Social Influences and the Development of Leadership Self-Efficacy among Students

Aquino, Karen Jann M.

College of Arts and Sciences, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, General Tinio St., Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study examined the social influences on the development of self-efficacy among student leaders in Nueva Ecija, focusing on institutional, community, peer, and familial support. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study surveyed student leaders to assess the extent of social support and its relationship to leadership self-efficacy. Results revealed that institutional, community, and familial support were rated as high, while peer support was rated as very high. Overall, student leaders perceived the social factors to provide high support. In terms of leadership self-efficacy, respondents strongly agreed that they possessed very high self-efficacy, particularly in creativity, accountability, communication, and team collaboration. Correlation analysis indicated a significant positive relationship between social factors and self-efficacy (r=0.57, p<0.01), with community and peer support showing the strongest influence. Findings suggest that strong support systems across institutional, community, peer, and familial domains play a crucial role in shaping student leaders' confidence in their leadership abilities. The study highlights the importance of fostering supportive environments to strengthen youth leadership, aligning with the view that self-efficacy develops through social interactions, role modeling, and experiential learning.

Keywords: Student Leadership, Self-Efficacy, Social Support, Institutional Support, Peer Support, Community Engagement

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is an essential developmental milestone in an individual's personal and social growth. It is often linked to affiliation, social development, and the ability to influence others effectively. Kouzes and Posner (2014) emphasized that leadership is critical in every sector, school, community, and nation. In higher education, student leadership has become a significant focus, serving as a training ground for future leaders (Guthrie & Osteen, 2012; Komives et al., 2011). However, as Dugan et al. (2011) noted, the absence of attention to leadership efficacy can hinder this development.

Assuming a student leadership role entails a heightened sense of responsibility, requiring balance among personal, academic, and social demands. As Ray Kroc once stated, "The quality of a leader is reflected in the standards they set for themselves." This statement underscores how leadership is not only about position but also about personal conviction and influence. From the researcher's own experiences as a former student leader and academic scholar, self-belief emerges as a vital factor in sustaining leadership and academic excellence. Balancing organizational commitments and academic performance requires considerable effort, and the driving force behind such persistence is self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their capability to accomplish specific tasks, including leadership responsibilities. Bandura (1997), in his social cognitive theory, identified perceived self-efficacy as a key determinant of behavior, shaping how people think, act, and feel. Within leadership, self-efficacy manifests as confidence in one's ability to lead, which strongly influences whether one chooses to take on leadership roles (Hannah et al., 2008; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Paglis, 2010). Stevenson (2015) further emphasized that without confidence, effective leadership becomes difficult to sustain.

Several factors influence the development of leadership self-efficacy. Personal factors—such as age, gender, and other demographic characteristics—shape individual perspectives. Koffler (2017) highlighted the role of demographics, while a nationwide study by the University of California (2011) found that age and sex significantly influence students' leadership efficacy.

Academic factors also play a crucial role. Academic achievements, such as grade point average (GPA) and motivation, strengthen belief in one's capabilities. McGrew (2008) defined academic self-efficacy as confidence in achieving designated performance levels in academic subjects. It is domain-specific, varying with the type of task (Zimmerman, 2000). In this context, self-efficacy refers to students' confidence in performing academic tasks such as preparing for exams or completing research papers (Zajacova et al., 2005). Higher academic performance often correlates with stronger self-efficacy (Honicke & Broadbent, 2016). This is consistent with Bandura's concept of mastery experiences, wherein prior accomplishments reinforce confidence and reduce self-doubt, thereby enhancing leadership readiness.

Beyond personal and academic domains, social factors—including institutional, peer, community, and family support—also shape leadership efficacy. Higher education institutions often highlight leadership development, civic responsibility, and lifelong learning in their mission and vision (Cress et al., 2001). Institutional support fosters leadership growth (Spillane et al., 2004), while interpersonal confidence enhances persistence, teamwork, and resilience (Habley et al., 2012; Goos & Hughes, 2010). Family and community likewise play a vital role. Rodriguez and Villareal (2003) underscored the influence of familial support, while parental involvement has been consistently associated with higher achievement and personal growth (Mo & Singh, 2008; Jeynes, 2007). In sum, leadership self-efficacy emerges from the interplay of personal, academic, and social factors. These dimensions collectively shape students' confidence to lead, persist in challenges, and develop the skills necessary for future leadership roles.

Research Problem

Statement of the Problem

This study attempted to identify which factors, personal, academic, and social, play a role in the self-efficacy of student leaders. Specific problems were asked:

How do the respondents rate the following social factors relative to themselves:

Institutional support;

Community Support;

Peer Support; and

Familial Support?

How do the respondents rate their self-efficacy as student leaders?

Is there a relationship between self-efficacy and

Personal factors;

Academic Factors; and

Social Factors?

METHODOLOGY

This study used a quantitative research design, specifically a descriptive correlation type, to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and various personal, academic, and social factors among college student

leaders in Nueva Ecija. The relationship was analyzed using Pearson's r and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (PPMCC) through SPSS.

The study was conducted in Nueva Ecija, where five well-known universities (three state and two private) were selected for the research. The study targeted 280 student leaders from these universities for the 2018-2019 academic year, with respondents holding key positions in student organizations. A purposive sampling method was used to select respondents representing the entire population of college student leaders in the province.

The study used a researcher-constructed survey questionnaire with two parts: Social factors (e.g., institutional, community, peer, and familial support) and Leadership self-efficacy. Each part utilized a four-point Likert scale to measure self-esteem, academic motivation, and support. The questionnaire underwent validation by experts and a reliability test (Cronbach's alpha of 0.89).

The researcher followed a step-by-step process to distribute the questionnaires, including obtaining approval from school administrators and ensuring informed consent from participants. The data were then collected, tabulated, and analyzed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Rate of Support from the Social Factors

The assessments of the social factors in terms of institutional, community, peer and familial support are presented in Tables 1 to 5.

Table 1 Respondents' Self-Assessment of Social Factors: Institutional Support

Indicator	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation
1. Leadership programs like in-house trainings and seminars for student leaders are promoted in my school.	3.27	0.63	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
2. My organization is allowed by my school to conduct activities (recruitments, celebrations of anniversaries &others).	3.35	0.64	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
3. Student leaders are given scholarships in my school.	2.86	0.85	Agree	High Support
4. The school that I am enrolled in pro-motes leadership to students through recognition of organizations in school events.	3.28	0.65	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
5. The school has activities/groups that empower students to engage in leadership like student organizations and student councils.	3.38	0.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
6. The school recognizes and gives award to organizations that have great contributions to the students.	3.23	0.75	Agree	High Support
7. When being selected to participate in outside competitions, the school is on full support to the organization.	3.23	0.71	Agree	High Support
8. School officials meet with student organization leaders regularly.	3.04	0.70	Agree	High Support
Composite Mean	**3.21**	**0.45**	**Agree**	**High Support**

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/Very High Support; 2.51-3.25 Agree/High Support; 1.76-2.50 Disagree/Low Support; 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/Very Low Support

The results in Table 1 show that respondents generally perceived institutional support for student leadership as high, with a composite mean of 3.21 (SD = 0.45). Most indicators were rated "Agree" or "Strongly Agree," reflecting that schools provide opportunities and recognition for student leaders. The highest-rated statement was that schools have activities and groups that empower students to engage in leadership, such as student councils and organizations (M = 3.38, SD = 0.59), which indicates that structural opportunities for leadership are strongly supported. Similarly, students strongly agreed that their schools promote organizational activities (M = 3.35), recognize student organizations in events (M = 3.28), and provide leadership trainings and seminars (M = 3.27), all pointing to a very high level of institutional encouragement for leadership growth. On the other hand, lower ratings were given to indicators related to scholarships for student leaders (M = 2.86, SD = 0.85) and regular meetings between school officials and organization leaders (M = 3.04, SD = 0.70), which suggests that while support structures exist, financial assistance and consistent institutional engagement remain limited.

These findings imply that schools are effective in providing avenues for leadership development through recognition, empowerment, and activities but are less consistent in offering tangible incentives and sustained communication with student leaders. While the presence of programs and organizational support reflects institutional commitment to leadership formation, the relatively lower support in scholarships and administrative consultations indicates gaps that may affect the motivation and long-term growth of student leaders. Strengthening financial support systems and fostering more regular dialogue between school officials and student leaders could further enhance students' leadership self-efficacy, making institutional support more holistic and impactful.

The results suggest that their universities highly support the student leaders' aspirations. Universities offer programs to help them hone their skills in leadership. Thus, it can be justified that their supportiveness makes a student leader competent. With the growing population of student leaders in Nueva Ecija, it can be concluded that universities are serious about their commitment to making future leaders. As the primary and the most important organizational experience of a child and an adolescent, the institution aims to empower students to become independent and self-regulated learners (Montgomery & Kohoe (2016). Thus, universities assert in their mission statements about student leadership skills, increasing responsible civic participation, and creating lifelong learners (Koffler, 2017). It can be accomplished by providing students with opportunities to experience and practice leadership through group projects and extracurricular activities to facilitate students' leadership capacities (Komives et al., 2013).

Table 2 Respondents' Self-Assessment of Social Factors: Community Support

Indicator	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation
1. My community collaborates with student leaders during activities such as tree planting, feeding programs, etc.	3.14	0.68	Agree	High Support
2. Community officials are readily available whenever our school organizations needed help.	3.07	0,68	Agree	High Support
3. I receive invites for participation in community service: tree planting, feeding programs etc.	2.98	0.74	Agree	High Support
4. Programs to be conducted by student organizations for the community are always welcome to the community officials.	3.17	0.63	Agree	High Support
5. Community officials give advice to student leaders on how they can help	3.09	0.68	Agree	High Support

create a harmonious environment in the university.				
6. When issues arise within the organization, student leaders can turn to officials for advises.	3.13	0.66	Agree	High Support
7. When activities of student organizations are to be conducted in the community, permits are easy to obtain.	2.98	0.79	Agree	High Support
8. The community officials give constructive and positive feedbacks to the activities conduct-ed by school organizations.	3.11	0.62	Agree	High Support
Composite Mean	**3.09**	**0.51**	**Agree**	**High Support**

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/Very High Support; 2.51-3.25 Agree/High Support; 1.76-2.50 Disagree/Low Support; 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/Very Low Support

The results in Table 2 reveal that respondents perceived community support for student leadership as high, with a composite mean of 3.09 (SD = 0.51). All indicators were rated "Agree," suggesting that while support exists, it is not as strong as the institutional support reflected in Table 1. The highest-rated indicator was the welcoming of programs conducted by student organizations for the community (M = 3.17, SD = 0.63), which shows that community officials are open and receptive to student-led initiatives. Similarly, collaboration in activities such as tree planting and feeding programs (M = 3.14), as well as the availability of officials when student organizations need assistance (M = 3.07), demonstrate a willingness of communities to engage with student leaders.

However, some areas received relatively lower ratings, such as receiving invites for community service activities (M = 2.98, SD = 0.74) and ease of securing permits for organizational activities (M = 2.98, SD = 0.79). These results suggest that while community support is present, it may not always be proactive or systematic. Rather, it appears to be reactive, extended when student leaders initiate activities or request assistance. The fact that officials provide advice (M = 3.09) and constructive feedback (M = 3.11) further indicates that communities play a supportive but somewhat secondary role in leadership development compared to schools.

In summary, community support for student leaders is perceived as reliable but moderate, providing encouragement, advice, and openness to student-led programs. However, the relatively lower ratings in invitations to service and ease of permit processing point to opportunities for improvement. More proactive engagement and streamlined collaboration between community officials and student leaders could strengthen this support, ensuring that communities serve not only as beneficiaries of student initiatives but also as active partners in nurturing leadership growth.

The respondents suggest that their community highly supports them as student leaders. Student leaders view the politicians in their area as people who are available whenever they need them. Student leaders appreciate the help and opportunities the officials in their area are extending them. The results suggest how the politicians in the province are transparent even in the students' lives. It has become apparent that the youth are more engaged and active in politics nowadays (Guiliano, 2017) since they are more informed and civic-minded than before (Hajira, 2016). They are engaged in experiential learning like community service (Guthrie and Jones, 2012). Furthermore, Soria et al. (2013) stated that "students who participated in community service on their own consistently reported higher socially responsible leadership while students who participated in service both on their own and in a student organization reported higher socially responsible leadership in all areas to save for consciousness of self."

Table 3 Respondents' Self-Assessment of Social Factors: Peer Support

Indicator	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation
1. My friends show their support of me being a student leader by being available whenever I needed them.	3.48	0.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
2. Whenever I doubt myself of being a student leader, I can seek advises from my colleagues.	3.37	0.68	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
3. My boyfriend/girlfriend/best friend inspires me to pursue being a student leader, as he/she believes that I am capable.	3.36	0.74	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
4. I feel that I have received enough affection and love from my classmates by being a student leader.	3.18	0.67	Agree	High Support
5. I always acquire moral support from my peers.	3.29	0.64	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
6. When other people negatively criticize my leadership, my friends will always defend me.	3.35	0.60	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
7. I could count on my friends to help me promote activities of our organizations.	3.35	0.61	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
8. I can easily talk to my friends/significant others whenever I am bothered with issues in the organization.	3.36	0.62	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
Composite Mean	**3.34**	**0.47**	**Strongly Agree**	**Very High Support**

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/Very High Support; 2.51-3.25 Agree/High Support; 1.76-2.50 Disagree/Low Support; 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/Very Low Support

The results in Table 3 indicate that respondents perceived peer support as very high, with a composite mean of 3.34 (SD = 0.47). This suggests that peers play a crucial and consistent role in reinforcing student leadership self-efficacy. The highest-rated indicator was "My friends show their support of me being a student leader by being available whenever I needed them" (M = 3.48, SD = 0.59), which highlights the strong sense of dependability and availability of friends. Similarly, students strongly agreed that they could seek advice from colleagues when in doubt (M = 3.37), draw inspiration from significant others (M = 3.36), and openly talk to friends or partners about organizational concerns (M = 3.36). These results demonstrate that peer relationships provide both emotional reinforcement and practical support in sustaining leadership roles.

Other indicators, such as receiving moral support (M = 3.29), being defended against negative criticism (M = 3.35), and receiving help in promoting organizational activities (M = 3.35), further emphasize the protective and encouraging role of peers in leadership development. The only indicator rated slightly lower, though still high, was the sense of affection and love from classmates (M = 3.18), which indicates that while peers are generally supportive, the expression of appreciation from broader groups such as classmates may not be as strong as that of close friends or significant others.

Overall, the findings show that peers provide very high levels of emotional, moral, and social support that strengthen student leaders' confidence and persistence. Such support not only shields leaders from external criticism but also inspires them to continue pursuing leadership responsibilities. This suggests that peer networks function as a vital foundation for leadership efficacy, offering encouragement, affirmation, and assistance that complement institutional and community support.

The results highly suggest that student leaders are highly supported by their peers. It is evident that people around them, like their friends, significant others, and colleagues, are always available whenever they need support. Student leaders highly appreciate this support because they always interact with them outside their homes. It is noted that during a student's stay in the school, they are mostly surrounded by people of their age whom they call peers. Thus, it is usual that they are the people they expect to turn to for help regarding issues surrounding them. It is also usual that they are the reason for staying in school. Students with high levels of peer-to-peer interaction through involvement report higher satisfaction with their overall college experience (Schreiner, 2010). Helping their peers gives Students valuable leadership experience (Koffler, 2017). Connecting students to their peers and their aspirations through leadership development activities is an important milestone in their lives (Komives et al., 2013; Kouzes and Posner, 2010; Kouzes and Posner, 2014).

Table 4 Respondents' Self-Assessment of Social Factors: Familial Support

Indicator	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation
1. My parents understand whenever I get home late after every organization meeting.	3.43	0.69	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
2. My parents and siblings support my decision to become a student leader.	3.43	0.68	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
3. My parents are greatly involved in my achievements in the school.	3.30	0.74	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
4. My family encourages me to run as a student leader in my school.	3.03	0.82	Agree	High Support
5. My parents and/or siblings always talk openly on how proud they are of me being a student leader.	3.02	0.79	Agree	High Support
6. When talking about the future plans of our organization, my family listens attentively and gives advices when needed.	3.11	0.79	Agree	High Support
7. I always get praised by my parents because I can juggle academics and my responsibilities as a student leader.	3.08	0.78	Agree	High Support
8. My family members understand whenever I talk about issues in the organization.	3.10	0.83	Agree	High Support
Composite Mean	**3.19**	**0.62**	**Agree**	**High Support**

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/Very High Support; 2.51-3.25 Agree/High Support; 1.76-2.50 Disagree/Low Support; 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/Very Low Support

The results in Table 4 reveal that respondents perceived familial support as high, with a composite mean of 3.19 (SD = 0.62). While several indicators reached the level of Very High Support, others fell under High Support, indicating that family encouragement is present but not maximized compared to peer and institutional support. The strongest-rated items were parental understanding when students arrive home late after meetings (M = 3.43, SD = 0.69) and family support for their decision to become a student leader (M = 3.43, SD = 0.68). These findings suggest that families generally acknowledge and respect the time and commitment required of student leaders. Additionally, parents' involvement in academic achievements (M = 3.30) was also rated very high, showing that families take pride in their children's accomplishments.

In contrast, other indicators such as family encouragement to run for leadership positions (M = 3.03, SD = 0.82), open affirmations of pride (M = 3.02, SD = 0.79), and praise for balancing academics and leadership (M = 3.08, SD = 0.78) were rated lower, though still within the "High Support" category. Similarly, listening and advising on organizational concerns (M = 3.11) and understanding leadership-related issues (M = 3.10) also fell under high but not very high support. These results suggest that while families recognize and support student leaders,

active encouragement, open affirmation, and deeper involvement in leadership-related matters are less consistent.

Overall, familial support is perceived as reliable but moderate, with strong emphasis on understanding time commitments and supporting leadership decisions, but weaker in terms of proactive encouragement and affirmations. This indicates that families play an important but secondary role in nurturing student leadership efficacy, often prioritizing academic performance while offering conditional support for leadership roles. Strengthening open communication, affirmations, and encouragement from family members could help student leaders feel more valued and motivated, thus enhancing their confidence and resilience in both academic and organizational responsibilities

The results suggest that the respondents' families support them in their leadership aspirations. Usually, families do support each other. It is evident in the province of Nueva Ecija that parents involve themselves in the activities of their children, such as student organizations. This might also be because student leaders can juggle their academics and organizations. Thus, their families have full support for them. It is also known that the family is where the student first learns how to socialize with people. Good (2010) stated that each person is shaped by his or her early primary attachment, the family. It plays a large role in development and relatedness to the world. In connection, parents' ambitions concerning their children's success in professional life can predict their children's competitiveness (Khadjavi and Nicklisch, 2018). Thus, a good family relationship impacts students' leadership behavior in social interaction and political belongingness (Ancajas, 2010). Furthermore, the involvement of parents influences young people's civic and political involvement (Contento et al., 2010).

Table 5 Summary of the Respondents' Self-Assessment of Social Factors

Social Factors	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation
1. Institutional Support	3.21	0.48	Agree	High Support
2. Community Support	3.09	0.51	Agree	High Support
3. Peer Support	3.34	0.47	Strongly Agree	Very High Support
4. Familial Support	3.19	0.62	Agree	High Support
Over-all Mean	**3.20**	**0.40**	**Agree**	**High Support**

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree/Very High Support; 2.51-3.25 Agree/High Support; 1.76-2.50 Disagree/Low Support; 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/Very Low Support

The results in Table 5 provide a summary of the respondents' self-assessment of the different social factors that contribute to leadership self-efficacy. The overall mean of 3.20 (SD = 0.40) indicates that, in general, social support for student leadership is perceived as high. Among the four dimensions, peer support ranked the highest (M = 3.34, SD = 0.47), described as Very High Support. This underscores the significant role of friends, classmates, and significant others in reinforcing confidence, offering emotional and moral support, and helping student leaders manage organizational responsibilities.

Institutional support (M = 3.21, SD = 0.48) and familial support (M = 3.19, SD = 0.62) were both rated as High Support, showing that schools and families are reliable in providing recognition, opportunities, and encouragement, though not at the same level of consistency as peers. Community support, on the other hand, obtained the lowest rating (M = 3.09, SD = 0.51), still under High Support, but suggesting that communities play a more limited and often reactive role in fostering student leadership.

Overall, the findings highlight that while students receive adequate support from institutions, families, and communities, it is their peers who serve as the strongest source of encouragement and reinforcement of leadership efficacy. This suggests that peer networks are vital in sustaining student leaders' confidence and motivation. Nonetheless, the relatively lower ratings in community and familial support point to the need for stronger collaboration and involvement from these sectors to ensure a more holistic support system. Enhancing the alignment among school, family, community, and peer support would provide student leaders with a more balanced and sustainable environment for leadership growth.

Self-Assessment of Self-efficacy as Student Leaders

Table 6 Respondents' Self-Assessment of Their Self-Efficacy as Student Leaders

Self-Efficacy Indicators	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation
1. I am good in organization and management of a team.	3.13	0.57	Agree	High Self-Efficacy
2. I can establish good relationships with the people that I work with.	3.38	0.56	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
3. I initiate every work needed to push through with a successful activity.	3.28	0.62	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
4. I try to be as creative as possible, when preparing for an activity.	3.44	0.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
5. I am able to set a new direction for the group, if the one currently taken doesn't seem correct to me.	3.26	0.58	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
6. I can persuade group members if they don't meet group objectives.	3.25	0.59	Agree	High Self-Efficacy
7. I can delegate the task of accomplishing specific goals to other group members.	3.29	0.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
8. I can communicate effectively with others, because I am friendly.	3.37	0.58	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
9. I can work well despite the changing personality of my colleagues.	3.29	0.58	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
10. I hold myself accountable the decisions I made for the organization.	3.39	0.59	Strongly Agree	Very High Self-Efficacy
Over-all Mean	**3.31**	**0.41**	**Strongly Agree**	**Very High Self-Efficacy**

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Strongly Agree /Very High Self-Efficacy; 2.51-3.25 Agree/High Self-Efficacy; 1.76-2.50 Disagree/Low Self-Efficacy; 1.00-1.75 Strongly Disagree/Very Low Self-Efficacy

The results presented in Table 6 show the respondents' self-assessment of their self-efficacy as student leaders. The overall mean of 3.31 with a standard deviation of 0.41 indicates that, in general, the respondents strongly agree, reflecting a very high level of self-efficacy. Among the indicators, the highest-rated was "I try to be as creative as possible when preparing for an activity" with a mean of 3.44, followed by "I hold myself accountable for the decisions I made for the organization" (3.39) and "I can establish good relationships with the people that I work with" (3.38), all of which imply very high self-efficacy. Similarly, respondents strongly agreed on their ability to initiate activities, set new directions, delegate tasks, communicate effectively, and adapt to colleagues' personalities, showing their competence in leadership responsibilities. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicator was "I am good in organization and management of a team" with a mean of 3.13, which still falls under the high self-efficacy category. Likewise, persuading group members to meet objectives was also rated relatively lower (3.25), yet still within high self-efficacy. These findings suggest that student leaders generally perceive themselves as highly capable in leading, organizing, and influencing others, with creativity, accountability, and interpersonal skills emerging as their strongest leadership assets.

The results show that student leaders in Nueva Ecija are highly self-efficacious in their leadership skills. Student leaders know they possess the skills of being leaders; thus, it was easy for them to rate statements in their favor. They know that when a person is given a responsibility, they must possess and live with the characteristics that accompany it. Students with leadership efficacy are expected to be leaders and to engage in leadership tasks (Habley et al., 2012). Leadership efficacy is the students' confidence in their capacity to lead (Dugan et al., 2008) and belief in one's capabilities and resources to perform a specific task – leadership (Nguyen, 2016). Several studies found that while students may be competent and capable of accomplishing leadership tasks, they

will not be effective if they do not see themselves as leaders (Caza and Rosch, 2014; Cho et al., 2015; Leone, 2015).

Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Factors

Table 7 Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Social Factors

Respondents' Self-Efficacy in Relation to:	Computed r	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Institutional Support	0.43**	0.00	Rejected	Significant
Community Support	0.53**	0.00	Rejected	Significant
Peer Support	0.52**	0.00	Rejected	Significant
Familial Support	0.30**	0.00	Rejected	Significant
Over-all	**0.57**	**0.00**	**Rejected**	**Significant**

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

Table 7 presents the relationship between self-efficacy and social factors of student leaders. The results reveal that all four social factors—institutional support (r = 0.43, p = 0.00), community support (r = 0.53, p = 0.00), peer support (r = 0.52, p = 0.00), and familial support (r = 0.30, p = 0.00)—show significant positive correlations with self-efficacy. Among these, community support emerged as the strongest factor influencing self-efficacy, closely followed by peer support, while familial support, though still significant, demonstrated the weakest correlation. The overall correlation coefficient (r = 0.57, p = 0.00) further confirms that the combined effect of these social factors significantly contributes to the self-efficacy of student leaders. This finding suggests that student leaders' confidence and capability in fulfilling their leadership roles are strongly influenced by the presence of supportive institutions, communities, peers, and families.

This was supported by the study of Gafoor and Ashraf (2012), which states that self-beliefs are greatly affected by the opportunity to be involved with the community and other social interactions. As Bandura (1997) emphasized, efficacy is influenced by environmental factors; this may be an advantage or constrain an individual's perceptions of his leadership capacity.

In terms of institutional support, there is a very high correlation to leadership self-efficacy. It was noted that self-efficacy and confidence increase when universities facilitate student engagement in campus activities, promoting participation in extracurricular activities. Through extracurricular activities, social responsibility improves through leadership (Foreman and Retallick, 2013). Thus, a positive relationship exists between student organizational involvement and leadership development (Ewing et al., 2009).

In terms of community support, experiential learning, like community service, is a primary way to learn leadership. In addition, exposure to politics can also persuade students to become part of their school organizations. Participation in community service is effective in the development of socially responsible leaders (Hunter et al., 2010). Students who communicate with campus or community leaders about a pressing concern, who act in the community to address a social problem, who work with others to make the campus community a better place, and who act to raise awareness about a campus, community, or global problem have higher self-efficacy (Koffler, 2017). In addition, Soria et al. (2013) stated that "students who participated in community service on their own consistently reported higher socially responsible leadership while students who participated in service both on their own and in a student organization reported higher socially responsible leadership in all areas to save for consciousness of self." Furthermore, being coached and observing positive leadership role models via formal leadership mentoring will help to develop confidence in leadership potential (Joo et al., 2016).

Concerning peer support, it is known that during this stage, building relationships with their peers is the highlight of their lives. Furthermore, connecting students to their peers and their aspirations through leadership development activities is an important milestone in their lives (Komives et al., 2013; Kouzes and Posner, 2010; Kouzes and Posner, 2014). Students with greater leadership efficacy are more likely to build positive relationships with their peers, work well in teams, set realistic goals, and have the confidence to address their

challenges. In addition, they have the ability to assess their strengths and weaknesses, make improvements for future learning, and thus have the capacity to learn more (Goos and Hughes, 2010). The sooner students are engaged, the greater the potential for change in their leadership efficacy (Koffler, 2017).

About familial support, they are the most stable support a person could ever have. The leadership skills were initially learned through the responsibilities given by parents. Good (2010) stated that each person is shaped by his or her early primary attachment. It plays a large role in development and relatedness to the world. The parents may influence a child's self-efficacy in numerous ways, such as through their created family environment. The parents shape the family environment by providing children with challenges, new experiences, positive role models, and realistic goals and expectations. Parent expectations and perceptions of children's abilities may influence and shape a child's self-efficacy (Schunk and Meece, 2006). In the twin studies of Cesarini et al. (2009) regarding the extent of parents regarding competition, it was found that parents serve as role models in their children's socialization. Parents' ambitions concerning their children's success in professional life can predict their children's competitiveness (Khadjavi and Nicklisch, 2018). Ancajas (2010) cited that good family relationships impact students' leadership behavior in terms of social interaction and political belonging. The involvement of parents influences young people's civic and political involvement (Contento et al., 2010).

CONCLUSIONS

The study revealed that student leaders in Nueva Ecija receive substantial support from their institutions, communities, peers, and families, which significantly contributes to the development of their leadership self-efficacy. Among the social factors examined, peer support emerged as the most influential, followed closely by community and institutional support, while familial support also provided a stable foundation. Overall, student leaders rated themselves with very high self-efficacy, particularly in creativity, accountability, communication, and team collaboration. The positive and significant correlations between social factors and self-efficacy affirm that the presence of strong support systems reinforces student leaders' confidence in their leadership abilities. These findings highlight the importance of cultivating enabling environments—within schools, families, peer groups, and communities—that actively encourage student leadership. By fostering such supportive networks, institutions and stakeholders can help shape competent, confident, and socially responsible future leaders.

RECOMMENDATION

In light of the conclusion that student leaders' self-efficacy is significantly strengthened by social support, it is recommended that schools reinforce peer support systems by promoting mentoring programs, leadership circles, and collaborative activities that nurture teamwork and confidence. Community stakeholders should also provide avenues for student leaders to engage in meaningful initiatives, allowing them to apply and enhance their leadership skills in real-world contexts. At the institutional level, schools and universities are encouraged to sustain leadership development programs, capacity-building workshops, and recognition activities that cultivate accountability, communication, and creativity among student leaders. Families likewise play a vital role and should be encouraged to provide consistent motivation, guidance, and affirmation to help student leaders balance their academic and leadership responsibilities. Finally, fostering a holistic network of support that integrates the efforts of institutions, peers, families, and communities will ensure that student leaders are empowered to maximize their self-efficacy and develop into socially responsible future leaders.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Ancajas, S.M. (2010). Type of family and academic performance of Grade VI students. Cebu City, Cebu Normal University Library

2. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. Retrieved from: http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1997-08589-000

3. Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. Journal of Management, 38(1), 9–44. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410606.

4. Caza, A., & Rosch, D. M. (2014). An exploratory examination of students' preexisting beliefs about leadership. Retrieved from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2013.801434

5. Cho, Y., Harrist, S., Steele, M., &Murn, L. (2015). College student motivation to lead in relation to basic psychological need satisfaction and leadership self-efficacy. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1061354

6. Contento, J.S.B., Bonghanoy, L.V., Borres, M.T., Montiadora, LT., &Pogado, C.V.J.A (2012). Political orientation and influence in campus-based politics of student leaders in Cebu Normal University. Retrieved: http://www.academia.edu/5428162/

7. Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. Journal of College Student Development, 42, 15-27. Retrieved from: https://www.scirp.org/(S(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=478235

8. Dugan, J. P., Bohle, C. W., Gebhardt, M., Hofert, M., Wilk, E., & Cooney, M. A. (2011). Influences of leadership program participation on students' capacities for socially responsible leadership.Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 48(1), 63-82.

9. Ewing, J. C., Bruce, J. A., & Ricketts, K. G. (2009). Effective leadership development for undergraduates: How important is active participation in collegiate organizations? Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1135780

10. Foreman, E. A., & Retallick, M. S. (2013). Using involvement theory to examine the relationship undergraduate participation in extracurricular activities and leadership development.Journal of Leadership Education, 12(2), 56-73. Retrieved from: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1012&context=ageds_pubs

11. Gafoor, K.A. & Ashraf, M.P. (2012). Influence of School-Image on Academic Self-Efficacy Belief. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED554545.pdf

12. Good, S. (2010). Psychoanalytic theory. Retrieved from: http://samanthagoodlicsw.com/theoreticalorientation

13. Goos, M., & Hughes, C. (2010). An investigation of the confidence levels of course/subject coordinators in undertaking aspects of their assessment responsibilities. Retrieved from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02602930903221477

14. Giuliano, T. (2017). Politicians and student activists stress importance of dialogue between University and government'. https://www.statepress.com/article/2018/02/sppolitics-students-and-state-leaders-foster-relationships

15. Guthrie, K. L., & Osteen, L. (Eds.). (2012). New directions for student services: Developing students' leadership capacity (140th ed.). San Francisco, CA: JosseyBass.

16. Guthrie, K. L., & Jones, T. B. (2012). Teaching and learning: Using experiential learning and reflection for leadership education. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20031

17. Habley, W. R., Bloom, J. L., & Robbins, S. B. (2012). Increasing persistence: Research-based strategies for college student success. San Francisco, CA:Jossey-Bass

18. Hajira, A. (2018). What is the effect of politics on students? Retrieved from: https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-effect-of-politics-on-students

19. Hannah, S.T., Eggers, J.T., & Jennings, P.L. (2008). Complex adaptive leadership. In: G. B. Graen and J. A. Graen, Editors, Knowledge driven corporation: a discontinuous model, LMX leadership: The series, Vol. VI, Information Age Publishing Inc. , Charlotte, NC (2008).

20. Honicke, T., & Broadbent, J. (2016). The influence of academic self-efficacy on academic performance: A systematic review. Educational Research Review, 17,63–84. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.11.002.

21. Hunter, M. S., Tobolowsky, B. F., Gardner, J. N., Evenbeck, S. E., Pattengale, J. A.,Schaller, M. A., & Schreiner, L. A. (2010). Helping sophomores succeed:Understanding and improving the second-year experience. San Francisco, CA:Jossey-Bass.

22. Jeynes, W.H. (2007). The Relationship between Parental Involvement and Urban Secondary School Student Achievement: A Meta-analysis. Urban Education 42 (1), 82–110. Retrieved from: http://www.teappoyo.com/bibliografia/Jeynes,%20W.%20H.%20(2008)..pdf

23. Joo, M.K., Yu, G.V., & Atwater, L. (2018). Formal leadership mentoring and motivation to lead in South Korea.Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001879118300563

24. Khadjavia, M., & Nicklischc, A. (2018). Parents' ambitions and children's competitiveness. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S016748701630280X

25. Koffler, J.A. (2017). Factors influencing leadership efficacy for traditional-aged sophomore male college students. Retrieved from: https://pilotscholars.up.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1044&context=etd

26. Komives, S. R., Dugan, J. P., Owen, J. E., Slack, C., & Wagner, W. (2011). The handbook for student leadership development (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

27. Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2013). Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

28. Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2010). The truth about leadership: The no-fads, heart of-the-matter facts you need to know. Retrieved from: https://www.ebscohost.com/uploads/corpLearn/pdf/TruthAboutLeadership_BBS.pdf

29. Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2014). The student leadership challenge: Five practices for becoming an exemplary leader (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

30. Leone, D. (2015). Effects of undergraduate leadership experiences on leadership Efficacy.Retrieved from: https://mountainscholar.org/bitstream/handle/10217/166934/Leone_colostate_0053A_12896.pdf?sequence=1

31. McGrew, K. (2008). Beyond IQ: A Model of Academic Competence &Motivation (MACM). Retrieved from: www.iapsych.com/acmcework/Academicself-efficacy.html

32. Mo, Y., & Singh, K. (2008). Parents' relationship and involvement: Effects on students' school engagement and performance.Research in Middle Level Education Online (RMLE Online), 31(10), 1-11. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ801108

33. Montgomery, A., & Kehoe, I. (2016). Reimagining the Purpose of Schools and Educational Organizations: Developing Critical Thinking, Agency, Beliefs in Schools and Educational Organizations. 10.1007/978-3-319-24699-4.

34. Nguyen, D. H. K. (2016). Student success through leadership self-efficacy: A comparison of international and domestic students. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1125559.pdf

35. Paglis, L.L. (2010). Leadeship self-efficacy: Research findings and practical applications. Retrieved from: https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/02621711011072487

36. Rodriguez, R.G., & Villarreal, A. (2003). Promoting student leadership on campus-creating a culture of engagement.Retrieved from: https://www.idra.org/resource-center/promoting-student-leadership-on-campus/

37. Schunk, D.H., &Meece, J.L. (2006). Self-efficacy development in adolescence. In F. Pajares& T. Urdan (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (pp. 71-96). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

38. Schreiner, L. A. (2010). Factors that contribute to sophomore success and satisfaction. In M. S. Hunter, B. F. Tobolowsky, J. N. Gardner, S. E. Evenbeck, J. A. Pattengale, M. A. Schaller & L. A. Schreiner (Eds.), Helping sophomores succeed: Understanding and improving the second-year experience (pp. 43-65). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

39. Spillane, J.S., Diamond, J.B., & Halverson, R. (2004). Distributed leadership: Toward a theory of school leadership practice. Retrieved from:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23739012_Distributed_Leadership_Toward_a_Theory_of_School_Leadership_Practice

40. Soria, K., Fink, A., Lepkowski, C. & Snyder, L. (2013). Undergraduate Student Leadership and Social Change.Journal and College and Character, 14(3), 241-252. Retrieved from: ttps://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1515/jcc-2013-0031

41. University of California. (2011). Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) Survey. Retrieved from: https://ir.ucsd.edu/undergrad/surveys/msl.html (accessed September 6, 2018).

42. Zajacova, A., Lynch, S.M., &Espenshade, T.J. (2005). Self-efficacy, stress, and academic success in college.Research in Higher Education, 46 (6), 677-706. Retrieved from: https://www.princeton.edu/~tje/files/Self%20Efficacy%20and%20Stress%20Zajacova%20Lynch%20Espenshade%20Sept%202005.pdf

43. Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25, 82-91. Retrieved from: http://acmd615.pbworks.com/f/SelfEfficacyMotivation.pdf In text citation: (Zimmerman, 2000).