (2006). Organizational Behavior: Key Concepts, Skills and Best Practices (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Kreitner, Robert and Angelo Kinicki (2004). Organizational Behavior (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Little, Graham R. (2006). 5 Steps to Successful Business Leadership. Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.
- Maximiano, Jose Mario B. (2006). Managing Human Resource in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Manila: Rex Book Store, Inc.
- Maxwell, John C. (2005). The 300-degree Leader: Developing your Influence from Anywhere in the Organization. Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- Medina, Roberto G. (2006). Business Organization and Management. Manila: Rex Book Store, Inc.
- Menkes, Justin (2006). Executive Intelligence. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Medel, A, M. Lopa-Perez and D. Gonzales (2007). Frontline Leadership: Stories of 5 Local Chief Executives. Quezon City: Ateneo School of Government and Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.
- Miller, Katherine I. (2006). Participation, Satisfaction and Productivity A Meta-analytic Review. Leaders and the Leadership Process 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. p. 309. NY: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
- Newstrom, John W. (2007). Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work (12<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Pierce, Jon L. and John W. Newstrom (2006). Leaders and The Leadership Process: Readings, Self-Assessment and Applications (4<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill

Poblador, Niceto S. (2008). Global Business Leaders, Show the Way. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing, Inc.

Ramasamy, Subburaj (2005). Total Quality Management. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.

Sultan, Kermally (2006). Gurus on People Management. New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited.

Templar, Richard (2005). The Rules of Management. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.

Wehrich, Heinz, Mark V. Cannice and Harold Koontz (2008). Management: Global and Entrepreneurial Perspective. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.

Zarate, Cynthia A. (2006). Organizational Behavior and Management in Philippine Organizations. Manila: Rex Book Store, Inc.

### **Internet Sources**

en.wikipedia.org retrieved on 29 July 2009

[www.akbayan.org](http://www.akbayan.org). retrieved on 29 July 2009

www.businessballs.com