

# Political Orientations of Student Leaders in a Public High School in Isabela, Philippines

Jovelle A. Gauran

Ugad High School, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803271S>

Received: 19 August 2024; Accepted: 26 August 2024; Published: 20 September 2024

## ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to determine the political orientations of student leaders in a public high school in Isabela, Philippines. The respondents of the study were the elected class officers of each class from Grades 7 to 10, and the officers of the Supreme Secondary Learner Government (SSLG) for the school year 2022-2023. The study made use of descriptive-quantitative-correlational-method of research and the tool utilized was a questionnaire. Frequency counts and percents were used in the profile of the respondents. Mean, median, standard deviation were utilized in determining the political orientations of the student leaders while Chi-Square tests were used in determining the significant difference in the distribution of student leader's political orientations when grouped by profile variables. Findings indicate that most of the student leaders were females, belonged to Grade 7 and had GWA ranging from 80-84 during the first quarter. Majority of the respondents practiced Collectivism, Liberalism and Militancy, while a few practiced Unionism. Almost all the student leaders described and practiced their political orientations *Often*. Student leaders in the higher years tend to be oriented towards Collectivism and Liberalism while the freshmen tend to be oriented towards Militancy and Unionism. The student leaders are not distributed differently in their political orientation when they are grouped by sex and first quarter GWA.

**Keywords:** supreme student government, student leader, political orientation

## INTRODUCTION

The school offers diverse range of political learning. This concept describes politically learned opportunities in which students are allowed to govern themselves and show their political orientations through leadership. Indeed, political learning at a young age is important as supported by the primacy principle and the structuring principle (Searing, Wright, & Rabinowitz, 1976) that political orientations are learned early in life and that these orientations are relatively lasting throughout life. Hence, leadership really plays a very significant function in every individual as well as in one's particular profession. In fact, leaders are not inherent but they are made. For instance, student organizations and extra-curricular clubs are opportunities for many students to lead and bestow their powers to represent others.

According to Nelson (2003), student leadership is quite an important characteristic for a school to have because each school, whether small or large, has similar attribute to those of the community from which different abilities, beliefs, values, and backgrounds share and come together with one focus in life. Nowadays, young people are devoted to leadership development and training, thus our research is focused on the political orientations of student leaders in a public high school in Nueva Vizcaya to determine the political orientations of the student leaders and the correlation of these orientations with their profile variables.

Moreover, political orientation is related to the way of having power in terms of political aspects. On the other hand, the term is described as the orientation of people to areas of public life covered by political peculiarity. In this paper, several types of political orientations were identified which include: liberalism, unionism, militancy and collectivism. Ideally, student leaders must have good qualities and characteristics such as humility, open-mindedness and other good influential behaviors that could mold them as good leaders in the society. According to the Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) article by Rodriguez and Villarreal (2003) entitled *Promoting Student Leadership on Campus, Creating A Culture of Engagement*, student leadership is an integral part of students' success by which they develop the ability to influence major decisions that require "listening" and "valuing" in the incorporation of ideas proposed by students. Indeed, educational institutions often focus on new efforts on mutual collaboration, engagement and accountability but fail to include students' perspectives. Thus, students interpret the landscape within the school as void of opportunities as key members of the planning process. One important thing in the process of improving school's holding power and broadening access and success from K-12 through higher education is to complete the picture of engagement, recognition and commitment to support the emerging student leadership.

According to Light (2001), building connections and community life contributes to more fulfilled college graduates. On the other hand, it is a powerful message to people who run schools and colleges such as deans, presidents, chancellors, academic vice presidents, principals and faculty that students who find ways of connecting their curricular and extra-curricular activities were satisfied. Therefore, it is important to create opportunities that encourage students to engage in internal dialogue about improving institutions and activities within their communities which must begin in elementary level.

Definitely, student leadership is most likely developed through involvement in extra-curricular activities that encourage hands-on experiences. According to Gardner (1990), leadership is the process of persuasion that induces objectives held by leaders within and outside the organization and in their positions. In many ways, it is necessary to give importance to students for them to enhance their leadership in which their political orientations are reflected in the nature of the organization and their relationships within the community setting. It is important to secure responsible leadership in the future so that we can demystify its constituent's process and enhance knowledge about leadership. Therefore, learning and studying how to better link and integrate cohesive philosophy about leadership including political orientations of the student leaders is significant.

Nowadays, a highlight issue is the implication of young peoples' individualism and interest for contemporary society. According to Putnam (2000), while civic participation among the young may have declined in conventional spheres, e.g. loyalty to institution, joining political parties and others, problems and issues in the schools expect responses from the students. Thus, most of the students develop their political orientations in school. For instance, high school student leaders are elected every year to serve the student body. They are elected to represent the interest of all students. These leaders are the instrument through which beliefs and issues in school are expressed. Therefore, a person's formal education has a strong relationship with his or her political orientation. Political orientations of student leaders are important in resolving conflict between the administration and the students. Several problems in institutions that student leaders are exposed to may affect directly the behavior of the students. Schools and educational institutions create student central councils and classroom organizations so that problems of the students will be heard and consensus will be achieved.

The aim of this research is to determine the political orientations of the student leaders in a public high school in Isabela, Philippines and to investigate if there is significant difference in their orientation when grouped according to their sex, grade level and first quarter GWA.

## RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODS

The research made use of quantitative design, primarily descriptive-correlation method. The research aimed to describe the political orientations of student leaders and find out if there is significant difference between the profile of student leaders and their political orientations.

The research was conducted at Ugad High School. It is located in Barangay Sto. Domingo, Echague, Isabela, Philippines. It has a total population of approximately 1800 students. The respondents of the research were the: (1) elected class officers of each class from Grades 7 to 10 and (2) the officers of Supreme Secondary Learner Government (SSLG) for the school year 2022-2023 in which they were chosen through purposive sampling. This study surveyed the total population of 80 student leaders of Ugad High School during the school year 2022-2023.

A questionnaire was utilized as the data gathering instrument. It is a form of structured survey questionnaire consisting of two parts: the personal data sheet and the statements for the identification of the student leader's political orientations. The personal data sheet includes the student leader's name, sex and grade level. The 16-item questionnaire on political orientation was made by the researchers and validated by the statistician and content validator. The political orientations identified in the questionnaire were: (a) Liberalism, (b) Unionism, (c) Militancy, (d) Collectivism, each with 2 item-indicators.

The following were the data gathering procedural steps made by the researchers:

## RESULTS

### PROFILE OF STUDENT LEADERS

Table 1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Student Leaders by Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	31	38.80%
Female	49	61.30%
Total:	80	100.00%

Table 2 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Student Leaders by Grade Level

Grade Level	Frequency	Percentage
7	22	27.50%
8	20	25.00%
9	21	26.30%
10	17	21.30%
Total:	80	100.00%

Table 3 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Student Leaders by First Quarter GWA

First Quarter GWA	Frequency	Percentage
90-100	19	23.80%
85-89	16	20.00%

80-84	30	37.50%
75-79	10	12.50%
Below 75	5	6.30%
Total:	80	100.00%

### STUDENT LEADERS' POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS

Table 4 Overall Student Leaders' Political Orientations

Political Orientation	Frequency	Percentage
Collectivism	26	32.5%
Liberalism	24	30%
Militancy	21	26.3%
Unionism	9	11.3%
Total:	80	100%

Table 4.1 Student Leaders' Political Orientation on Liberalism

Statement	Response Distribution				Descriptive			
	N	S	O	A	Mean	Median	SD	QD
n=80								
2. I open-mindedly accept the individual feedbacks regarding school activities and programs conducted.	2.50%	40.00%	32.50%	25.00%	2.80	3	0.85	O
6. I make sure that the rules and policies are suitable to the context of the students before implementing it.	2.50%	25.00%	47.50%	25.00%	2.95	3	0.78	O
7. I make sure that the individual students are aware of and understand all policies and procedures.	2.50%	22.50%	35.00%	40.00%	3.13	3	0.85	O
8. I give chance to student who violated a rule to explain his side democratically before imposing appropriate disciplinary actions.	5.00%	31.30%	31.30%	32.50%	2.91	3	0.92	O
Overall:					2.95	2.88	0.60	O

Legend: N=Never; S=Sometimes; O=Often; and A=Always

Table 4.2 Student Leaders' Political Orientation on Unionism

Statement	Response Distribution				Descriptive			
	N	S	O	A	Mean	Median	SD	QD
n= 80								
1. I try to support the organization.	1.30%	38.80%	43.80%	16.30%	2.75	3	0.74	O
9. I settle conflicts immediately when they occur in the organization.	2.50%	45.00%	46.30%	6.30%	2.56	3	0.65	O
10. I organize students with the same problems in order to address their grievances.	7.50%	46.30%	30.00%	16.30%	2.55	2	0.86	S

11. I manifest concern to my fellow students especially for the needs of the organization.	2.50%	41.30%	37.50%	18.80%	2.73	3	0.80	O
Overall:					2.65	2.75	0.49	O

Legend: N=Never; S=Sometimes; O=Often; and A=Always

Table 4.3 Student Leaders' Political Orientation on Militancy

Statement	Response Distribution				Descriptive			
	N	S	O	A	Mean	Median	SD	QD
n= 80								
3. I expect fellow leaders and students to perform their duties at the highest level.	0.00%	25.00%	31.30%	43.80%	3.19	3	0.81	O
5. I strictly assist in the implementation of appropriate penalties and disciplinary actions to the students who do not obey rules and regulations.	2.50%	51.30%	31.30%	15.00%	2.59	2	0.77	S
15. When someone makes a mistake, I tell them not to ever do that again and make a note of it.	6.30%	31.30%	28.80%	33.80%	2.90	3	0.95	O
16. I remind my fellow leaders and students if their work is not good as I think it should be.	2.50%	40.00%	41.30%	16.30%	2.71	3	0.77	O
Overall:					2.84	3	0.58	O

Legend: N=Never; S=Sometimes; O=Often; and A=Always

Table 4.4 Student Leaders' Political Orientation on Collectivism

Statement	Response Distribution				Descriptive			
	N	S	O	A	Mean	Median	SD	QD
n= 80								
4. I improve my leadership most when I prioritize the group welfare before myself whenever conducting activities and programs.	1.30%	41.30%	45.00%	12.50%	2.69	3	0.70	O
12. I always consult with others before making my personal decision regarding school activities and programs.	5.00%	13.80%	31.30%	50.00%	3.26	3.5	0.88	A
13. I improve my leadership most when I always try to include others in determining what to do and how to do certain activities and programs.	1.30%	31.30%	47.50%	20.00%	2.86	3	0.74	O
14. I ask ideas and input on upcoming plans and projects from others.	1.30%	33.80%	32.50%	32.50%	2.96	3	0.85	O
Overall:					2.94	3	0.54	O

Legend: N=Never; S=Sometimes; O=Often; and A=Always

## STUDENT LEADERS' POLITICAL ORIENTATION WHEN GROUP ACCORDING TO PROFILE VARIABLES

Table 5 Student Leaders' Political Orientation by Sex

Sex	Stat.	Political Orientation				Total
		Collectivism	Liberalism	Militancy	Unionism	
Male	F	10a	9a	8a	4a	31
	%	38.50%	37.50%	38.10%	44.40%	38.80%
Female	F	16a	15a	13a	5a	49
	%	61.50%	62.50%	61.90%	55.60%	61.30%
Total:	F	26	24	21	9	80
	%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Each subscript letter denotes a subset of political orientation categories whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the 0.05 level.

Table 5.1 Comparison of Student Leaders' Political Orientation by Sex

Chi-Square Tests				
	Value	Degrees of Freedom	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	0.143a	3	0.986	1
Fisher's Exact Test	0.278			1
N of Valid Cases	80			

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected frequency less than 5. The minimum expected frequency is 3.49.  
 b. The standardized statistic is -.218.

Table 6 Student Leaders' Political Orientation by Grade Level

Grade Level	Stat.	Political Orientation				Total
		Collectivism	Liberalism	Militancy	Unionism	
Grade 7	Count	4	4	9	5	22
	Expected Count	7.2	6.6	5.8	2.5	22.0
	% of Total	5.0%	5.0%	11.2%	6.2%	27.5%
Grades 8 to 10	Count	22	20	12	4	58
	Expected Count	18.9	17.4	15.2	6.5	58.0
	% of Total	27.5%	25.0%	15.0%	5.0%	72.5%
Total:	Count	26	24	21	9	80
	Expected Count	26.0	24.0	21.0	9.0	80.0
	% of Total	32.5%	30.0%	26.2%	11.2%	100.0%

Table 6.1 Comparison of Student Leaders' Political Orientation by Grade Level

<b>Chi-Square Tests</b>						
	<b>Value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</b>	<b>Point Probability</b>
Pearson Chi-Square	9.364a	3	.025	.024		
Likelihood Ratio	9.108	3	.028	.037		
Fisher's Exact Test	8.898			.025		
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.993a	1	.005	.006	.003	.002
N of Valid Cases	80					

*a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.48.*

*b. The standardized statistic is -2.827.*

Table 7 Student Leaders' Political Orientation by First Quarter GWA

<b>First Quarter GWA</b>	<b>Stat.</b>	<b>Political Orientation</b>				<b>Total</b>
		<b>Collectivism</b>	<b>Liberalism</b>	<b>Militancy</b>	<b>Unionism</b>	
85 and Above	Count	16	9	7	3	35
	Expected Count	11.4	10.5	9.2	3.9	35.0
	% of Total	20.0%	11.2%	8.8%	3.8%	43.8%
84 and Below	Count	10	15	14	6	45
	Expected Count	14.6	13.5	11.8	5.1	45.0
	% of Total	12.5%	18.8%	17.5%	7.5%	56.2%
Total:	Count	26	24	21	9	80
	Expected Count	26.0	24.0	21.0	9.0	80.0
	% of Total	32.5%	30.0%	26.2%	11.2%	100.0%

Table 7.1 Comparison of Student Leaders' Political Orientation by First Quarter GWA

<b>Chi-Square Tests</b>						
	<b>Value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</b>	<b>Point Probability</b>
Pearson Chi-Square	5.047a	3	.168	.172		
Likelihood Ratio	5.058	3	.168	.191		
Fisher's Exact Test	4.895			.185		
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.744a	1	.053	.058	.033	.014
N of Valid Cases	80					

*a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.94.*

*b. The standardized statistic is 1.935.*



## DISCUSSION

### PROFILE OF STUDENT LEADERS

Table 1 shows the student leaders' profile in terms of their sex. There were 80 student leaders of whom there were more females (n= 49, 61.30%) than males (n= 31, 38.80%).

Table 2 presents the student leaders' profile in terms of grade level. The biggest proportion was from Grade 7 (n= 22, 27.50%), next was Grade 8 (n=20, 25.00%), followed by Grade 9 (n=21, 26.30%) and lastly, the Grade 10 (n=17, 21.30%).

Table 3 shows the student leaders' profile in terms of first quarter GWA. 30 (37.50%) among the 80 respondents were student leaders who gained 80-84 first quarter GWA, followed by 19 (23.80%) 90-100 first quarter GWA, 16 (20.00%) 85-89 first quarter GWA, 10 (12.50%) 75-79 first quarter GWA and 5 (6.30%) Below 75 first quarter GWA. It can be noted that most of the student leaders gained 80-84 first quarter GWA.

### STUDENT LEADERS' POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS

Table 4 presents the overall political orientations of the student leaders. Collectivism (n=26, 32.5%) has the biggest proportion, followed by Liberalism (n=24, 30%), and Militancy (n=21, 26.3%) while Unionism (n=9, 11.3%) has the smallest proportion among the political orientations. This implies that majority of the student leaders practiced Collectivism. Brooks (2014) reiterated the idea that student leaders provide support on academic and welfare issues and highly represent the students collectively. She also mentioned that Militancy has been declining especially in the importance of activist pursuits. However, the study of Frank, Carrera, & Dharamsi (2007) revealed that students tend to be more liberal than conservative. This suggests that the student leaders imposed appropriate penalties and disciplinary actions to the students who do not obey rules and regulations in the school.

The student leaders' political orientation on Liberalism were identified with 4-item statement indicators in the survey questionnaire which were enumerated in Table 4.1. As indicated by the computed means and standard deviations, the following were *Often* practiced by student leaders regarding Liberalism: 2.) *I open-mindedly accept the individual feedbacks regarding school activities and programs conducted* (Mean= 2.80, SD= 0.85); 6.) *I make sure that the rules and policies are suitable to the context of the students before implementing it* (Mean= 2.95, SD= 0.78); 7.) *I make sure that the individual students are aware of and understand all policies and procedures* (Mean= 3.13, SD= 0.85); and 8.) *I give chance to student who violated a rule to explain his side democratically before imposing appropriate disciplinary actions* (Mean= 2.91, SD= 0.92). The result of the study reveals that Liberalism was *Often* practiced by student leaders as indicated in the overall computed mean of 2.95 and standard deviation of 0.60 respectively. The findings support the study of Frank, Carrera, & Dharamsi (2007) which states that students tend to be more liberal than conservative. This suggests that student leaders imposed appropriate penalties and disciplinary actions to students who do not obey rules and regulations in the school.

The student leaders' political orientation on Unionism was identified with 4-item statement indicators in the survey questionnaire which were enumerated in Table 4.2. As indicated by the computed means and standard deviations, the following were *Often* practiced by the student leaders regarding Unionism: 1.) *I try to support the organization* (Mean= 2.75, SD= 0.74); 9.) *I settle conflicts immediately when they occur in the organization* (Mean= 2.56, SD= 0.65); and 11.) *I manifest concern to my fellow students especially for the needs of the organization* (Mean= 2.73, SD= 0.80). However, statement number 10.) *I organize students with the same problems in order to address their grievances* (Mean= 2.55, SD= 0.86) was described as *Sometimes* practiced. The result shows that Unionism was *Often* practiced, as indicated in the overall computed mean of 2.65 and standard deviation of 0.49 respectively. As further discussed by



Akinwumi (2015), Unionism promote smooth relationship and unity among students and school administrators. Peter & Ebimobwei (2015) also cited that unionists engage political interactions through dialogue on different policies and even the school authorities in providing services that promote sustained environment for academic discussions. This suggests that the student leaders maintain peace and order in the school.

The student leaders' political orientation on Militancy was identified with 4-item statement indicators in the survey questionnaire which were enumerated in Table 4.3. As indicated by the computed means and standard deviations, the following were *Often* practiced by the student leaders regarding Militancy: 3.) *I expect fellow leaders and students to perform their duties at the highest level* (Mean= 3.19, SD= 0.81); 15.) *When someone makes a mistake, I tell them not to ever do that again and make a note of it* (Mean= 2.90, SD= 0.95); and 16.) *I remind my fellow leaders and students if their work is not good as I think it should be* (Mean= 2.71, SD= 0.77). On the other hand, statement number 5.) *I strictly assist in the implementation of appropriate penalties and disciplinary actions to the students who do not obey rules and regulations* (Mean= 2.59, SD= 0.77) was described as *Sometimes* practiced. The table tells that Militancy was *Often* practiced, as indicated in the overall computed mean of 2.84 and standard deviation of 0.58 respectively. In contrast, Brooks (2014) pointed out that representative function is important and this has been associated with the decline in the importance of other functions like activist pursuits. This suggests that student leaders involved in the study control the basic services that should be rendered to the students.

Table 4.4 shows the student leaders political orientation on Collectivism as identified with 4-item statement indicators in the survey questionnaire. As indicated by the computed means and standard deviations, the following were *Often* practiced by student leaders regarding Collectivism: 4.) *I improve my leadership most when I prioritize the group welfare before myself whenever conducting activities and programs* (Mean= 2.69, SD= 0.70); 13.) *I improve my leadership most when I always try to include others in determining what to do and how to do certain activities and programs* (Mean= 2.86, SD= 0.74); and 14.) *I ask ideas and input on upcoming plans and projects from others* (Mean= 2.96, SD= 0.85). Moreover, statement number 12.) *I always consult with others before making my personal decision regarding school activities and programs* (Mean= 3.26, SD= 0.88) was described as *Always* practiced. Half of the respondents highly viewed themselves practicing this role as student leaders. From the result of the study alone, it reveals that Collectivism was *Often* practiced, as indicated in the overall computed mean of 2.94 and standard deviation of 0.54 respectively. As mentioned by Brooks (2014), student leaders provide support on academic and welfare issues and highly represent the students collectively. This suggests that student leaders accept suggestions and views from others to improve their leadership.

## **STUDENT LEADERS' POLITICAL ORIENTATION WHEN GROUP ACCORDING TO PROFILE VARIABLES**

Table 5 shows the political orientations of student leaders when grouped according to sex. Among male student leaders, Collectivism has the biggest proportion with a percentage of 38.50%, followed by Militancy (38.10%) and Liberalism with a percentage of 37.50% but Unionism (44.40%) has the smallest proportion. However, among females, the biggest proportion was Liberalism (62.50%), followed by Militancy (61.90%), Collectivism (61.50%), but Unionism (55.60%) has the smallest proportion among the political orientations. In contrast, the study of Shkodriani & Gibbons (1990) revealed that women are more collectivist than men. This suggests that more female student leaders do not accept suggestions and views from others. In general, female student leaders have the biggest proportion with an overall percentage of 61.30%, followed by males (38.80%) which have smallest proportion among the student leaders' political orientations by sex. This implies that female student leaders practiced more their political orientations.

Table 5.1 presents the comparison of student leaders' political orientations when grouped according to sex. Results of the Chi-Square tests revealed that there is no significant difference in the distribution of the

respondents' political orientations when grouped by sex. This is shown by the computed p-values which were all greater than 0.05. This means that sex variable had no bearing on the political orientations of the student leaders of Ugad High School. The student leaders have the same political orientations regardless of sex.

Table 6 presents the student leaders' political orientations by grade level. Among Grade 7 student leaders, Militancy has the biggest proportion (11.2%), followed by Unionism (6.2%) and Collectivism and Liberalism (5.0%) which has the smallest proportion. On the other hand, Collectivism (27.5%) has the biggest proportion among Grades 8 to 10 student leaders, followed by Liberalism (25.0%), then Liberalism (15.0%), but has the smallest proportion in Unionism (11.10%) among the Grades 8 to 10 student leaders. Grade 7 student leaders has the biggest proportion with an overall percentage of 27.5% and Grades 8 to 10 (72.5%) which has the smallest proportion among the student leaders' political orientations by grade level. This implies that student leaders practiced more their political orientations. However, Fay & Middleton (1939) supported that there is a consistent trend towards Liberalism from freshman to senior years.

Table 6.1 shows the comparison of student leaders' political orientations when grouped according to grade level. Results of the Chi-Square tests revealed that there is a significant difference between the respondents' political orientations and grade level. This is shown by the computed p-values which were all less than 0.05. This means that grade level has a bearing on the political orientations of the student leaders of Ugad High School. The student leaders have different political orientations across of grade levels. A greater proportion of freshman student leaders were more oriented towards Militancy and Unionism. A greater proportion of student leaders in the upper years were more oriented towards Collectivism and Liberalism.

Table 7 shows the student leaders' political orientations when grouped according to first quarter GWA. The respondents with 85 and above first quarter GWA has the biggest proportion in Collectivism (20.0%), followed by Liberalism (11.2%), and Militancy (8.8%), but has the smallest proportion in Unionism (3.8%). As mentioned by Brooks (2014), student leaders provide support on academic and welfare issues and highly represent the students collectively. The respondents with 84 and below first quarter GWA has the biggest proportion in Liberalism (18.8%), followed by Militancy (17.5%), and Collectivism (12.5%), but has the smallest proportion in Unionism (7.5%). As further discussed by the study of Frank, Carrera, & Dharamsi (2007) which states that students tend to be more liberal than conservative. This suggests that student leaders imposed appropriate penalties and disciplinary actions to students who do not obey rules and regulations in the school. However, contrary to the study of Akinwumi (2015), Unionism promote smooth relationship and unity among students and school administrators. Peter and Ebimobowei (2015) also reiterated that unionists engage political interactions through dialogue on different policies and even the school authorities in providing services that promote sustained environment for academic discussions. Generally, student leaders with 84 and below first quarter GWA has the biggest proportion with an overall percentage (56.2%) and 85 and above first quarter GWA as having the smallest proportion with an overall percentage (43.8%). The findings indicate that student leaders with 85 and above first quarter GWA lean towards Collectivism as their dominant political orientation. The student leaders with 84 and below first quarter GWA lean towards Liberalism as their dominant political orientation. However, student leaders with 85 and above and 84 and below GWA's lean towards Unionism as their least political orientation. This implies that student leaders with 85 and above first quarter GWA practiced more on Collectivism and 84 and below first quarter GWA practiced more on Liberalism. However, student leaders with 85 and above and 84 and below first quarter GWA's practiced least on Unionism as their least political orientation. According to Eze (2015), youths with poor academic background have grown politically through student union bodies.

Table 7.1 displays the test of difference of the student leaders' political orientations when grouped according to first quarter GWA. Results of the Chi-Square tests revealed no significant difference between

political orientations of the respondents and their first quarter GWA. This was evidenced by the computed p-values which were all greater than 0.05. This means that regardless of whether the student leaders have high or low first quarter GWA, they have the same political orientations. In the study of Hawkins (2010), he pointed out that students' involvement in organizations or clubs is negatively correlated with their grades. In contrary, student leaders with a GWA of below 75 results support the conclusion of Hartnett (1965) that too much extracurricular activities involvement outside of the classroom can lead to lower academic performance. However, Astin (1984) directly contradicted that more student involvement is better. It is significant to note that the prime amount of involvement can be largely dependent on the individual and his or her level of participation in each student organization.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Most of the student leaders were females, belonged to Grade 7 and have GWA ranging from 80-84 during the first quarter.
2. Majority of the respondents practiced Collectivism, Liberalism and Militancy, while a few practiced Unionism.
3. Almost all the student leaders described and practiced their political orientations
4. Student leaders in the higher years tend to be oriented towards Collectivism and Liberalism while the freshmen tend to be oriented towards Militancy and Unionism. The student leaders are not distributed differently in their political orientation when they are grouped by sex and first quarter GWA.

## REFERENCES

1. Adams, T., & Keim, M. (2000). Leadership practices and effectiveness among Greek student leaders. *College Student Journal*, 34, 259–270. Retrieved on December 02, 2018.
2. Akinwumi, B. (2015). *Student unionism is losing*. Retrieved on January 03, 2019 from <http://thenationonlineng.net/students-unionism-is-losing/>.
3. Andring, H. (2002). Advising the involved student: When extracurricular involvement compromises academic achievement. *The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal*. Retrieved on November 2018 from <http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor>.
4. Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
5. Baker, C. (2008). Under-represented college students and extracurricular involvement: The effects of various student organizations on academic performance. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11(3), 273-298.
6. Brooks, R. (2014). *What role do students' unions play in today's HE system?* Retrieved on January 03, 2019 from <https://blogs.surrey.ac.uk/sociology/2014/08/20/what-role-do-students-unions-play-in-todays-he-system/>.
7. Collison, M. (1990, March 28). Colleges pay attention to time students spend outside the classroom. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 02, 2019 from <http://www.chronicle.com>.
8. Evans, N., Forney, D., & DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
9. Eze, P. (2015). *Student unionism*. Retrieved January 03, 2019 from <http://sunnewsonline.com/new/student-unionism>.
10. Fay, P., & Middleton, W. (1939). *Certain factors related to liberal and conservative attitudes of college students; sex, classification, fraternity membership, major subject*. Retrieved on January 03, 2019 from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1940-00419-001>.
11. Foubert, J., & Gainger, L. (2006). Effects of involvement in clubs and organizations on the psychosocial development of first-year and senior college students. *NASPA Journal*, 43(1), 166-182.

12. Frank, E., Carrera, J., & Dharamsi, S.(2007). *Political self-characterization of US medical students*. Retrieved on January 03, 2019 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1829428/>.
13. Gardner, J. (1990) On Leadership. *New York, NY: The Free Press*. Retrieved on January 2019 from <http://www.altfeldinc.com/pdfs/JohnWGardner.pdf>.
14. Gyamerah, D. A., et. al. (2014). *Assessing the impact of student politics on academic Performance among student leaders- a case study Koforridua Polytechnic*.
15. Haber, P. (2010). Iron sharpens iron: Exploring the experiences of female college student leaders. *Advancing Women in Leadership Vol. 31, pp. 86-101, 2011*. Retrieved September 23, 2018 from [http://advancingwomen.com/awl/awl\\_wordpress/ISSN\\_1093-7099](http://advancingwomen.com/awl/awl_wordpress/ISSN_1093-7099).
16. Hartnett, R. (1965). Involvement in co-curricular activities as a factor in Academic performance. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 6, 272-274.
17. Hawkins, A. (2010) Relationship between undergraduate student activities and academic performance. *College of Technology Directed Projects*. Retrieved on December 15, 2018 from <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/techdirproj/13>.
18. Huang, Y., & Chang, S. (2004). Academic and co-curricular involvement: their relationship and the best combinations for student growth. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(4), 391-406.
19. Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J., Bridges, B., & Hayek, J. (2006). What matters to student success: A review of the literature. Commissioned report for the National Symposium on Postsecondary Student Success: Spearheading a Dialog on Student Success. Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.
20. Kuk, L., Thomas, D., & Banning, J. (2008). Student organizations and their relationship to the institution: a dynamic framework. *Journal of Student Affairs*, 17, 9-20.
21. Light, R. (2001) Making the most of college. Cambridge, Mass.: *Harvard University Press*. Retrieved on January 2019 from <http://www.altfeldinc.com/pdfs/JohnWGardner.pdf>.
22. Mehus, O. (1932). Extracurricular activities and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 6(3), 143-149.
23. Nadler, M. (1997). The value of student organizations and the role of faculty advisers. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 52(1), 16-25.
24. Nelson, G. (2003). Student leadership today. *School of Education at Johns Hopkins University- Leadership in Education*. Retrieved December 2018 from <http://education.jhu.edu/PD/newhorizons/student-voices-12/student-leadership-today>.
25. Pascarella, E., Edison, M., Whitt, E., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L., & Terenzini, P. (1996). Cognitive effects of Greek affiliation during the first year of college. *NASPA Journal*, 33(4), 242-259.
26. Pascarella, E. T., Flowers, L., & Whitt, E. J. (2001). Cognitive effects of Greek affiliation in college: Additional evidence. *NASPA Journal*, 38(3), 280-301.
27. Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
28. Peter, Z., & Ebimobowei, S. (2015). Leadership and student unionism, challenges and solutions in the Nigerian tertiary education system (colleges of education, polytechnics and universities). *European Scientific Journal*, 11(25), 1857-7881.
29. Posner, B. (2009). A longitudinal study examining changes in students' leadership behavior. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(5), 551-563.31.
30. Posner, B. (2012). *Effectively measuring student leadership*, *Adm. Sci.*2012,2,221234; doi:10.3390/admsci2040221, ISSN20763387. Retrieved November 13, 2018 from [www.mdpi.com/journal/admsci](http://www.mdpi.com/journal/admsci).
31. Posner, B., & Brodsky, B. (1992). A leadership development instrument for college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 231-237.
32. Pritchard, M., & Wilson, G. (2003). Using emotional and social factors to predict student success. *Journal of College Student Development*,44(1), 18-28.
33. Purdue University. (2010). *Data digest: Instruction and student life*. Retrieved on January 01, 2019 from <http://www.purdue.edu/datadigest>.
34. Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of american community* (New York:



- Simon and Schuster). Retrieved on December 2018 from [http://www.bowlingalone.com/media.php3\\_](http://www.bowlingalone.com/media.php3_)
35. Reisberg, L. (2000). Proliferation of campus clubs: Too much of a good thing? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 15, 2019 from <http://www.chronicle.com>.
  36. Rodriguez, R., & Villarreal, A. (2003) Promoting leadership on campus “creating a culture of engagement,” *IDRA Newsletter* (San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association, June-July 2001). Retrieved on January 2019 from <http://www.idra.org/mendezbrown/rosana-may 2003.pdf>
  37. Searing, D., Wright, G., & Rabinowitz G. (1976). The primacy principle: Attitude change and political socialization. *British Journal of Political Science*, 6, pp 83-113. doi:10.1017/S0007123400000533. Retrieved November 2018.
  38. Schragger, R. (1986). The impact of living group social climate on student academic performance. *Research in Higher Education*, 25(3), 265-276.
  39. Shkodriani, G., & Gibbons, J. (1990). Collectivism among Mexican University students. *Educational Resources Information Center*.
  40. Strapp, C., & Farr, R. (2010). To get involved or not: The relation among extracurricular involvement, satisfaction, and academic achievement. *Teaching of Psychology*, 37, 50-54
  41. Terenzini, P., Pascarella, E., & Blimling, G. (1996). Students’ out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 149-162.
  42. Ullah, H., & Wilson, M. (2007). Students’ academic success and its association to student involvement with learning and relationships with faculty and peers. *College Student Journal*, 41(4), 1192-1202.
  43. Wang, J., & Shiveley, J. (2009). The impact of extracurricular activity on student academic performance. Retrieved on November 2018 from [http://www.csus.edu/oir/Assessment/Non-academic\\_Program\\_Assessment/Student\\_Activities/Student\\_Activity\\_Report\\_2009](http://www.csus.edu/oir/Assessment/Non-academic_Program_Assessment/Student_Activities/Student_Activity_Report_2009).
  44. Young, J. (2010). Leadership styles and gender role: Internalization among female managers in the United States; *Advancing Women in Leadership Vol. 31, pp.102-112, 2011*. Retrieved October 08, 2018 from [http://advancingwomen.com/awl/awl\\_wordpress/](http://advancingwomen.com/awl/awl_wordpress/) ISSN 1093-7099.