



Research Article

The Relationship Between Student Leadership's Development Program and Capacity Building Toward the Student Empowerment Program

Sendong Zhang* and Juliet Demalen

Trinity University of Asia; jademalen@tua.edu.ph (J.D)

Correspondence: sendongnzhang@tua.edu.ph;

ABSTRACT

The study aims to explore the relationship between student leadership development program and student leadership capacity building leading to the creation of a Student Empowerment Program to enhance students' industry readiness and quality of life. It examines respondents' profiles, their assessments of student leadership development programs implemented in universities in Yantai City, Shandong Province, and the relationship between these programs and career success regarding leadership capacity-building dimensions (Personal, Interpersonal, Organizational). The researcher employed a descriptive-correlational research design, composed of 537 respondents from three selected universities. The study found that student leadership development programs have a strong and positive impact on students' leadership capacity building. These programs enhance personal, interpersonal, and organizational skills, preparing students for professional challenges. However, further improvement in fostering collaboration, offering balanced feedback, and tracking long-term progress is needed. The findings emphasize the need to design a comprehensive Student Empowerment Program to enhance leadership capabilities and career preparedness.

Keywords: Student Leadership Development, Leadership Capacity, Student Empowerment Program, Capacity Building

Citation: Zhang, S., & Demalen, J. (2025). "The Relationship Between Student Leadership's Development Program and Capacity Building Toward the Student Empowerment Program." CMU Journal of Science. 29(1), 86

Academic Editor: Dr. Michael Arie P. Medina

Received: March 7, 2025

Revised: June 16, 2025

Accepted: June 17, 2025

Published: July 25, 2025



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. INTRODUCTION

Student leadership is a powerful tool and a differentiator in higher education, as it attracts high-performing students. Many employers expect that colleges and universities train students to acquire leadership skills that combine theoretical and practical knowledge [2]. Student competence is one of the attributes being measured if graduates best fit the market and employability factor for future jobs. Engaging in student management work or leadership activities has a positive impact on student leadership development and how they succeed in the future. However, gaps remain in leadership training, requiring universities to develop structured programs that bridge academic learning with professional readiness [8]. The goal of the Chinese Student Leadership Program, like many leadership programs in China, is to develop student leadership potential through workshops, mentoring, and participation in extracurricular activities [4]. Yantai City, Shandong Province, serves as the focal area of this study due to its emphasis on higher education and leadership development. Despite the existence of leadership programs, challenges such as outdated teaching strategies and insufficient mentorship persist highlighting the need for further assessment and program improvement.

This study evaluates the relationship between student leadership development programs and student leadership capacity building, focusing on five key dimensions: purpose, people, positioning, practice, and progress. It further evaluates the impact of these programs on students' personal, interpersonal, and organizational leadership capacities. The findings will contribute to designing a comprehensive Student Empowerment Program that strengthens leadership training and enhances career preparedness.

To address the identified gaps, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

What is the assessment of school personnel on student leadership development programs implemented in schools or universities regarding: Purpose, People, Positioning, Practice, and Progress?

Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the school personnel respondents on the student leadership development program when their profile is used as a test factor? What is the assessment of student respondents on their leadership capacity building in terms of: Personal Leadership, Interpersonal Leadership, and Organizational Leadership? Is there a significant relationship between student leadership development programs and students' leadership capacity building? Based on the study's results, what Student Empowerment Program can be designed to support students' leadership growth and career success?

2. METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive-correlational research design to identify the correlation between student leadership development programs and student leadership capacity building. A quantitative approach was employed using a survey questionnaire for data collection, which required statistical treatment. The study included 537 respondents from three universities in Yantai City, Shandong Province: Shandong Business Institute, Yantai Engineering and Technology College, and Yantai University. The Raosoft Online Calculator was used to determine the sample size, applying a 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level. A total of 206 students and 331 school personnel (teachers, staff, and administrators) who had participated in leadership programs for over a year were purposively sampled. Eligible participants were 18 years old and above, while those not involved in leadership programs were excluded.

A researcher-developed questionnaire assessed student leadership programs across five dimensions: purpose, people, positioning, practice, and progress. It also measured leadership capacity building in personal, interpersonal, and organizational dimensions. The questionnaire was validated by three research experts (two from academia and one from the industry) and underwent a pilot test with 25 external respondents. Cronbach's Alpha was used to confirm its reliability. Responses were recorded using a five-point Likert scale. Data collection commenced after securing ethical clearance from the Institutional Ethics Review Committee (IERC), Protocol Code: 2024-2nd-CASE-Zhang-V1. After receiving university approval, surveys were administered voluntarily, confidentially, and anonymously. Collected data were processed using SPSS Version 27. For statistical analysis, percentage and frequency distribution were used to analyze demographic data, while weighted mean measured leadership program assessments. Standard deviation determined response variability, one-way ANOVA identified differences in responses, and independent sample T-tests were used for group comparisons. Pearson correlation determined relationships among variables, and Cronbach's Alpha ensured internal reliability. Ethical considerations were strictly observed. Participants provided informed consent, and confidentiality was maintained throughout the study. Participation was voluntary, and respondents could withdraw at any time without consequences. No monetary incentives were offered, and all sources were cited correctly. All participants were 18 years old and above, and the data collected were used solely for research purposes.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Assessment of the School Personnel Respondent

Table 1. Assessment of the School Personnel Respondents on the Student Leadership Development Programs Implemented in the School or Universities

Indicators	Respondent Classifications	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Purpose	Teacher	4.91	Highly Implemented	2
	Staff	4.70	Highly Implemented	
	Admin/Head	4.75	Highly Implemented	
	Combined	4.80	Highly Implemented	
People	Teacher	4.91	Highly Implemented	3
	Staff	4.66	Highly Implemented	
	Admin/Head	4.75	Highly Implemented	
	Combined	4.79	Highly Implemented	
Positioning	Teacher	4.94	Highly Implemented	1
	Staff	4.71	Highly Implemented	
	Admin/Head	4.74	Highly Implemented	
	Combined	4.83	Highly Implemented	
Practice	Teacher	4.93	Highly Implemented	4
	Staff	4.48	Implemented	
		4.74	Highly Implemented	
	Admin/Head			
Progress	Combined	4.72	Highly Implemented	5
	Teacher	4.94	Highly Implemented	
	Staff	3.71	Implemented	
	Admin/Head	4.74	Highly Implemented	
OVERALL MEAN	Combined	4.43	Implemented	
	Teacher	4.93	Highly Implemented	
	Staff	4.45	Implemented	
	Admin/Head	4.74	Highly Implemented	
	Combined	4.71	Highly Implemented	

Legend: Highly Implemented (HI, 5) =4.51-5.0); Implemented (I, 4) =3.51-4.50); Moderately Implemented (MI, 3) =2.51-3.50); Slightly Implemented (SL, 2) =1.51-2.50); Not Implemented at all (NI, 1) =1.0-1.50

Table 1 exhibits the Assessment of the School Personnel Respondents on the Student Leadership Development Programs Implemented in the Schools or Universities. It is noted that as to Indicators Purpose, People, Positioning, and Practice, the school personnel respondents such as the teachers, staff, and head/administrators assessed the student leadership development programs as "Highly Implemented" with the combined overall mean value of 4.71.

The highest-rated component is "Positioning," with a combined mean of 4.83. This confirms that student leadership development programs have a strong foundation and are effectively implemented, which implies that there is strong support for strategically integrating leadership development within the institution. This means that the schools prioritize a clear and influential role for student leadership and reflect a strong emphasis on the

strategic integration of leadership development within institutional structures. Conversely, "Progress" received the lowest rating and was interpreted as "implemented" with a combined mean of 4.43, indicating room for further enhancement in tracking and evaluating student leadership growth over time. This highlights differences in perspectives and engagement levels across roles, indicating that staff may feel less connected to the program's structure or outcomes. These results indicate that universities have established well-defined leadership frameworks, which guarantee that student leadership development is embedded within academic and extracurricular structures.

3.2. Statistical Analysis of Respondents' Assessments

Table 2 presents the significant differences in respondents' assessments of the Student Leadership Development Program.

Table 2.1. Significant Difference in the Assessment of the Respondents on Student Leadership Development Program as to Respondents' Classification

Indicators	Respondents' Classification	Mean	F-value	Sig Value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Purpose	Teacher	4.91	16.08	.000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Staff	4.70				
	Admin/Head	4.75				
	Total	4.80				
2. People	Teacher	4.91	24.70	.000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Staff	4.66				
	Admin/Head	4.75				
	Total	4.79				
3. Positioning	Teacher	4.94	21.53	.000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Staff	4.71				
	Admin/Head	4.74				
	Total	4.82				
4. Practice	Teacher	4.93	90.91	.000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Staff	4.48				
	Admin/Head	4.74				
	Total	4.72				
5. Progress	Teacher	4.94	617.56	.000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Staff	3.71				
	Admin/Head	4.74				
	Total	4.43				
Overall	Teacher	4.93	153.96	.000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Staff	4.45				
	Admin/Head	4.74				
	Total	4.71				

@.05 Level of Significance

Table 2.1 presents the significant differences in respondents' assessments of the Student Leadership Development Program based on classification. It is noted that all variables tested are significant.

Key findings include: The overall F-value is 153.96 with a Sig Value of .000, leading to a rejection of Ho and confirming significant differences among the respondents' assessments.

The highest F-value is seen in the "Progress" indicator (617.56) with a significance value of .000, further confirming the presence of statistically significant differences. This finding implies that teachers, staff, and administrators view the program's impact and implementation differently, influenced by their distinct perspectives and responsibilities within the institution.

Table 2.2. Summary of Kruskal-Wallis Test on the Significant Difference in the Student Leadership Development Program as Assessed by the School Personnel Respondents when their Age was Used as Factor

Areas	Kruskal-Wallis H	df	Asymp Sig	Decision
Purpose	13.59	4	0.0087	Reject Ho
People	3.28	4	0.5122	Accept Ho
Positioning	7.35	4	0.1185	Accept Ho
Practice	9.62	4	0.0474	Reject Ho
Progress	13.56	4	0.0088	Reject Ho

Table 2.3. Summary of Mann-Whitney U Test on the Significant Difference in the Student Leadership Development Program as Assessed by the school personnel respondents when their sex was used as a factor.

Areas	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp Sig	Decision
Purpose	14587.5	0.271	Accept Ho
People	13304	0.637	Accept Ho
Positioning	13137.5	0.482	Accept Ho
Practice	13744	0.947	Accept Ho
Progress	14620	0.266	Accept Ho

Table 2.2 presents the summary of the Kruskal-Wallis Test on the significant difference in the assessment of the Student Leadership Development Program based on age.

Key findings include:

Significant differences ($p < 0.05$) found in:

Purpose - Older respondents may have more established perspectives on leadership goals.

Practice - Differences in hands-on leadership experiences across age groups.

Progress - Younger respondents may have different expectations for tracking and evaluation.

No significant differences ($p > 0.05$) were found in:

People – consistent perceptions across age groups.

Positioning - Leadership positioning is viewed similarly by all age groups.

These findings highlight the importance of adapting leadership programs to address age-related differences in perception. By refining program content to align with diverse age groups' priorities, institutions can enhance engagement and ensure leadership development initiatives effectively support all participants.

Table 2.3 presents the summary of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the significant difference in the students' leadership development program as assessed by the school personnel respondents when their sex was used as a factor.

The results are as follows:

No statistically significant differences were found ($p > 0.05$) in all areas:

Purpose: Mann-Whitney U = 14587.5, $p = 0.271$ → No significant difference.

People: Mann-Whitney U = 13304, $p = 0.637$ → No significant difference.

Positioning: Mann-Whitney U = 13137.5, $p = 0.482$ → No significant difference.

Practice: Mann-Whitney U = 13744, $p = 0.947$ → No significant difference.

Progress: Mann-Whitney U = 14620, $p = 0.266$ → No significant difference.

This shows that gender does not affect how leadership development programs are perceived by school personnel. These results imply that gender may not be a vital factor affecting perceptions of the program's efficacy among school personnel. Such uniformity in assessment can be seen as a positive indicator that the program's goals and activities are communicated and executed inclusively, with male and female staff members feeling similarly informed and engaged.

3.3. Perceived Effects of the Student Leadership Development Program on Career Success

Table 3 presents the assessment on the perceived effects of the Student Leadership Development Program on their future career success across three leadership capacity building dimensions: Personal, Interpersonal, and Organizational.

Table 3. Assessment of the Student Respondents on the Perceived Effects of the Student Leadership Development Program to their Leadership Capacity

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Personal	4.41	Agree/High Effect	3
2. Interpersonal	4.42	Agree/High Effect	2
3. Organizational	4.44	Agree/High Effect	1
Overall Mean	4.42	Agree/High Effect	

Legend: Strongly Agree/Very High Effect (5) = 4.51-5.0; Agree/High Effect (4) = 3.51-4.50; Moderately Agree/Moderate Effect (3) = 2.51-3.50; Disagree/Slight Effect (2); Strongly Disagree (1) = 1.0-1.51

Data revealed that all indicators have an "Agree/High Effect" interpretation. The overall mean score of 4.42, classified as "Agree/High Effect," implies that students perceive the program to have a high positive impact across all three dimensions. This emphasizes that students perceive the program as effective in preparing them for leadership roles that involve organizational decision-making, collaboration, and governance. The highest-rated dimension is Organizational, with a mean score of 4.44, ranked 1st. This is followed by Interpersonal (mean of 4.42, ranked 2nd) and Personal (mean of 4.41, ranked 3rd). The highest ratings in the organizational dimension highlight the program's success in preparing students for leadership roles that require effective decision-making, collaboration, and governance.

This result reinforces the success of the program in fostering leadership capabilities that extend beyond individual skills to encompass essential organizational and interpersonal dimensions. This also shows the Student Leadership Development Program has demonstrated a positive impact in enhancing students' organizational, interpersonal, and personal capacities, as indicated by the strong mean scores across all three dimensions.

3.4. Relationship Between Student Leadership Development Program and Leadership Capacity

Table 4 presents the correlation analysis using Pearson's *r* to determine the relationship between the Student Leadership Development Program and students' leadership capacity building.

Table 4. Significant Relationship Between Student Leadership Development Program and Students Leadership Capacity Building Using Pearson *r* Correlation

Variable Tested		R-Value	Sig Value (2 tailed)	Decision on HO	Interpretation
Student Development Program	Student Leadership Capacity	1.00	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
Purpose	Personal	1.00	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Interpersonal	.983	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Organizational	.973	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
People	Personal	.983	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Interpersonal	1.00	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Organizational	.972	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
Positioning	Personal	.973	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Interpersonal	.972	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Organizational	1.00	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
Practice	Personal	.993	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Interpersonal	.984	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Organizational	.963	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
Progress	Personal	.975	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Interpersonal	.993	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant
	Organizational	.981	.000	Reject Ho/Not Supported	Significant

Table 4 presents the correlation analysis using Pearson r on the relationship between the Student Leadership Development Program and students' leadership capacity.

The results indicate a perfect positive correlation ($R=1.00$) with a significant p -value of 0.000, signifying a statistically significant relationship between the program and students' leadership capacity. This implies that as students engage with the program, their preparedness for future career challenges is proportionally enhanced. The significance across all dimensions—personal, interpersonal, and organizational—suggests that the program's capacity-building approach aligns with professional career requirements. The strong association among these dimensions highlights the program's holistic impact, demonstrating that improvements in one area contribute to success in others.

These findings confirm that the Student Leadership Development Program effectively equips students with leadership and career-readiness skills. To further strengthen its impact, universities may continue integrating comprehensive training across multiple skill areas while incorporating ongoing feedback for continuous program refinement.

4. DISCUSSION

The focus of the study is to establish the relationship between student leadership development programs and student leadership capacity building in specific universities in Yantai City, Shandong Province, and to propose a Student Empowerment Program to enhance leadership training. Based on the findings, student leadership development programs are highly implemented across all five dimensions, such as Purpose, People, Positioning, Practice, and Progress, where respondents from the participating institutions and the students have agreed to their effectiveness. However, while the programs are well-integrated, gaps remain in long-term sustainability, stakeholder engagement, and post-program tracking. As shown in Table 1, indicators such as Purpose, People, and Positioning are assessed by the teachers, admin/heads, and staff respondents as "highly implemented". Similar assessment and observation by the three respondents exist and this implies that they are all agreed that student leadership development programs are "highly" implemented in the university. On the other hand, with regard to the indicators Practice and Progress, both teachers and admin/heads interpreted these indicators as "highly implemented". In contrast, the staff respondents interpreted these two indicators as "implemented." This means that the staff respondents may not be convinced that these Student Leadership Development Programs are fully and properly implemented the way it is looked by the teachers and admin/head respondents. Although, the result

"highly implemented" and "implemented" are both positive, these results provide also an insight for continuous improvement on the implementation of the Student Leadership Development Programs. Furthermore, it is observed that the highest-rated component is "Positioning," with a combined mean of 4.83, which implies that there is strong support for strategically integrating leadership development within the institution. This means that the schools prioritize a clear and influential role for student leadership and reflect a strong emphasis on the strategic integration of leadership development within institutional structures. This rating implies that universities prioritize developing defined clear roles and frameworks for leadership, that allow student leaders to contribute to the schools. As defined sense of purpose in leadership enhances students' development, guiding them through phases of self-discovery and mission articulation, which is supported by this focus on positioning, [11]. This parallel with positioning leadership development within institutional priorities ensures alignment with strategic goals, fostering a culture of collaboration and accountability, [16]. In addition, positioning leadership programs as part of broader student affairs initiatives strengthens institutional engagement and student success, [3]. Furthermore, integrating leadership development into academic curriculums, would reinforce students' readiness for future leadership roles while advancing the university's mission, [8]. Collectively, these studies affirm the significance of "Positioning" in leadership development programs as a strategic component for institutional success. Administrators and teachers may particularly recognize the value of imparting leadership development in the institutional culture, aligning well with organizational goals, and promoting long-term growth for student leaders. Conversely, "Progress" received the lowest rating and interpreted as "implemented" with a combined mean of 4.43, indicating room for further enhancement in tracking and evaluating student leadership growth. Teachers rated the programs most favorably, with a composite mean of 4.93, reflecting high confidence in the leadership program's integration and efficacy. Administrators similarly rated it highly, with a mean of 4.74, showing consistent endorsement across senior staff. However, staff members rated the programs lower at a mean of 4.45, falling under "Implemented" rather than "Highly Implemented." This highlights differences in perspectives and engagement levels across roles, indicating that staff may feel less connected to the program's structure or outcomes. This lower rating implies challenges in tracking or measuring the longitudinal development of student leaders and evaluating their improvement over time. Regular evaluations regarding leadership qualities ought to be done more often in student programs in order to facilitate their development as this might prevent the

programs from being able to capitalize on the existing gaps which need to be addressed,[1]. Addressing this gap could involve introducing more detailed evaluation and feedback processes, that enable stakeholders to supervise and assists students in their leadership paths. The overall mean across all respondents indicates a consensus that the programs are "Highly Implemented" with a strong foundation for student leadership development. This implies that the institution has established solid program structures for development of students as leaders. Purpose-driven programs especially those that include mentorship and experiential opportunities are essential for transformative leadership development, which is supported by the high ratings here, [4]. However, the implemented rating from staff highlights the need to ensure that all groups feel engaged and integral to these programs. Cultivating a more inclusive and open environment, the institution could promote a stronger sense of mutual accountability and collective learning,[17]. This would strengthen the impact of leadership programs across all personnel groups.

The assessment of the student leadership development programs indicates that these programs are perceived as "Highly Implemented" by school personnel, with a strong emphasis on positioning and clear institutional integration. However, the lower ratings on the "Progress" component indicate an opportunity to enhance tracking and evaluation processes to monitor student leaders' long-term growth and impact. In response, institutions may consider implementing strong feedback and assessment systems, involving all personnel groups to develop a more inclusive approach. This would ensure that staff members feel connected to the programs and could enhance the collective impact of leadership initiatives. By creating a supportive environment, every role would contribute to the growth and empowerment of student leaders. This holistic approach would strengthen program outcomes and align with the institutional goals of fostering career-ready graduates with essential leadership skills.

Table 2a presents the significant differences in respondents' assessments of the leadership programs. The overall F-value (153.96, $p=0.000$) indicates differences in perception, much like in the Progress ($F=617.56$, $p=0.000$) results. These results lead to the assumption that the teachers and administrators more directly involved in these initiatives, perceive the programs more favorably than staff members do. This gap demonstrated that there is a need to expand the program's accessibility and engagement for all stakeholders to be in line with the endeavor of leadership development.

In the same way, Table 2.2 supports the program's purpose, practices, and progress vary by age group. This could mean that personnel from different age groups experience and prioritize these components of leadership development differently, due to varying levels of experience,

development, and exposure to leadership roles. The differences in "Purpose" and "Progress" assessments align with age impacts the perception of long-term goals and growth-oriented elements, with older respondents having a more established perspective on these aspects, [22]. In addition, the difference in "Practice" illustrates a possible discrepancy in age-based experiences or expectations about hands-on leadership training, which is similar to [study that stresses the need for age-tailored development practices in educational programs.

In addition, table 2.3 result affirmed that there is no significant differences in the assessment of leadership programs between male and female respondents across all areas. This showed that gender does not affect how leadership development programs are perceived by school personnel. These results mean that gender may not be a vital factor affecting perceptions of the program's efficacy among school personnel. Such uniformity in assessment can be seen as a positive indicator that the program's goals and activities are communicated and executed inclusively, with male and female staff members feeling similarly informed and engaged. This alignment in perceptions is consistent with findings by [17], who emphasized that inclusive program implementation fosters a cohesive understanding and support among diverse demographic groups within educational settings.

Furthermore, table 3 confirmed that students have high positive trust in these leadership programs concerning their personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity building. The highest-rated dimension is Organizational, with a mean score of 4.44, ranked 1st. This is followed by Interpersonal (mean of 4.42, ranked 2nd) and Personal (mean of 4.41, ranked 3rd). The findings indicate that the Student Leadership Development Program is effective and have a high impact in enhancing students' organizational, interpersonal, and personal capacities, with the organizational dimension receiving the highest mean. This emphasizes that students perceive the program as effective in preparing them for leadership roles that involve organizational decision-making, collaboration, and governance. According to [24], organizational capacity building plays a crucial role in fostering effective leadership within educational settings, as it enhances students' ability to engage in strategic decision-making and organizational processes. The high ratings in interpersonal and personal dimensions further underscore the program's comprehensive approach to leadership development. As [23] argues, programs that foster interpersonal skills, such as communication and relationship-building, are essential for preparing students for success in professional environments, where collaboration and effective communication are key. In addition, programs that support personal growth, like those that promote emotional intelligence and self-awareness, contribute to students'

long-term success [25]. As [15] suggests, fostering these personal competencies is vital in navigating the complexities of leadership in any field. Student Leadership Development Program has demonstrated a positive impact in enhancing students' organizational, interpersonal, and personal capacities, as indicated by the strong mean scores across all three dimensions. The highest ratings in the organizational dimension highlight the program's success in preparing students for leadership roles that require effective decision-making, collaboration, and governance. However, while the program excels in these areas, further refinement in specific aspects such as continuous skill-building for interpersonal and personal growth may help maintain and elevate its effectiveness. To further optimize the program's impact, future iterations could focus on enhancing opportunities for collaboration and further fostering a culture of accountability and transparent communication within organizational settings, which would further equip students for the complex demands of modern professional environments.

As shown in Table 4, it can be inferred that there is a significant relationship between the Student Leadership Development Program and students' leadership capacity. This implies that the involvement of students in leadership development activities improves their readiness for careers. The Program's emphasis on capacity-building Purpose, People, Positioning, Practice, and Progress significantly contributes to key career competencies. The findings accentuate that leadership programs equip students with skills and experiences that enable them to function professionally in the environment satisfactorily. Readiness is improved due to leadership development programs because they teach essential skills such as communication, teamwork, and problem-solving, [16]. In the same way, structured leadership training can help students transition more effectively into the workforce, [20].

Additionally, as stated in Table 4, the relationship derived from the SLDP and personal, interpersonal, and organizational skills is significant correlated, this means that the program takes a holistic approach to preparing students for leadership roles by strengthening various competencies. These findings corroborate, [11] study concerning the impact of early career leadership programs where it was shown that students with such fundamental training can advance at the pre-professional level Furthermore, [18] stressed the contribution of structured career readiness tools in aiding students' skill formation and goal setting, thus, highlighting the essence these instruments have in leadership programs. The strong association found across all tested dimensions suggests that improvements in one area of the program contribute to success in other areas, which underscores a properly designed leadership development program. In addition, these finding stresses that universities must persist in providing leadership

training with a focus on a broad range of skills to adequately prepare students for the world of work. The results also indicate that integrating ongoing feedback and assessment mechanisms can increase the program's effectiveness. Overall, the findings demonstrate that the Student Leadership Development Program has a significant and positive impact on students' career success. To maximize its effectiveness, universities should ensure continuous refinement of the program, incorporating evidence-based strategies that enhance students' leadership skills and career preparedness. Further studies may examine the program participants' career achievements after some years to see what changes can be made in this program to improve it further.

5. CONCLUSION

The study affirms that Student Leadership Development Program (SLDP) is important in improving students' leadership skills in three areas: personal, interpersonal, and organizational. These improvements support the creation of a strong Student Empowerment Program. It is important to regularly check, update, and improve the SLDP to meet students' changing needs and help them get ready for future jobs.

The results clearly show a strong connection between the SLDP and students' leadership growth. The program helps students develop key leadership skills, solve problems, and prepare for real-life work situations.

Thus, Higher education institutions may continue enhancing student leadership programs while ensuring that existing initiatives remain effective. It is recommended that the Student Leadership Development Program (SLDP) undergo regular evaluation and refinement to align with students' evolving needs and career trends. Additionally, leadership training content should be diversified, integrating experiential learning activities such as mentorship programs, industry collaborations, and real-world problem-solving tasks to enhance students' competencies and readiness for professional challenges.

In addition, new features may be added to the program, including, but not limited to, leadership boot camps, peer coaching sessions, and multidisciplinary case competitions to promote students' initiative and creative problem-solving. These will improve the leadership qualities and promote the student's ability to respond to challenges and resolve problems successfully, which is key to effective employment. Moreover, continuous assessment of the program's implementation is necessary to measure its effectiveness and identify areas for improvement, to analyze and enhance leadership training and remains dynamic and responsive to industry demands.

This study provides valuable insights into the role of leadership programs in shaping students' future careers,

emphasizing the need for sustained institutional support in leadership capacity-building. Regular updates to leadership development initiatives will ensure that students receive relevant training that aligns with workforce expectations. Integrating structured assessments and feedback mechanisms will optimize program effectiveness, allowing students to maximize their leadership potential. Additionally, this study highlights the significance of fostering an environment where leadership training goes beyond theoretical instruction to include practical applications. Encouraging student participation in extracurricular leadership roles, community engagement projects, and networking opportunities with industry professionals can significantly enhance their preparedness for future careers. Although leadership training alone may not guarantee career success, a well-designed program with real-world applications can bridge the gap between academic learning and professional achievement. Continuous evaluation and strategic improvements in SLDP implementation will ensure students develop the leadership skills necessary for long-term career growth and success.

Author Contributions: Author Sendong Zhang performed original manuscript preparation, questionnaire, data collection, full-text writing-review and editing. Author Juliet A. Demalen provided conceptualization, methodology, supervision, review and editing, all authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: The data supporting this study will be made available upon request by contacting the author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

6. REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. How service learning affects students. *Jossey-Bass*, (2019).
- Bai, B.; Li, M.; Lyu, X. Sustainable career and employability of student leaders in China. *Front. Psychol.* 2022, 13, 1033401. Available online: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1033401> (Accessed on 4 January, 2025)
- Brown, A. C., & Thompson, L. M. (2019). Leadership programs and their place in student affairs. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 56(1), 34-48.
- Buskey, F. C. Developing purpose-driven leaders: A conceptual model for leadership development. *Journal of Leadership Education* (2020). 19(2), 22-35.
- Chinese Student Leadership Program (CSLP) - Office of China Programs - Missouri State. (n.d.). https://china.missouristate.edu/CSLP.htm?utm_source
- Davis, P., & Fegley, R. Developing career-ready graduates: The role of leadership programs in higher education. *Journal of Career Development* (2020), 47(3), 245-260.
- Garcia, A. M., & Patel, R. S. (2021). The impact of leadership development on career advancement and leadership roles. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(3), 289-304.
- Garcia, R. S., & Martinez, P. A. (2020). Integrating leadership development into the curriculum: A comprehensive framework. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 20(4), 18-34.
- Hilts, D., Liu, Y., Li, D., & Luke, M. (2022). Examining ecological factors that predict school counselors' engagement in leadership practices. *Professional School Counseling*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759x221118042>
- Jaymalin, Mayen. DOLE: Most of the unemployed are educated (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2019/01/02/1881616/dole-most-unemployed-are-educated>
- Lee, J. Early career leadership programs: Building skills for professional success. *Leadership & Organizational Studies* (2024), 31(1), 75-89.
- Matahela, V.E., & van Rensburg, G.H. An autonomy supportive climate for facilitation of self-leadership in health sciences educators. *Health SA Gesondheid*, 28, (2023). <https://doi.org/10.4102/hsag.v28i0.2308>
- Martinez, N. D., Sowcik, M., & Bunch, J. C. (2020). The impact of leadership education and co-curricular involvement on the development of socially responsible leadership outcomes in undergraduate students an exploratory study. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 19(3), 32-43. <https://doi.org/10.12806/v19/i3/r3>

- Morris, M. L., Hemer, K. M., Hossfeld, E. L., & Wood, L. N. Student leadership development: A longitudinal examination of purpose. *Journal of Leadership Education* (2020), 19(3), 73-90.
- Muchtar, Y., Absah, Y., Sadalia, I., & Siahaan, E. (2022). The role of innovative work behaviour as the mediator between inclusive leadership and subjective career success. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.211226.029>
- O'Neil, D. A., Hopkins, M. M., & Bilimoria, D. Leadership development and career readiness: Examining the link between training and workforce outcomes. *Human Resource Management Journal* (2019), 29(2), 112-130
- Paganin, G., Avanzi, L., Guglielmi, D., Hera, C. M. A. d. I., & Mazzetti, G. (2023). How emotional contagion among teachers affects the relationship between transformational leadership and team cohesion. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(8), 685. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13080685>
- Putri, R. A., Wahyuni, D., & Santoso, T. Career readiness instruments and their impact on student leadership training programs. *Journal of Educational Leadership Research* (2022), 19(4), 327-341.
- Sholikah, M., Rahman, F., & Widodo, A. Structured leadership training and its effect on students' transition to the workforce. *Journal of Applied Psychology and Leadership* (2021), 14(3), 198-213.
- Smith, J. M., & Rodriguez, A. Positioning student leadership development within higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Administration* (2019), 20(2), 45-58.
- Soria, K. M., Kaste, K., Diekemper, K. M., Blamo, M., Belrose, M. R., & Brazelton, G. B. (2020). Enriching college students' leadership efficacy. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 19(4), 87-98. <https://doi.org/10.12806/v19/i4/r7>
- Tynjälä, P. (2022). Workplace learning from the organizational point of view. In *Research Approaches on Workplace Learning: Insights from a Growing Field*, Springer International Publishing. Cham. 429–450.
- Wilson, A. C., & Harris, B. J. (2023). Measuring the progress of leadership programs: A framework for assessment. *Journal of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 11(1), 45-60.
- Yeoward, J. L. and Nauta, M. M. (2020). Perceived interpersonal influences and college-major nontraditionality as predictors of women's leadership aspirations. *Journal of Career Development*, 48(6), 787-800. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845320902268>
- Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of CMUJS and/or the editor(s). CMUJS and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.