INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH

VOLUME 1 ISSUE 4 • DECEMBER 2021
ISSN 2782-9227 (Print) • 2782-9235 (Online)

Copyright ©2021
The author(s)

This journal contains open-access articles published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license, which grants anyone to reproduce, redistribute and transform, commercially or non-commercially, with proper attribution. Read full license details here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

For publication concerns, contact the publisher at irssr@iiari.org.

ISSN 2782-9227 (Print)
2782-9235 (Online)

Published by:
Institute of Industry and Academic Research Incorporated
South Spring Village, Bukal Sur
Candelaria, Quezon, Philippines
Postal Code 4323
Contact Numbers: (042) 785-0694 • (+63) 916 387 3537
Visit the website https://iiari.org

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH

ISSN 2782-9227 (PRINT) 2782-9235 (ONLINE)

Volume 1 Issue 4 | December 2021

ISSN 2782-9227 (Print)

2782-9235 (Online)

This journal is published quarterly every March, June, September and December.

For more information, visit the website **https://iiari.org/journals/irssr.**

D I S C L A I M E R

Although the article follows rigorous process of evaluation and peer review, the authenticity of the data and information is the sole responsibility of the author. Furthermore, the standpoint and perspective of the authors as expressed in their research articles do not necessarily reflect that of the publisher, the journal and the editorial board.

Aims and Scope

International Review of Social Sciences Research (IRSSR) is an open access refereed journal focused on the various domains of social sciences. The diverse fields of knowledge under the umbrella of social sciences offer interesting areas suited for different methods of research. This allows researchers to apply multiple designs to describe, analyze and evaluate historical, current and futuristic situations or events. Moreover, there are multitude of areas such as social issues, current events, environment, humanities, history, and education, among others. This journal celebrates the broad spectrum of social sciences by providing a platform for the dissemination of the research outputs. It encourages intellectual discussions of topics that contribute to the various fields of knowledge.

The journal employs rigorous double-blind review to ensure quality publications. Authors receive formative feedback through feedforward communication approach. It is the prime objective of the reviewers to help authors improve the quality of the papers. As the journal promotes internationalization and collaboration, the multi-dimensional perspectives of the author and reviewers add high value to the research article. Moreover, the journal has solid support system for copyediting and formatting. The journal ensures that the research articles are within the standards of international publication.

The journal covers, but not limited to, the following:

- Law and Politics
- Philosophy and Religion
- Psychology
- Sociology
- Human development
- Geography and Anthropology
- Communication and Modern Languages
- Ancient and Modern Literature
- Arts and Art Appreciation
- Humanities and Human Behavior
- History and Historiography
- Environment development and sustainability
- Social issues and trends

Editorial Board

Dr. Anna C. Bocar
Gulf College, Oman
Editor-in-chief

Julio Ramillo A. Mercurio
Hermana Fausta Elementary School, Philippines
Managing Editor

Section Editors

Dr. Diobein C. Flores
Santo Tomas College of Agriculture Sciences and Technology Philippines

Dr. Portia R. Marasigan
Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

Dr. Marzena Smol
Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

Editorial Board

Dr. Richard Ryan C. Villegas
National University, Manila, Philippines

Rev. Edgar Allan Dela Cruz Mendoza, PhD
Pearl of the Orient International Auxiliary Chaplain Values Educators Inc., Philippines

Dr. Sumi V. S.
Maulana Azad National Urdu University, India

Atty. Jose I. Dela Rama, Jr., D.C.L.
Tarlac State University School of Law, Philippines

Dr. Roldan C. Ragot
Bangko Kabayan (A Development Bank) Philippines

Dr. Ma'rifah SH MH
Sultan Adam College of Legal Studies Indonesia

Dr. Ana Raissa Trinidad-Lagarto
University of Southeastern Philippines

EDITORIAL POLICIES

Statement of Open Access

The IIARI upholds and supports open access research publication that allows global sharing of scholarly information without restrictions. Through this platform, free access to shared information promotes knowledge and education. As such, this journal publishes open-access research articles that anyone can reproduce, redistribute and transform, commercial or non-commercially, with proper attribution. The articles' first publication in the journal should always be acknowledged.

Copyright

The open-access articles herein are published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license, which grants anyone to reproduce, redistribute and transform, commercially or non-commercially, with proper attribution. Authors retain the copyright but grant the journal the right to the first publication. Authors can use any contents of the article provided there is proper acknowledgement. Reprint and reproduction of the article does not require prior permission. Read full license details here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

Repository Policy

The authors are allowed to deposit their articles in institutional repositories, publish in institutional websites and upload in social networking sites with proper attribution and link to the article's DOI. This journal uses OJS/PKP submission that allows archive of pre-print. The post-print in PDF version is also deposited in Internet Archive for long-term preservation of the articles.

Authors' Warranties

Upon signing the copyright transfer form, authors ensure that:

- The article is an author's original work.
- It is not considered for publication nor any part previously published elsewhere.
- The author confirms, to the best of his knowledge, the authenticity and integrity of the data gathered.
- There is no fabrication, plagiarism, material misrepresentation, academic dishonesty, discriminatory and bigoted language contained in the article.
- The author obtains prior permission for the use of any previously published text or material owned by another person.

Peer Review

The journal recruits external experts in the field to assist the editor in the evaluation and selection of the papers. They are selected based on their qualification and specialization. All submitted papers duly accepted by the editor for suitability to journal scope or structural requirements are sent to the reviewers. The journal editorial staff reserve the right to choose the appropriate reviewer based on their knowledge of the topic. The journal adheres to the double blind peer-review process. Neither the author nor the reviewers know each other's identity. Invitations are sent to potential reviewers. Thereafter, the paper is sent only to those who agreed to accept the review invite. The editor makes the decision after the receipt of at least two reviews.

For other editorial policies and publication details, you can visit the following:
Editorial Policies: https://iiari.org/journals/irssr/policies/

Author Guidelines: https://iiari.org/journals/irssr/guidelines/

Table of Contents

	Page
Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Efficacy of University Student Leaders *Hanna Jane H. Aquino, Kerstine Jane Orozco & Portia R. Marasigan*	**1**
Personality Traits and Non-Suicidal Self-Injury among Young Adolescents *Kayla Camille M. Agos, Daniela Tricia D. Batino & Portia R. Marasigan*	**23**
Dress Code Policy Adherence and Self-Discipline of University Students *Lyndonn Stephen D. Santos & Portia R. Marasigan*	**44**

International Review of Social Sciences Research
Volume 1 Issue 4 December 2021
DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352083

Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Efficacy of University Student Leaders

[1]Hanna Jane H. Aquino, [1]Kerstine Jane Orozco & [2]Portia R. Marasigan

Abstract

The study aimed to determine the relationship between the emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy of the members of student body organization in Laguna State Polytechnic University- San Pablo City Campus (LSPU-SPCC). Through descriptive correlational research method, 80 student-officers were chosen using stratified random sampling. The research instrument was used to measure the respondents' emotional intelligence and their level of leadership efficacy as to adaptability, personal skills, positivity, flexibility, and communication skills. To statistically analyze the data, Pearson r was used. The study findings showed that students have high level of emotional intelligence, high level of leadership efficacy as to flexibility and very high level of leadership efficacy as to adaptability, personal skills, positivity, and communication skills. Furthermore, there was no significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and their emotional intelligence. Similarly, no significant relations were recorded on the profile and leadership efficacy. However, there was significant relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy of the respondents. The results could serve as inputs to institutional leadership programs.

Keywords: *Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Efficacy, Emotions, Leadership*

Received: October 23, 2021 **Revised:** December 2, 2021 **Accepted:** December 7, 2021

Suggested Citation: Aquino, H.H., Orozco, K. & Marasigan, P.R. (2021). Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Efficacy of University Student Leaders. *International Review of Social Sciences Research*, Volume 1 Issue 4, pp. 1- 22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352083

About the authors:

[1]Students, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines
[2]Associate Professor 5, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

© The author (s). Published by Institute of Industry and Academic Research Incorporated.
This is an open-access article published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license, which grants anyone to reproduce, redistribute and transform, commercially or non-commercially, with proper attribution. Read full license details here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

1. Introduction

Emotions play an important role for effort that people demonstrate psychological health, and moods. These emotions are woven into every interaction that influence how people react to challenges and opportunities, determine whether to collaborate to resolve conflict, and prompt willingness to forgive others. As the emotional intelligence (EI) has the capacity to be aware of, to control, and to express these emotions, it also enables every person to handle interpersonal relationships judiciously and empathetically. Thus, is serves as basis of any personal decision, problem solving and judgment, which are necessary values of a leader.

George (2000) points out that emotionally intelligent leader can promote effectiveness at all levels in organizations. It gives them the ability to understand others, their emotions, actions as well as behavior towards them. It also enables leaders make smart decisions to bring out the best in people. Studies on emotional intelligence suggests that moods and feelings are linked to actions and thinking process. Consequently, the skills coupled with emotional intelligence make an effective leader. These may also include the ability to inspire others, personal integrity, communication skills and comfort with building relationships, among others. Accordingly, a leader must possess two mental processes: thinking and feeling to be an effective leader to their followers. As leader delegates or influences others to attain specified objectives, they can be a driver of organizational success.

One main factor of an individual's ability to identify and control feelings, as well as other people's feelings, both individually and in groups, is through emotional intelligence. When leading an organization, it is important to gain the trust of every member. If a leader cannot understand other people emotionally, then it is impossible for someone to be an effective leader. As such, leadership efficacy is the ability of an individual's skill associated with the level of confidence in leading other people. According to Humphrey (2002), leadership is an intrinsically emotional process, whereby leaders recognize followers' emotional states, attempt to evoke emotions and seek to manage followers' emotional states accordingly. Thus, leaders set the tone of their organization (Landry, 2019). If they lack emotional intelligence, it could have more far-reaching consequences, resulting in lower employee engagement and a higher turnover rate. In addition, an effective leadership involve social interaction that defines leader's ability to control

their followers. It is a premise that organizations need to develop the leaders' emotional intelligence to manage effectively their own emotions in decision-making.

In this context, this study argues on the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy. As such, it aims to correlate the emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy of the members of student body organization in LSPU-SPCC. Specifically, it sought to assess the level of emotional intelligence, level of efficacy in terms of adaptability, personal skills, positivity, flexibility and communication skills, significant relationship between the demographics and emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy and the relationship between the emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy.

2. Literature review

2.1. Emotional Intelligence

According to Palaganas (2018), emotions are intrinsically linked to humanity, which play a significant role in determining the acts within the environment. People with high levels of emotional intelligence are naturally capable of achieving their own sentiments, perceiving and expressing themselves, forming and maintaining social relationships, coping with stressful challenges, and making personal decisions that ensure good outcomes. Effective people not only have the technical skills to perform their roles, but more importantly, demonstrate emotional intelligence (Batool, 2013).

In terms of leadership, EI is manifested in the way a person handles interpersonal relationships, steers organizational performance, and influences organizational culture. It also encompasses wide-ranging leadership functions that go beyond technical skills (Arguelles, 2020). Emotionally intelligent leaders can use their social skills to inspire and persuade this category of followers to adopt the proposed change and strive to contribute efficiently toward achieving the organizational goal (Srivastava, 2013). According to Bipath (2008), it is an essential skill for leadership effectiveness, and a predictor of superior performance. By recognizing the concerns of individual members, emotionally intelligent leaders use their social skills to convince those who seem reluctant to participate in the change efforts.

The EI is a vital factor for having success in social institutions, because it shows how an individual applies knowledge to different circumstances in life (Ocampo, 2019). As argued by

Srivastava (2013), emotionally intelligent leaders can use their social abilities to motivate and persuade group of followers to embrace the suggested change and work diligently toward the organization's goal. These leaders use their social abilities to persuade individuals who are hesitant to participate in change attempts by recognizing their members' worries. Furthermore, such leaders are sensitive to diversity, which is a challenge in today's workplace. According to Foltin and Keller (2012) as cited by Issah and Zimmerman (2016), these type of leaders know and therefore create an environment of open communication for those to be affected by the change to contribute in analyzing the present situation of the organization and to share in the future desired state of the organization. In addition, they recognize that the reaction of the change recipients is a reflection of the underlying fear and uncertainty (Foltin & Keller, 2012).

According to Castillo (2005), a leader must have high emotional intelligence to develop a high level of collective emotional health in his or her people. One cannot give or develop something, which one does not have or only have a meager supply of. A highly emotionally intelligent leader is likely to be successful in leading his/her organization through whatever crisis they may be confronted with. As explained by Zoller and Pieston (2014), emotional intelligence is about handling relationships, reading and managing non-verbal messages and cues, and being able to control emotions in times of struggles.

2.2. Components of Leadership Efficacy

Adaptability. Nelson et al. (2010) define adaptability as a "*functional change (cognitive, behavioral, and/or affective) in response to actual or correctly anticipated alterations in environmental contingencies*". Therefore, a person can foresee and counteract any reluctant behavior from teammates. According to Bester (2014), adaptive leaders respond quickly to change, organize their team to generate solutions to new problems, and lead performers who perform well under conditions of uncertainty. Heifetz (2018) stated that the adaptive leader understands that change can be a painful process. Therefore, he or she can foresee and counteract any reluctant behavior from teammates.

Personal Skills. Fulton (2019) describes student-leaders as someone who understand the objective and driven to get there. They desire personal success and intrinsically set their own goals beyond the ones set. The success of a leader does not necessarily depend on traits, but the working relationship between the leader and other group members, and changing situations. According to

Doyle (2021), effective leaders have the ability to communicate well, motivate their team, handle and delegate responsibilities, listen to feedback, and have the flexibility to solve problems in an ever-changing workplace. Moreover, Lavery and Hine (2013) assert that student-leaders acquire skills such as time management, organization, interpersonal communication, decision-making, public speaking, and conflict resolution amongst others. Students who build effective skills will be able to grow into strong and effective leadership practices as they continue to mature. According, Fallon et al. (2011), found that successful leadership needs a systematic and constant exercise as well as a long process and procedure to enhance leadership skills. Thus, to work in the twenty-first century, the preparation is needed by now. A leader should show eagerness, a solid determination, and self-confidence to achieve the goals and engage with the workers to assist them to the success and provide them an opportunity of authorization and relaxation at the workplace.

Positivity. Reh (2020) describes leaders as positive out of necessity. They have to be positive if they are going to successfully inspire and motivate their team toward a goal. Moreover, Youssef-Morgan and Luthans (2013), argue that positivity is crucial for leaders in challenging times. Positive leaders focus on an overall positive treatment of their followers. Cameron (2013) adds that positive leadership practices promote a heliotropic effect, helping people to move toward the positive.

Flexibility. According to Kagame (2021), flexibility is an increasingly important trait in a rapidly changing economic and social environment. Flexible leaders are those who can modify their style or approach to leadership in response to uncertain or unpredictable circumstances. In addition, flexible leaders can adapt to changes as they come. They can revise their plans to incorporate innovations and overcome challenges, while still achieving their goals.

Communication Skills. According to Root (2018), effective leadership demands interacting with people. This requires communicating in a manner that goes beyond just relaying information. The most successful leaders inspire others, build connections between people, and create alignment throughout the organization. Moreover, Landry (2019) asserts that effective communication is vital to gain trust, align efforts in the pursuit of goals, and inspire positive change. When communication is lacking, important information can be misinterpreted, causing relationships to suffer and, ultimately, creating barriers that hinder progress. According to Gaubatz and Ensminger (2017), even in the situations where members of the organization are satisfied with

the status quo and therefore become resistant to the idea of change, the communication skills of the leader are equally essential to create dissatisfaction with the status quo among the members.

2.3. Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Efficacy

The study conducted by Batool (2013) found positive significant relationship between leadership style and emotional intelligence. As emotional intelligence has become increasingly popular as a measure for identifying potentially effective leaders, it also become a tool for developing effective leadership skills. Accordingly, emotional intelligence and leadership skills are two prevalent skills linked to successful performance in the workplace and effective leadership (Brown, 2014; Miller, 2015). In addition, people who promote emotional intelligence showed that it brought positive outcome in their respective careers, because they influenced each other as they stayed attuned and connected together (Ishmaill et al., 2012; Kannaiah & Shanthi, 2015).

Several studies had established a clear positive association between EI and leadership. For instance, the cross-sectional study of Obomanu (2018) proved that there were positive and statistically significant relations between the EI and leadership effectiveness of bankers in Africa. The study posits that leaders with high level of EI achieve personal and organizational effectiveness. Similar findings were recorded by Nabih, et al. (2016) on the EI as predictor of leadership effectiveness. The review of empirical studies conducted by Baba and Siddiqi (2018) also showed that organizations with emotionally intelligent leaders have productive, motivated, efficient and committed staff. The extent of influence is similar to any field. For example, the study of Koh and O'Higgins (2018 found that the cadet officers of Singapore Air Force have EI and leadership effectiveness with positive statistical relationship. Meanwhile, the study of Gomez-Leal, et al. (2021) on the EI and leadership in schools had the same findings. It was concluded that EI is key for the effective leadership of school leaders. In addition, Ainomugisha (2018) asserts that emotionally intelligent leaders foster safe environments, where employees feel comfortable to take calculated risks, suggest ideas and to voice their opinions. In such safe environments, working collaboratively is not just an objective, but it gets woven into the organizational culture as whole. When a leader is emotionally intelligent, they can use emotions to drive the organization forward. Leaders often have the responsibility of effecting any necessary changes in the organization, and if they are aware of others' possible emotional reactions to these changes, they are able to plan and prepare the most optimal ways to make them.

3. Methodology

The study used descriptive correlational design to ascertain and to explain further the emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy of the officers of the student body organizations in LSPU-SPCC.

The respondents of the study are 80 student-officers of different organizations in the university selected using quota sampling. The study aims to collect 10 samples from the different departments. The criteria considered for the selection of the respondents include: he or she must be an officer of any student body organization; currently registered or enrolled during the conduct of the survey; and willing to participate in the study. The profile of the respondents includes: majority of them were 20 to 22 years old (78.75%), 17.50% of them were 18 to 19 years old, and the remaining 3.75% were 23-25 years old; majority of them were male (52.50%); and majority of the respondents were in their 3rd year (43.75%), 38.75% were in their 2nd year, 15% were in 1st year and the remaining 2.50% were in their 4th year.

The respondents were chosen from the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Computer Studies, College of Engineering, College of Business Management and Accountancy, College of Hospitality Management and Tourism, College of Teacher Education, College of Criminal Justice and Education, and College of Information Technology.

The study used 3 data gathering instruments namely: Information sheets, to determine the profile of the students; Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, adapted from Daniel Goleman, to determine the level of emotional intelligence; and Test on Leadership Efficacy, to determine the level of leadership efficacy. All these instruments assessed the study variables which are answerable by a 4-scale Likert style indicators.

Due to the on-going travel bans and restrictions, the data gathering was conducted online. The “new normal” for survey research was done through Google forms distributed through online messenger application such as Facebook and e-mails. The form include a thorough explanation on the purpose of the study. All the respondents were given sufficient time to answer the given questionnaire. The respondents were aware on the confidentiality of their answers.

The data gathered were calculated using weighted mean, to measure the average of the scores of the test taken by the respondents, frequency and percentage distribution, to know the

number of occurrences of a repeating event per unit of time, and Pearson-Product Moment Correlation (Pearson r), to measure the correlation between the two variables.

4. Findings and Discussion

Table 1 shows the level of student-leaders' emotional intelligence. From the 25 indicators of EI, the overall mean was 3.40 interpreted as 'High'. The data proved that the students' self-assessment indicated a high level of EI. Few of the indicators were assessed with a very high level. This signifies that the student-leaders are emotionally intelligent in handling cases and situations related to their position in the student organization.

Indicator 7 has the lowest mean score of 2.88 and the standard deviation of 0.66 with an interpretation of high level, which implies that the respondents often lose composure when they are under stress. It means that they are not sure how to manage if they are under stress especially when they have a lot of tasks to focus on. Most of the time, they cannot handle the pressure that they are feeling during stressful situations. Indicator 16 has the highest mean score of 3.70 and the standard deviation of 0.48 with an interpretation of high level, which implies that the respondents often ask others feedback on the things that have been done and can be improved. It gives them confidence to do their work when other members approve of them and they also learn from it to improve themselves when others disapprove. They can deal with difficult situations and can build better relationships.

With an overall weighted mean of 3.45, standard deviation of 0.64 and an interpretation of high level, it implies that the respondents often develop their emotional intelligence in being a member of a student body organization. It is easy for them to remain calm in every stressful situation and can resolve any conflicts that may happen. They can build a good relationship and trust with other people by being aware of others and also their own emotions. If members lack emotional intelligence, there could be a lot of consequences and they will have a hard time focusing on their tasks. As stated by Moore (2009), leaders can use emotional information to build trust and secure cooperation, display empathy to employees, social awareness, develop collaboration, understand the loss that people experience during the change process and display their skills in addressing issues and solving problems.

Table 1

Level of Student-Leaders' Emotional Intelligence

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Able to describe how your own feelings affect your own actions.	3.37	0.62	High
2. Acts appropriately even in emotionally charged situations.	3.23	0.64	High
3. Understands another person's motivation.	3.62	0.56	High
4. Understands subtle feelings of others.	3.46	0.59	High
5. Tries to resolve conflict instead of allowing it to fester.	3.41	0.63	High
6. Understands social networks.	3.46	0.59	High
7. Loses composure when under stress.	2.88	0.81	High
8. Controls impulses appropriately in situations.	3.21	0.61	High
9. Understands others by listening attentively.	3.57	0.52	Very high
10. Can recognize emotions as they experience them.	3.51	0.61	Very high
11. Aware of the connection between what is happening and your own feelings.	3.47	0.57	High
12. Acknowledges own strengths and weaknesses.	3.60	0.58	Very high
13. Sees the positive in people, situations and events more often than the negative.	3.47	0.57	High
14. Enjoys organizing groups.	3.50	0.57	Very high
15. Avoids conflict and negotiations.	3.27	0.69	High
16. Ask for others' feedback on the things that have been done and can be improved.	3.70	0.48	Very high
17. Can recognize easily if they are stressed.	3.26	0.65	High
18. Seeks to improve oneself by setting measurable and challenging goals.	3.45	0.59	High
19. Tries to resolve conflict by openly talking about disagreement with those involved.	3.33	0.72	High
20. Excellent at empathising with someone else's problem.	3.27	0.67	High
21. Understands other's perspectives when they are different from own perspective	3.43	0.63	High
22. Works well in teams by being respectful of others	3.51	0.61	Very high
23. Reasons for disagreements are easy to understand.	3.22	0.71	High
24. Sees possibilities more than the problems.	3.48	0.55	High
25. Avoids getting impatient or showing frustration inappropriately.	3.35	0.63	High
Over all Mean	**3.40**	**0.64**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 - 4.00 = always / very high, 2.50 - 3.49 = often / high
1.50 - 2.49 = seldom / low, 1.00 - 1.49 = never / very low

Table 2

Leadership Efficacy as to Adaptability

Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I am able to foster a good interpersonal relationship towards my team members.	3.36	0.62	High
2. I consider the suggestions of my team members for the improvement of the organizational goals.	3.65	0.50	Very high
3. I actively listen to my team members involving the need in decision making.	3.62	0.60	Very high
4. I encourage my team members to be enthusiastic towards work.	3.57	0.56	Very high
5. I seek opportunities that can enhance my team member's leadership skills.	3.56	0.57	Very high
6. I consider the ideas of my team members in planning events in an organization.	3.63	0.53	Very high
7. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.	3.60	0.51	Very high
8. I consider the freedom of my team members that can adapt to current issues and events.	3.62	0.53	Very high
9. I encourage my team members to improve their skills.	3.56	0.59	Very high
10. I encourage my team members to seek opportunities, to discover and improve their skills.	3.56	0.59	Very high
Over all Mean	**3.57**	**0.56**	**Very high**

Legend: 3.50 - 4.00 = always / very high, 2.50 - 3.49 = often / high
1.50 - 2.49 = seldom / low, 1.00 - 1.49 = never / very low

Table 2 shows the respondents' leadership efficacy in terms of adaptability. Indicator 1 has the lowest mean score of 3.36. The standard deviation of 0.62 with an interpretation of high level implies that the respondents are often able to foster a good interpersonal relationship towards their team members. It means that the respondents do not have any interpersonal relationship towards their team members most of the time since they tend to focus a lot on their own tasks. They give most of their time in dealing with their organization. Indicator 2 has the highest mean score of 3.65. The standard deviation of 0.50 with an interpretation of very high level means that the respondents always consider the suggestions of team members for the improvement of the organizational goals. It means that the respondents have eagerness to gain knowledge from other members. They accept other members' opinions to improve themselves as a member of the student body organization.

The overall weighted mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of 0.56 was interpreted as very high level. It can be implied that the respondents can always adapt in any situation that they may face. Being adaptable makes an organization or a team more productive and effective. Their teamwork boosts creativity, gives support and improves productivity. According to Calarco

(2020), adaptable leaders recognize that leading and managing change is an imperative of today's world, and they urgently seek new ways to solve novel problems, master new skills, and embrace new challenges with grounded innovation.

Table 3 shows the respondents' leadership efficacy in terms of personal skills. Indicator 3 has the lowest mean of 3.48 and a standard deviation of 0.72 with an interpretation of high level, which means that the respondents are often reliable in decision making. It means that the respondents sometimes find it difficult in making decisions since their organization depends on it. Decision making is very important in an organization since it also results in being productive in accomplishing daily tasks. Indicator 2 has a mean of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.42 with an interpretation of very high level, which means that the respondents always respect and understand other perceptions and beliefs in an organization. They consider other members' opinions to avoid any conflict and to build trust in each other. An effective team member also understands others to achieve their goals and be responsible.

Table 3

Leadership Efficacy as to Personal Skills

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. As a leader, I am responsible for my duties.	3.75	0.46	Very high
2. As a leader, I respect and understand other perceptions and beliefs in an organization.	3.81	0.42	Very high
3. As a leader, I am reliable in my decision making.	3.48	0.72	High
4. As a leader, I maintain my goal and perspective in a current event.	3.66	0.50	Very high
5. As a leader, I am responsible to trust my team members.	3.75	0.49	Very high
6. As a leader, I am able to develop the ability of my teammates to lead in organization.	3.61	0.56	Very high
7. As a leader, I am responsible to share the goals and objectives to my teammates in an organization.	3.70	0.48	Very high
8. As a leader, I am responsible for knowing the weaknesses of an organization.	3.62	0.53	Very high
9. As a leader, I am able to avoid wasting time in an organization during current events.	3.52	0.55	Very high
10. As a leader, I am responsible to share to my teammates the action plan of an organization.	3.70	0.46	Very high
Over all Mean	**3.66**	**0.53**	**Very high**

Legend: 3.50 - 4.00 = always / very high, 2.50 - 3.49 = often / high
1.50 - 2.49 = seldom / low, 1.00 - 1.49 = never / very low

With an overall weighted mean of 3.66, a standard deviation equivalent to 0.53 and an interpretation of very high level, it can be implied that the respondents always apply their personal skills to be an effective member of the student body organization. It means that the respondents apply their personal skills effectively to have good teamwork. By having good teamwork, the organization will be successful in every task they may face. According to Gilley, et al. (2009), for effective organizational change leaders must have different skills or behaviors such as leader's ability to motivate, communicate, and build team, by adopting these skills a leader will become an effective leader.

Table 4

Leadership Efficacy as to Positivity

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. As a student leader, I can motivate my team members by sharing our vision.	3.55	0.54	Very high
2. As a student leader, I maintain my enthusiasm among my team members and in an organization.	3.61	0.51	Very high
3. I generally build solid relationships with those I work with.	3.61	0.51	Very high
4. As a student leader, I make an acknowledgement to my team members about their performance.	3.70	0.48	Very high
5. I maintain being open-minded to a current event in an organization.	3.66	0.52	Very high
6. As a student leader, I can motivate my team members to achieve our goals in an organization.	3.57	0.54	Very high
7. As a student leader, I appreciate the extra efforts of my team members in current events.	3.72	0.50	Very high
8. As a student leader, I consider the ethical consequences of every decision.	3.63	0.53	Very high
9. As a student leader, I maintain to help my team members to develop their strength.	3.55	0.52	Very high
10. I maintain to support my team members with their ideas that are needed in the organization.	3.57	0.54	Very high
Over all Mean	**3.66**	**0.52**	**Very high**

Legend: 3.50 - 4.00 = always / very high, 2.50 - 3.49 = often / high
1.50 - 2.49 = seldom / low, 1.00 - 1.49 = never / very low

Table 4 shows the respondents' leadership efficacy in terms of positivity. Indicator 1 has the lowest mean score of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 0.54 with an interpretation of very high. It means the respondents always motivate their team members by sharing their vision. It also means that the respondents sometimes find it difficult to give their support to other members especially when they are in a stressful situation. They tend to focus on motivating their own self especially when the members only focus on their own tasks. Indicator 9 also has a lowest mean score of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 0.52 with an interpretation of very high level. It means that the respondents always help their team members to develop their strength. It means that the

respondents sometimes cannot help other members since they also cannot handle another task to finish. Indicator 7 has the highest mean score of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.50 with an interpretation of very high level. It means that the respondents always appreciate the extra efforts of their team members in current events. Appreciating their efforts helps them to boost their confidence and to be more creative. It also gives motivation to them to do more by thinking that their efforts were appreciated by other members.

The overall weighted mean of 3.66 and a standard deviation equivalent to 0.52 were interpreted as very high level. It can be implied that respondents always choose to be positive in every situation or even a failure and often try to find at least one good thing about the situation. According to Stottlemayer (2002), with a primary source of positive emotions, leaders may build a successful organizational culture.

Table 5

Leadership Efficacy as to Flexibility

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. As a student leader, it is easy for me to manage my responsibilities.	3.19	0.80	High
2. As a student leader. I can focus on the main planning in the organization event.	3.45	0.57	High
3. I can quickly find solutions to problem/s raised in the organization.	3.26	0.62	High
4. It is easy for me to administer the announcement to a student in an organization.	3.45	0.66	High
5. As a student leader, it is easy for me to make a time table to manage my time.	3.24	0.68	High
6. As a student leader, it is easier for me to find solutions than complaining.	3.41	0.57	High
7. It is easy for me to gather my team members during meetings.	3.23	0.71	High
8. As a student leader, I often find other ways by achieving our objectives in an organization.	3.46	0.57	High
9. It is easy for me to multitask during current events.	3.29	0.68	High
10. As a student leader, I can make others' time tables to finish their responsibility in an organization.	3.26	0.64	High
Over all Mean	3.32	0.65	High

Legend: 3.50 - 4.00 = always / very high, 2.50 - 3.49 = often / high
1.50 - 2.49 = seldom / low, 1.00 - 1.49 = never / very low

Table 5 shows the respondents' leadership efficacy in terms of flexibility. Indicator 1 has the lowest mean score of 3.19 and a standard deviation of 0.80 with an interpretation of high level. It means that some of the respondents often easily manage their responsibilities but there are also times they find it hard to manage their responsibilities or their tasks. They cannot handle the work that they have to finish especially when they experience a lot of pressure. Indicator 8 has the highest mean of 3.46 and a standard deviation of 0.57 with an interpretation of high level. It means that some of the respondents often find other ways by achieving their objectives in an organization. The respondents always have the eagerness to accomplish their tasks and to serve their organization.

The overall weighted mean of 3.32 and standard deviation equivalent to 0.65 were interpreted as high level. It can be implied that the respondents are often flexible in every task responsibility that they may face. They are ready to respond to changing situations or circumstances. It gives an ability for them to be productive especially during the times that there are changes in a situation. If members can't be flexible in managing their tasks, they will have a hard time finishing all their tasks and responsibilities.

Table 6

Leadership Efficacy as to Communication Skills

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I maintain listening first before correcting my team members.	3.67	0.49	Very high
2. I choose my words, before saying it to my team members.	3.61	0.60	Very high
3. I maintain good communication among my team members.	3.67	0.49	Very high
4. I respect the suggestions among my team members.	3.76	0.42	Very high
5. I make clarifications with my team members if there are misunderstandings on a certain task.	3.76	0.42	Very high
6. I generally build solid communication with my teammates in an organization.	3.65	0.53	Very high
7. I maintain to share positive feedback to my teammates in an organization.	3.67	0.47	Very high
8. I maintain to speak appropriately to my teammates during meetings and events in an organization.	3.63	0.60	Very high
9. I maintain good interaction with my teammates in an organization.	3.68	0.46	Very high
10. I maintain to help my teammates during hard times in current events.	3.73	0.43	Very high
Over all Mean	**3.68**	**0.50**	**Very high**

Legend: 3.50 - 4.00 = always / very high, 2.50 - 3.49 = often / high
1.50 - 2.49 = seldom / low, 1.00 - 1.49 = never / very low

Table 6 shows the respondents' leadership efficacy in terms of communication skills. Indicator 2 has the lowest mean score of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 0.60 with an interpretation of very high level. It means that some of the respondents always choose their words, before saying it to their team members. It also implies that there are times negative words are said especially when under pressure but they always choose to be understanding to avoid problems. Indicator 4 has the highest mean score of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.42 with an interpretation of very high level. It means that some of the respondents always respect the suggestions of their team members. It gives other members an opportunity to take over some tasks and to be more creative. Indicator 5 also has the highest mean score of 3.76 which means that some of the respondents always make clarifications with their team members if there are misunderstandings on a certain task. Asking for clarifications can help avoid any problems and misunderstanding within the organization.

With an overall weighted mean of 3.68 and standard deviation equivalent to 0.50, there were interpreted as very high level. It can be implied that the respondents always try to communicate with their other members to build their trust, good relationship and to help other members in doing certain tasks. Being open with all of the members can help in being successful in dealing with their tasks and their organization to be successful.

Table 7

Summary Results of Level of Leadership Efficacy

Factors	Mean	Level
Adaptiveness	3.57	Very High
Personal Skills	3.66	Very High
Positivity	3.66	Very High
Flexibility	3.32	High
Communication Skills	3.68	Very High
Overall Mean	**3.58**	**Very High**

Legend: 3.50 - 4.00 = always / very high, 2.50 - 3.49 = often / high
1.50 - 2.49 = seldom / low, 1.00 - 1.49 = never / very low

Table 7 shows the summary result of the level of student-leaders' leadership efficacy. Communication skills appear to have the highest mean score of 3.68, which indicates a very high

level of leadership efficacy of the respondents. It implies that it is important for the respondents to know how to communicate effectively to every member to build trust and to support each other. By communicating, they become aware of what weaknesses and strengths a member possesses. It can also help them in clarifying tasks to avoid any misunderstanding with their members. Moreover, flexibility has the lowest mean score of 3.32 which shows that the respondents still find it hard to manage their responsibilities especially when under pressure. They could not focus on their responsibilities at the same time. Most of them could not handle the pressure that they are experiencing. The overall mean indicates a very high level of leadership efficacy. This confirms that the members of the student body organization have the knowledge, skills and abilities to lead other people that make an organization successful and productive. These data proved that respondents possess the skills that can help them to be an effective member of student body organization.

Table 8

Test of Relationship between Profile and Emotional Intelligence

Variables	r-value	p-value	interpretation
Age	-0.191	0.092	not significant
Sex	0.046	0.058	not significant
year level	-0.186	0.086	not significant
College	0.048	0.060	not significant

Legend: $p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant

As to the relationship between the level of emotional intelligence of the respondents and their profile, the statistical results show that the demographic profile of the respondents do not have any significant relationship to emotional intelligence. Being an emotionally intelligent member of a student body organization does not depend on their age, sex, year level and course. It develops as they grow as a better person and by learning from their experiences, as long as they have the desire to pursue it. It depends on their knowledge and to how they would apply it to their daily life. Therefore, the age, sex, year level, and the college of specialization has no implication of their level of emotional intelligence. The demographic profiles of the student-leaders are not predictors of their level of emotional intelligence. This is attributed to the similarity of the

responses, which were mostly high and very high self-assessments. The similarity of the self-assessments translated to skewness of the data.

Table 9

Relationship between Profile of the Respondents and Leadership Efficacy

Variable	adaptiveness		personal skills		Positivity		flexibility		communication skills	
	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value
Age	0.262	0.008*	-0.134	0.127	0.117	0.102	0.070	0.081	-0.003	n/a
Sex	0.000	n/a	0.131	0.120	0.000	N/A	0.046	0.070	0.000	n/a
year level	0.164	0.153	0.004	0.052	0.336	0.02*	0.025	0.061	0.053	n/a
College	0.045	0.071	0.025	0.060	0.122	0.116	-0.017	0.058	-0.020	n/a

Legend: p < 0.05, significant; p > 0.05, not significant
** significant*

As to the relationship between the respondents' demographics and leadership efficacy, the results in table 9 show that all demographic variables have no significant relationship to the leadership efficacy, measured in terms of adaptability, personal skills, positivity, flexibility and communication skills. The demographics are not predictors of the level of leadership efficacy. It implies that there are the demographic profiles of the student-leaders do not necessary reflect the level of their leadership efficacy. This again is attributed to the similarity on the self-assessments of the respondents. Similarly, the leadership efficacy is relative to how a person can effectively do their responsibilities, which depends on their eagerness to learn and better leader, not on their profile. These are more intrinsic than extrinsic in nature reflecting that as long as they have the passion to do it and to have the knowledge to guide every person, they can be effective leaders.

Table 10

Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Efficacy

Variables	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Adaptiveness	0.506	0.011	Significant
personal skills	0.432	0.029	Significant
Positivity	0.523	0.008	Significant
Flexibility	0.460	0.020	Significant
communication skills	0.472	0.019	Significant

Legend: p < 0.05, significant; p > 0.05, not significant

Table 10 shows the correlation between emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy of the student-leaders. All the indicators of leadership efficacy have statistical significant relationship with the emotional intelligence. The positive relationship implies that the higher the emotional intelligence of the student-leaders the higher their leadership efficacy. This also connotes that the emotional intelligence has positive influence on the leadership efficacy. The statistical results affirmed all the studies supporting the positive significant relations between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness (Batool, 2013; Brown, 2014; Miller, 2015; Ishmaill et al., 2012; Kannaiah & Shanthi, 2015; Obomanu, 2018; Nabih, et al., 2016; Baba & Siddiqi, 2018; Koh & O'Higgins, 2018; Gomez-Leal et al., 2021; Ainomugisha, 2018).

5. Conclusion

This study used descriptive correlational design to assess the emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy of the student-leaders in LSPU-SPCC. There were 80 student-leaders chosen as respondents using quota sampling, representing 10 students from the different departments. The three data gathering instruments used were information sheets, Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, and Test on Leadership Efficacy. The survey was conducted through Google forms and Facebook messenger.

The study revealed high level of student-leaders' emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy as to adaptability, personal skills, positivity, and communication skills. It was further revealed that there was no significant relationship between the demographic profile of the respondents and their emotional intelligence as well as leadership efficacy. However, there was positive correlation between emotional intelligence and leadership efficacy. The results affirm that the emotional intelligence of the student-leaders positively influence their level of leadership efficacy.

As the study has various limitations as to the variables tested and the number of samples, further research could consider re-test or attest the reliability of and validity of the results. A wider scope and bigger sample size can prove or disprove the consistency of the results. As to the development of student-leaders, the university may take the results as inputs in the leadership development programs or leadership succession to continuously share the good practices of the

students in various departments. The various departments may intensify its campaign for strong emotional intelligence of the students upon assumption of various responsibilities in the university student bodies. It should be noted that leadership development is not a one-way process. The students and the whole academic community help shape the entire studentry.

References

Ainomugisha, G. (2018). *The Importance of Emotional Intelligence in Leadership*. https://inside.6q.io/emotionalintelligence-in-leadership/

Baba, M. & Siddiqi, M. (2018). Emotional Intelligence And Transformational Leadership: A Review Of Empirical Studies. *The Business Review*, Vol. 22, No. 1

Batool, B (2013). Emotional Intelligence and Effective Leadership. *Superior University*. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.652.8649&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Bester, CP (2014). Adaptable Leaders for the South African Army. *CDA Press*.

Bipath, K. (2008). The emotional intelligence of the principal is essential in the leadership of a functional school. *The International Journal of Learning*, 15:57–64.

Brown, C. (2014). The Effects of Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Leadership Style on Sales Performance. *Economic Insights: Trends and Challenges*, Vol. III (LXVI), No.3, pp. 1-14

Calarco, A. (2020). Adaptable Leadership. *Center for Creative Leadership*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED606779.pdf

Cameron, K. (2013). Practicing positive leadership: Tools and techniques that create extraordinary results. *San Francisco, CA*: Berrett-Koehler.

Castillo, R. (2015). The Need for Emotionally Intelligent Leaders. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*. https://business.inquirer.net/186753/the-need-for-emotionally-intelligent-leaders

Doyle, A. (2021). Important Leadership Skills for Workplace Success. *The Balance Careers*. https://www.thebalancecareers.com/top-leadership-skills-2063782

Gaubatz, J. A., Ensminger, D. C. (2017). Department chairs as change agents: Leading change in resistant environments. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 45, 141-163. doi:10.1177/1741143215587307

George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53(8), 53-58

Gilley, A., McMillan, H.S., & Gilley, J.W. (2009), Organizational change and characteristics of leadership effectiveness, Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 38-47.

Goleman, D.P. (1995). Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More than IQ for Character, Health, and Lifelong Achievement. New York: Bantam Books.

Fallon, H., et al. (2011), Engaging with leadership development in Irish academic libraries: some reflections of the future leaders program (FLP). *The Australian Library Journal*.

Foltin, A., Keller, R. (2012). Leading change with emotional intelligence. *Nursing Management, 43, 20*-25. doi:10.1097/01.NUMA.0000421675.33594.63

Fulton, J. (2019). 10 Interesting Characteristics of a Student Leader. Classcraft. https://www.classcraft.com/blog/characteristics-of-a-student-leader/

Hasson, G. (2012). Brilliant Emotional Intelligence: Harness the Power of Emotions, Succeed in All Areas of Your Life. Harlow: Pearson Life.

Heifetz, R. (2018). Adaptive Leadership - Know the Traits of Adaptive Leaders. *Corporate Finance Institute*. https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/careers/soft-skills/adaptive-leadership/

Humphrey, R. (2002). The many faces of emotional leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13(5), 493-504*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00140-6

Ishmaill, I. et al. (2012). "The Role of Emotional Intelligence on Job Performance" in International Journal of Business and Social Science, Vol.3, No.1.

Kagame, P. (2012). Great Leaders are Flexible. *SIGMA Assessment Systems*. https://www.sigmaassessmentsystems.com/flexible-leader/.

Koh, C. B., & O'Higgins, E. (2018). Relationships between emotional intelligence, perceived and actual leadership effectiveness in the military context. *Military Psychology*, 30(1), 27 42. doi:10.1080/08995605.2017.1419021

Lavery, S. and Hine, G. (2013). Catholic School Principals: Promoting Student Leadership Catholic Education: *A Journal of Inquiry and Practice, 17(1), 41-66*.

Landry, L. (2019). 8 Essential Leadership Communication Skills. *Harvard Business School Online*. https://online.hbs.edu/blog/post/leadership-communication

Miller, K.B. (2015). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence Behaviors and Leadership Practices among Women Leaders in Education and Business Organizations. *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertion*. The Philippines: Capella University.

Moore, B. (2009). Emotional intelligence for school administrators: A priority for school reform? *American Secondary Education,* 37(3), 20-28.

Nabih, Y., Metwally, A.H. & Nawar, Y. (2016). Emotional intelligence as a predictor of leadership effectiveness. *The Business and Management Review*, Volume 7 Number 5

Nelson, J.K., Zaccaro, S.J. & Herman, J.L. (2010). Strategic information provision and experiental variety as tools for developing adaptive leadership skills. Consulting Psychology Journal: *Practice and Research.*

Obomanu, F. (2018). Emotional Intelligence: Catalyst for Leadership Effectiveness. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: A Administration and Management Type*. Volume 18 Issue 6

Ocampo, J. (2019). Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Trait among Master Teachers. *Mimbar Pendidikan* 4(1):2503-457. DOI:10.17509/mimbardik.v4i1.16970

Poonamallee, Latha et al. (2018). "Improving Emotional Intelligence through Personality Development: The Effect of the Smart Phone Application Based Dharma Life Program on Emotional Intelligence" in Frontiers in Psychology, Volume 9.

Quismorio, E. (2020). CSC offers course on emotional intelligence. Manila Bulletin. https://mb.com.ph/2020/02/14/csc-offers-course-on-emotional-intelligence/

Raquel Gómez-Leal, Allison A. Holzer, Christina Bradley, Pablo Fernández-Berrocal & Janet Patti (2021): The relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership in school leaders: a systematic review, Cambridge Journal of Education, DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2021.1927987

Reh, J. (2020). Great Leaders Know How to Be Positive. *The Balance Careers.* https://www.thebalancecareers.com/leaders-are-always-positive-2275805.

Root, D. (2018). Why Effective Leadership Starts with Communication. *Eagle's Flight.* https://www.eaglesflight.com/blog/why-effective-leadership-starts-with-communication.

Srivastava, K. (2013). Emotional intelligence and organizational effectiveness. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal, 22(2), 97-99*.

Stottlemyer, B. G. (2002). An examination of emotional intelligence: Its relationship to achievement and the implications for education. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 63*(2-A), 572.

Youssef-Morgan, C.M., & Luthans, F. (2013). Positive leadership: Meaning and application across cultures. Organizational Dynamics, 42, 198–208. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2013.06.005

International Review of Social Sciences Research
Volume 1 Issue 4 December 2021
DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352084

Personality Traits and Non-Suicidal Self-Injury among Young Adolescents

[1]Kayla Camille M. Agos, [1]Daniela Tricia D. Batino & [2]Portia R. Marasigan

Abstract

The study determined the personality traits and the level of non-suicidal injury (NSSI) among the young adolescents of Tiaong, Quezon in the Philippines. A descriptive-correlational research design was used with 70 participants selected through purposive sampling technique. The participants were mostly 18 years old, women, first born children and Roman Catholic. The questionnaire was divided into three parts: respondents' profile as to age, gender, religion, and birth order; the NSSI to assess the self-harm inventory and Big Five Inventory to describe the respondents' personality. Results revealed the respondents' personality with high level of openness to new experience but with severe level of NSSI. It was further revealed that only religion has a significant relationship to NSSI. The results imply that adolescents open to new experience have tendencies to commit non-suicidal self-injury.

Keywords: *Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI), Personality Traits, Young Adolescent, Non-Suicidal, Self-Injury*

Received: October 26, 2021 **Reviewed:** December 2, 2021 **Accepted:** December 7, 2021

Suggested Citation: Agos, K.M., Batino, D.D. & Marasigan, P.R. (2021). Personality Traits and Non-Suicidal Self-Injury among Young Adolescents. *International Review of Social Sciences Research*, Volume 1 Issue 4, pp. 23 - 43. DOI: **https://doi.org/10.53378/352084**

About the authors:

[1]BS Psychology student, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines
[1]BS Psychology student, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines
[2]Associate Professor 5, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

© The author (s). Published by Institute of Industry and Academic Research Incorporated.
This is an open-access article published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license, which grants anyone to reproduce, redistribute and transform, commercially or non-commercially, with proper attribution. Read full license details here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

1. Introduction

People may wonder about their different attributes and still find a way to compare themselves to others and their imperfections. The way a person interacts with the outside environment is determined by their personality. But what does "having a personality" mean? Personality is a term describing an individual's characteristic ways of thinking, feeling, and acting across time and place. It is the character of a person that defines how one acts and responds, as well as how one connect and interact with the environment. In general, personality is the distinctive pattern of feelings, emotions, and behaviors that make up a personal characteristic. It involves behavioral features, both inherent and acquired, that distinguish one person from another and that can be seen in the relationships of people with the environment and their social group (Holzman, 2020).

One of the ways of assessing personality is the Big Five Model of Personality: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. It has to be always remembered that one’s behavior is the result of a complex interaction between a person's fundamental personality and environmental factors. The scenario in which a person finds himself or herself has a significant impact on how he or she behaves. People's answers, on the other hand, are usually congruent with their underlying personality features. These dimensions cover a wide range of personality traits. Many people have these clusters of qualities, according to research. Individuals who are gregarious, for example, are likely to be chatty. These characteristics, however, may not usually occur simultaneously. Each person's personality is complicated and unique, and they may exhibit behaviors that span multiple of these characteristics. On another hand, self-harm can be a means to express frustration and upsetting sensations or emotions. Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI) is a kind of self-harm recognized by the DSM-5 and defined as “purposeful self-inflicted damage to the surface of his or her body of a sort that is likely to generate blood, bruises, or discomfort but only mild to moderate bodily harm." (APA, 2013). This description includes behaviors such as cutting, burning, and hitting. It leaves out behaviors that target the body's internal processes, such as swallowing substances or eating disorders. In the absence of intent to die, it is defined as "direct, deliberate destruction of one's body tissue in the absence of intent to die" (Guerreiro et al., 2013).

NSSI is more frequent among teens and young adults. It is defined as any activity that causes hurt or injury to people as a method of coping with difficult feelings and is carried out to regulate an individual's negative emotional state. It is more common among those who are prone to negative self-talk and self-criticism. It generally begins between ages 11 and 15, and can extend until adulthood. Identifying and studying NSSI activities, down to the smallest distinction, can help to understand the underlying mechanisms that may create and maintain problematic coping behaviors, as well as contribute to the development of effective ways for people who struggle with the urge to injure themselves. Commonly, NSSI is used as a way of controlling emotions and actions are carried out to decrease negative emotional states. It usually begins and peaks in adolescence and is a common threat to the mental health of adolescents.

This study demonstrated the importance of personality characteristics as a major element of one's emotional and mental stability, since personality traits are characterized as reflecting the nature of a person's patterns of thoughts, feelings, and actions. The inquiries focused on what motivates a person to do it and how personality factors and dominant attributes influence it. This study focused on the association between NSSI and an individual's personality attributes, notably teens, who are predominantly prospective self-harmers. Moreover, this study focused on identifying the personality profile that can be employed to prevent the risk of self-harm attempts and to identify the common methods of self-harm incidents among young adolescents residing in Tiaong, Quezon, Philippines.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Personality Traits

Personality is a set of key characteristics and how people communicate with one another. The results of particular tests designed to discover certain personality characteristics are used to determine an individual's personality. Mangal (2014) defined personality as the sum of one's actions toward oneself and others. It encompasses a person's physical, emotional, social, and spiritual characteristics. Furthermore, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (APA, 2013) or “DSM-5” defined personality traits as the tendency to behave, perceive, and think in relatively consistent ways across time and across situations in which the trait may be manifested. Among the widely accepted structural personality models, the Five Factor Model (McCrae & John, 1992) arranges these identified personalities hierarchically to five (5) general traits.

Openness in various forms is a general love of art, feelings, adventure, odd feelings, imagination, interest, and experience. They seem to be more creative and mindful of their feelings as compared with closed individuals (Schacter et al., 2011).

Conscientiousness is defined as a generally consistent pattern of individual differences in the dispositions to adhere to socially mandated principles and plans, to withhold enjoyment, and to adhere to norms and rules (Che et al., 2018).

Extraversion includes activities such as being talkative, assertive, and outgoing. The principal key to this personality is social contact. They are simple to approach and frequently report higher satisfaction levels (Salmon, 2012).

Agreeableness is a personality trait that influences a person's ability to form and maintain social interactions. People with poor compatibility, on the other hand, care less about social approval and more about protecting themselves and others from danger (Nguyen et al., 2013).

Neuroticism is the tendency of the trait to experience negative results, such as anxiety, self-consciousness, irritability, and depression. Individuals with high neuroticism levels are poorly responsive to environmental stress, see normal conditions as dangerous, and can experience small complaints as hopelessly overwhelming (Widiger et al., 2017).

Every individual can have a dominant personality trait or several dominant personality traits, and it has an obvious effect on an individual. Strong personality traits make it likely that a person often acts in a particular way in certain situations, but it is possible to act in an atypical, more situation-dependent way (Matthews et al., 2013).

2.2 Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI)

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-V), published by the American Psychological Association (2013) defines NSSI as a diagnosis if in the last year the individual has, on 5 or more days, engaged in intentional self-inflicted damage to the surface of his or her body of a sort likely to induce bleeding, bruising, or pain with the expectation that the injury will lead to only minor or moderate physical harm. It is used to regulate emotions and communicate distress. Affect regulation, self-punishment, and suicide prevention were the most

commonly identified functions for NSSI. It is also used to affirm interpersonal boundaries, seek sensations, and influence others (Horvat et al., 2015). On the other hand, Jutengren et al., (2011), as cited in Benjet et al., (2017) presented that about 25% to 49% of adolescents perform NSSI at least once in their lives and about 10% to 30.9% engage in NSSI. Likewise, the lifetime history of NSSI among adolescents has ranged from 7% to 66% (Somer et al., 2015). Studies from other jurisdictions have also reported wide variation in prevalence estimates of NSSI among adolescents in clinical samples, ranging from 40% (Kaess et al., 2013) to 80% (Auerbach et al., 2014).

2.3 Personality Traits and Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI)

One strategy to understand the NSSI phenomenon is to consider the contributions of personality. Personality traits are arranged hierarchically with the most studied level of the hierarchy consisting of five general traits: neuroticism (i.e., stress reactive, prone to negative affect), extraversion (i.e., sociable, prone to positive affect), conscientiousness (i.e., self-controlled, detail oriented), agreeableness (cooperative, trusting), and openness to experiences (interested in new things, intellectual). Several studies indicate that persons who self-injure differ from persons without history of self-injury by high neuroticism and openness and low conscientiousness, agreeableness and extraversion according to the higher-order Big 5 traits (Brown, 2009; Goldstein, Flett, Wekerle, & Wall, 2009; MacLaren & Best, 2010; Mullins-Sweatt et al., 2013).

Personality traits are closely related to self-harm behaviors. Preventing self-harm behaviors should take into account the personality characteristics of adolescents. Extraversion and neuroticism, both risk factors for self-harm, are personality qualities linked to self-harm practices (Liang et al., 2014). The NEO Five-Factor Inventory revealed that NSSI students had greater levels of neuroticism and openness to experience, but lower levels of conscientiousness and extraversion. The findings are consistent with earlier studies on the frequency of NSSI among students and its relationship to personality in other countries (Allroggen et al., 2014).

High neuroticism, on the other hand, has been linked to both current and previous suicide thoughts. Agreeableness was negatively related to thwart belonging, but not perceived burdensomeness, indicating differentiated patterns of relationships between this personality domain and the two suicides constructs. It was conducted with a college sample. It demonstrated

the potential benefit of identifying predisposition risk factors for suicide ideation and interpersonal suicide predictors. This may have implications for the development of upstream suicide prevention measures (DeShong et al., 2015).

According to several studies, those who self-injure have high neuroticism and openness while having low conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion (Mullins et al., 2013). Extraversion and agreeableness were shown to be protective variables against NSSI, while neuroticism was found to be a risk factor (You et al., 2016). NSSI groups scored substantially higher on neuroticism and significantly lower on extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness than those who did not have NSSI, according to Arthurs, et al., Tan (2017). Research has also shown that NSSI in students is related to high neuroticism and openness to experience and low agreeableness and conscientiousness (Allroggen et al., 2014).

Results of the study conducted by Masana et al. (2021) to fifty one (51) participants in a battery test revealed that adolescents at risk for NSSI exhibited high levels of neuroticism and openness to experience but low levels of extraversion and conscientiousness. Hence, the current research endeavored to explicate the personality and behavioral characteristics that illustrate the behavioral dynamics of non-suicidal self-injury as experienced by Filipino adolescents. Behavioral dynamics include the descriptive analysis of the personality traits which motivate or cause the overt, external behavior (Pam, 2013).

2.4 Adolescence and Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI)

As stated by McAndrew (2018), personality traits can be good predictors of behavior. Adolescents who self-harm are more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult, and they are more likely to engage in anti-social behavior compared to adolescent non-self-harmers. According to Brickell et al. (2014), adolescents use NSSI to manage negative feelings and communicate through suffering when they cannot apply more effective solutions, as it brings out soothing experiences that ease the emotional pain.

Poor emotional control among adolescents at risk for NSSI is common. Adolescents who perform NSSI often have problems controlling intense emotions (Floyd, 2019). As adolescents are vulnerable to hard life experiences due to developmental changes that they experience, emotions

cascade. Adolescents use NSSI to manage these feelings and to communicate suffering when they cannot apply more effective solutions (Brickell et al., 2014). NSSI brings about soothing experiences that ease emotional pain (Klonsky et al., 2014).

Goodyear et al. (2011) mentioned that self-injury is a relatively common phenomenon in adolescents. Often, there is no suicidal intention; rather, action is used for one or more reasons related to reducing distress, inflicting self-punishment, and/or signaling personal distress to important others. Adolescents with both NSSI and suicide attempts reported significantly more adverse life events and trauma symptoms than adolescents with NSSI alone, regardless of the frequency of NSSI. The greatest differences (effect sizes) were found for interpersonal negative events and symptoms of depression and posttraumatic stress (Zetterqvist, et al., 2012).

To date, only a few studies examining non-suicidal self-injurious behaviors among adolescents in non-western countries, like the Philippines, have been published. There was an attempt to convey the context of NSSI among Filipino adolescents in the Ilocano community (Banaticla et al., 2016). However, the findings might be generalized only to adolescents from Ilocos and not to other regions in the Philippines. It is also reported that NSSI surfaces mostly among high schools or junior high schools in the Philippines (Estanislao, 2013).

2.5 Sex and Non -Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI)

There is evidence of sex differences in frequencies and specific methods of NSSI that may also have implications for intervention and prevention programs. While women may prefer cutting, scratching, bruising, and nail biting more often than men, men are more likely to report burning behaviors, and the most preferable method for men is self-hitting. Moreover, some studies have found that men reported more episodes of NSSI per day than women, although others have revealed that women reported an earlier age of onset.

On a cross-sectional study conducted by Galicia & Bautista (2017) involving six colleges from a university in Manila, the results revealed that among the respondents who engaged in any self-harming behavior (N=76), 62% (47 out of 76) were female while 37% (28 out of 76) were males. The respondents endorsed the three most common forms of NSSI: 1) severe scratching (43%), 2) cutting (37%), and 3) punching self (32%). The majority of the respondents (62% or 47

out of 76) who endorsed engaging in self-harming behaviors employed multiple forms of self-harming behavior. The mean age of onset for any form of self-harm was found to be 13.75 years.

According to Barrocas et al. (2012), past studies reporting effects of sex on NSSI engagement have focused on early and middle adolescents, but not children, and they did not test for gender by age interaction for NSSI engagement. Although some research has found that more girls than boys report NSSI, other research has shown no gender difference. Results from the current study showed a grade by sex interaction for lifetime NSSI. In younger youth (i.e., third and sixth graders), NSSI rates did not differ between girls and boys. Older girls (i.e., in ninth grade) were more likely to engage in NSSI than same-aged boys. This study suggests that it is not until the transition to adolescence that the gender difference in NSSI engagement emerges. Three times as many adolescent girls engaged in NSSI compared with boys.

Youth reported using different behavioral methods of NSSI across different developmental periods and genders. Past research shows that adolescents and young girls report cutting their skin at higher rates than boys of the same age. In the current sample, girls reported cutting or carving their skin most often; boys reported hitting themselves. Older youth (i.e., ninth-graders) reported cutting or carving their skin most often; younger youth (i.e., third-graders) reported hitting themselves most often. Based on these findings, it seems important to take into account developmental trends and gender when assessing NSSI behaviors and to assess a greater breadth of NSSI behavioral methods.

2.6 *Birth Order and Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI)*

As previously mentioned, the research conducted by Rohrer et al. (2015) debunked the notion that birth order had any effect on personality, but what is interesting is that they also found significant results for birth order on other variables. For instance, they stated that birth order has a significant effect on intelligence, saying that firstborns have a slightly higher intellect than later-born children (Rohrer et al., 2015). Another study (Barclay et al., 2016) has shown that being born later than your siblings gives you disadvantages in life. For example, you are more likely to be hospitalized for alcohol or narcotic use.

Salmon et al. (2011) found that first and last-born children reported being favored by their parents, which implies that there are differences in how parents favor their children depending on birth order. To the best of our knowledge, there is still a great gap when it comes to empirical research conducted on birth order, and especially when linking it to non-suicidal self-injury.

2.7 *Religion and Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI)*

In most cases, religion provides people with something to believe in, a feeling of order, and, in most cases, a community of people with whom they may connect through shared ideas. These aspects can have a significant positive influence on mental health—research shows that religion lowers the incidence of suicide, self-harming alcoholism, and drug abuse (Greenstein, 2016).

According to Busser et al. (2017), in their pre-investigation, spiritual unhappiness is on the rise. In the research, religious coping was linked to an increase in non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) among individuals. Negative religious coping is a technique that incorporates thoughts that God or a higher power has abandoned or neglected you while you're stressed.

Doubt or depressed feelings may arise when a person is conflicted or challenged by religious matters. Spiritual or religious problems can cause changes in one's beliefs and practices, as well as one's conduct and sentiments toward others and one's connection with oneself. Those who doubt their religion may feel off-balance or dread divine punishment for their doubts, particularly if their faith is founded on trust in a punishing deity (Pargament, 2013).

2.8 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the Five-Factor Theory of Personality by McCrae and Costa (1984). Based on this detailed review and years of researching and interviewing people, McCrae and Costa described the five key qualities that define a personality: Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness to Experiences, Agreeability, and Conscientiousness.

It is a wide spectrum of features that explain variations in the behavior of the person. The basic traits that serve as the building block of personality have been identified. A collection of

individual traits contributes to more complex aspects of personality within each factor. There are key provisions that continue through maturity and form our acts, and can be applicable in our lives.

3. Methodology

Descriptive-correlational approach was employed in this study to investigate the association that exists between personality factors and non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) in the respondents. The study's participants were young adolescents from Tiaong, Quezon, Philipppines. Seventy (70) respondents were obtained by the researchers. The respondents are young teenagers ranging in age from sixteen to nineteen (16–19) years old, as these adolescent years are more complex in terms of thinking and may ponder self-harm more clearly (Jacobson et al., 2009).

Purposive sampling was performed to find participants who are reported to have harm themselves. Strict criteria were imposed. First, the participants should have residence in Tiaong, Quezon, Philippines. Second, participants should be sixteen to nineteen (16–19) years old. Third, participants should have been reported to have harmed themselves. Lastly, self-harming had to be for six months to one year only.

The study used available online tools and technologies to gather significant information and critical data that would be beneficial and relevant in completing this investigation. In addition, the usage of several published articles were examined. The consent forms were issued that included the researchers' names, the objective of their study, the protocols for conducting this study, and the advantages; it also included confidentiality terms, contact information, and conditions surrounding their voluntary participation and assent. Questionnaire and consent forms were delivered using Facebook, an online social media platform. Participants volunteered to take part in this study by logging in to their email accounts and answering the questionnaire. All the responses to this survey were kept in a database that concealed the names of the participants and any email or Internet information. Utmost confidentiality and anonymity of the participants were observed. Completed tests and questionnaires were gathered, and the findings were collated, evaluated, and interpreted.

Lastly, the study used the following statistical tools: frequency and percentage distribution were used to describe the respondents' profile data; mean and standard deviation were used to measure the average and variability of the scores of the respondents; Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to measure the significant relationship of Non-Suicidal Self Harm and the personality traits of young adolescents.

4. Findings and Discussion

Table 1

Self-Harm Inventory of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	S.D.	Interpretation
1. Overdosed?	0.84	0.37	High
2. Cut yourself on purpose?	0.86	0.35	High
3. Burned yourself on purpose?	0.83	0.38	High
4. Hit yourself?	0.79	0.41	High
5. Banged your head on purpose?	0.77	0.42	High
6. Abused alcohol?	0.76	0.43	High
7. Driven recklessly on purpose?	0.67	0.47	Moderate
8. Excessively scratched yourself on purpose?	0.74	0.44	High
9. Prevented wounds from healing?	0.67	0.47	Moderate
10. Made medical situations worse on purpose (e.g skipped medications)	0.66	0.48	Moderate
11. Been promiscuous? (i.e. had many sexual partners)	0.04	0.2	Low
12. Set yourself up in a relationship to be rejected?	0.76	0.43	High
13. Abused prescription of medication?	0.69	0.47	High
14. Engaged in emotionally abusive relationships?	0.64	0.48	Moderate
15. Attempted suicide?	0.94	0.23	High
16. Lost a job on purpose?	0.19	0.39	Low
17. Engaged in sexually abusive relationships?	0.13	0.34	Low
18. Exercised an injury on purpose?	0.87	0.34	High
19. Tortured yourself with self-defeating thoughts?	0.91	0.28	High
20. Starved to hurt yourself?	0.96	0.2	Moderate
21. Abused laxatives to hurt yourself?	0.49	0.5	Moderate
OVERALL MEAN	0.68	0.09	High

*Legend***:** *High 0.68-1.00; Moderate 0.34-0.67; Low 0.00-0.33*

Table 1 shows that the respondents have a high level of NSSI as they overdosed, cut themselves on purpose, burned themselves on purpose, hit themselves, banged their heads on purpose, abused alcohol, excessively scratched themselves on purpose, set themselves up in a relationship to be rejected, abused prescription medication, attempted suicide, exercised an injury on purpose, and tortured themselves with self-defeating thoughts. On the other hand, the following indicators, namely: Were driven recklessly on purpose, prevented wounds from healing, intentionally made medical situations worse, engaged in emotionally abusive relationships, starved to hurt themselves, and abused laxatives to hurt themselves, revealed a moderate level of NSSI. Lastly, the indicators: being promiscuous, intentionally losing a job, and engaging in sexually abusive relationships showed a low level of NSSI.

The overall mean of 0.68, with a standard deviation of 0.09 implies that the respondents have been highly engaged in Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI). The highest indicator was involved in directly hurting and setting themselves into an emotional situation. It shows that young adolescents used it to cope with painful or strong emotions. It is their way of getting control over their feelings and relieving them.

There are different types of self-injury; they may be present in isolation or as a complex constellation of behaviors. NSSI includes behaviors such as cutting, hitting, burning, and scraping one's skin, biting oneself, and other types of behavior that may bring on physical pain. In a multi-national study, the lifetime NSSI rate was 18% (Zetterqvist et al., 2020).

Table 2

Personality Traits of the Respondents as to Openness to Experience

Indicators ***I see myself as someone who…***	**Mean**	**S.D.**	**Interpretation**
1. Is original, comes up with new ideas.	3.64	0.76	High
2. Is curious about many things.	4.2	0.75	High
3. Is ingenious, a deep thinker.	3.81	0.87	High
4. Has an active imagination	4.09	0.78	High
5. Is inventive.	3.07	0.89	Moderate
6. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences.	3.84	0.86	High
7. Prefers work that is routines.	2.69	0.81	Moderate
8. Likes to reflect, play with ideas.	3.67	0.74	High
9. Has few artistic interests.	2.56	0.83	Low
10. Is sophisticated in art, music or literature.	3.4	1.04	Moderate
OVERALL MEAN	3.5	0.09	High

Legend: Very High 4.21-5.00; High 3.40-4.20; Moderate 2.61-3.40; Low 1.81-2.60; Very Low 1.00-1.80

Table 2 shows that respondents have a high level of openness to experience as they come up with new ideas, are curious about many things, are ingenious or deep thinkers, have an active imagination, value artistic and aesthetic experiences, and like to reflect or play with ideas. Meanwhile respondents are on the moderate level on being inventive, prefer work that is routine and is sophisticated in art, music, or literature. Lastly, respondents have a low level of openness to experience, as well as having few artistic interests.

The overall mean of 3.5, with a standard deviation of 0.09 implies that respondents have a high level of openness to experience. It shows that respondents enjoy trying new things and are usually liberal or open-minded. They are knowledgeable and adventurous, which may lead them to have a high level of openness to new experiences. As openness to experience refers to people

with a high level of this characteristic, they have a diverse set of interests. They are fascinated by the world and other people, and they are ready to learn new things (Cherry, 2010).

Table 3

Personality Traits of the Respondents as to Conscientiousness

Indicators *I see myself as someone who…*	**Mean**	**S.D.**	**Interpretation**
1. Does thorough job.	3.26	1.03	Moderate
2. Can be somewhat careless.	2.49	1	Low
3. Is reliable worker.	3.6	0.92	High
4. Tends to be disorganized.	2.96	1.07	Moderate
5. Tends to be lazy.	2.77	1.07	Moderate
6. Perseveres until the task is finished.	3.52	0.81	High
7. Does thing efficiently.	3.57	0.77	High
8. Makes plans and follows through them.	3.4	0.84	Moderate
9. Is easily distracted.	2.59	1.23	Low
OVERALL MEAN	3.13	0.15	Moderate

Legend: *Very High 4.21-5.00; High 3.40-4.20; Moderate 2.61-3.40; Low 1.81-2.60; Very Low 1.00-1.80*

Table 3 shows that respondents have a high level of conscientiousness as they are reliable workers, persevere until the task is finished, and do things efficiently. At the moderate level, the respondents do a thorough job, tend to be disorganized, tend to be lazy, and make plans and follow through on them. Respondents have a low level of conscientiousness as they can be somewhat careless and easily distracted.

The overall mean of 3.13 with a standard deviation of 0.15 implies that respondents have a moderate level of conscientiousness. Overall, it shows that respondents were responsible, organized, and goal oriented, which led them to have a moderate level of conscientiousness, and in the indicators, numbers three, six, and seven, it implies the positive attributes of being a good worker and hard-working person. Conscientiousness refers to a personality attribute defined as the ability to control one's urges and act in socially acceptable ways (Ackerman, 2020).

Table 4

Personality Traits of the Respondents as to Extraversion

Indicators *I see myself as someone who…*	**Mean**	**S.D.**	**Interpretation**
1. Is talkative.	3.56	1.14	High
2. Is reserved.	2.69	0.94	Moderate
3. Is full of energy.	3.19	1.08	Moderate
4. Generates a lot of enthusiasm.	3.31	0.77	Moderate
5. Tends to be quiet.	2.54	1.23	Low
6. Has an assertive personality.	3.34	0.78	Moderate
7. Is sometimes shy, inhibited.	2.36	0.89	Low
8. Is outgoing, sociable.	3.44	1.03	High
OVERALL MEAN	3.05	0.17	Moderate

Legend: *Very High 4.21-5.00; High 3.40-4.20; Moderate 2.61-3.40; Low 1.81-2.60; Very Low 1.00-1.80*

Table 4 shows that respondents have a high level of extraversion as talkative and outgoing or sociable. On the moderate level, the respondents are reserved, full of energy, generate a lot of enthusiasm and have an assertive personality, and lastly, they have a low level of extraversion as they tend to be quiet and are sometimes shy or inhibited.

The overall mean of 3.05, with a standard deviation of 0.17 indicates that respondents have a moderate level of extraversion. Overall, respondents can express their emotions, are somewhat socially active and somehow carefully think before speaking, which leads them to have a moderate level of extraversion. Extraversion refers to thriving in social circumstances. They get invigorated and thrilled when they are in the company of others. They are also full of sociability, talkativeness, assertiveness, and a high level of emotional expressiveness (Cherry, 2010).

Table 5 shows that respondents have a high level of agreeableness as they are helpful and unselfish with others, start quarrels with others, have a forgiving nature, are generally trusting, are considerate and kind to almost everyone, and like to cooperate with others. The respondents are on the moderate level as they tend to find fault with others and are sometimes rude to others. Lastly, respondents have a low level of agreeableness as they can be cold and aloof.

Table 5

Personality of the Respondents as to Agreeableness

Indicators *I see myself as someone who…*	**Mean**	**S.D.**	**Interpretation**
1. Tends to find fault with others.	3.27	0.95	Moderate
2. Is helpful and unselfish with others.	3.79	1.02	High
3. Starts quarrels with others.	3.41	1.04	High
4. Has forgiving nature.	3.83	0.92	High
5. Is generally trusting.	3.7	0.98	High
6. Can be cold and aloof.	2.57	0.97	Low
7. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone.	3.89	0.84	High
8. Is sometimes rude others.	2.96	0.84	Moderate
9. Likes to cooperate with others.	3.5	0.84	High
OVERALL MEAN	3.43	0.08	High

Legend: *Very High 4.21-5.00; High 3.40-4.20; Moderate 2.61-3.40; Low 1.81-2.60; Very Low 1.00-1.80*

The overall mean of 3.43, with a standard deviation of 0.08 indicates that the respondents have a high level of agreeableness. Overall, the respondents' care a lot for other people and show them kindness and affection, which leads to a high level of agreeableness. It also shows that they are trustworthy and forgiving, preferring to work together rather than compete. Agreeable individuals have the capacity to be kind, empathic, trustworthy, cooperative, and sympathetic, which is determined by their ability to be agreeable (Gordon, 2020).

Table 6 shows that respondents have a high level of neuroticism as they can be tense, worry a lot, be moody, and get nervous easily, while the respondents have a moderate level of neuroticism as they are depressed or blue, relaxed or handle stress very well, are emotionally stable and not easily upset, and remain calm in tense situations.

The over-all mean of 3.31, with a standard deviation of 0.11 implies that respondents have a moderate level of neuroticism. Overall, the respondents can endure worrying about things and experiencing dramatic shifts in mood, which may lead them to a moderate level of neuroticism.

Table 6
Personality Traits of the Respondents as to Neuroticism

Indicators *I see myself as someone who…*	**Mean**	**S.D.**	**Interpretation**
1. Is depressed, blue.	2.79	1.12	Moderate
2. Is relaxed, handles stress very well.	2.7	0.99	Moderate
3. Can be tense.	3.6	0.86	High
4. Worries a lot.	3.93	0.87	High
5. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset.	2.94	1.01	Moderate
6. Can be moody.	3.87	0.82	High
7. Remains calm in tense situations.	2.93	1.05	Moderate
8. Gets nervous easily.	3.73	0.9	High
OVER-ALL MEAN	3.31	0.11	Moderate

Legend: *Very High 4.21-5.00; High 3.40-4.20; Moderate 2.61-3.40; Low 1.81-2.60; Very Low 1.00-1.80*

Neuroticism refers to a personality trait that is characterized by irritability and emotional instability. Individuals with this personality type are more likely to have mood swings, anxiety, impatience, and melancholy (Cherry, 2010).

Table 7
Test of Correlation between the Profile of the Respondents and Non-Suicidal Self Injury

Variables	**Non-Suicidal Self-Injury**		
	r-value	**p-value**	**Interpretation**
Age	0.115	0.058	Not Significant
Sex	0.13	0.058	Not Significant
Birth Order	-0.136	0.061	Not Significant
Religion	0.262	0.016	Significant

Legend: $p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant

Table 7 shows the test of correlation between the profile of the respondents and non-suicidal self-injury. Among the profiles of the respondents, which include age with a p-value of 0.058, gender with a p-value of 0.058, birth order with a p-value of 0.061 and religion with a p-value of 0.016, only religion is significant for non-suicidal self-injury. This indicates that the age, gender, and birth order of the respondents do not affect their level of self-harm.

There is a significant relationship between religion and NSSI, which states that respondents engage in NSSI because they may feel abandoned by God and have lost faith in Him. Respondents are not fully committed to their religion, which is why they feel ignored and use self-harm as their own way of coping. Spirituality may potentially be a risk factor for NSSI. The link between NSSI and religiosity is ambiguous: religion may serve as a means of coping; yet, negative forms of religious coping may lead to a rise in NSSI. On the other hand, NSSI may be a method of dealing with some parts of religiosity. Questioning and uncertainty, for example, might lead to the usage of NSSI as a coping mechanism in religion. Spiritual dissatisfaction and religious coping, for example, might be linked to NSSI. Furthermore, NSSI's functions may be influenced by religious self-identity ("higher religiousness was associated with greater use of NSSI to communicate with or gain attention from others, whereas lower religiousness was associated with greater use of NSSI to relieve unwanted emotions"), requiring different treatment.

The onset of non-suicidal self-injury usually starts in adolescence (Glenn & Klonsky, 2011; Hankin & Abela, 2011; Klonsky, 2011) and decreases throughout late adolescence and young adulthood (García-Nieto et al., 2015; Jacobson & Gould, 2007). These are the reasons why the researchers focused the study on young adults.

Aside from prevalence data, only a few studies have looked at how NSSI traits differ between boys and females. According to data from studies of undergraduate college students, women and men use the same number of NSSI techniques. However, there may be differences in other NSSI features, such as medical severity and the relevance of social and internal self-injury functions (Whitlock, 2011). This shows that non-suicidal self-injurious conduct may emerge differently in girls and males under various circumstances. Interestingly, while it is typical for individuals to believe that NSSI is more frequent in women, general population studies indicate equal prevalence in men and women. However, there appears to be a gender difference in the NSSI methods used: women are more likely to use cutting, whereas men are more likely to use beating or burning. In recent years, birth order has struggled to yield major empirical results in several sectors of social science, such as personality (Rohrer et al., 2015).

Positive religious coping was linked to a lower risk of using NSSI to relieve unpleasant feelings, whereas poor religious coping was linked to a higher risk of using NSSI for this reason,

as well as to avoid punishment or unwanted responsibilities, and lower religiousness was linked to more NSSI use to relieve unpleasant feelings (Wieman, 2014).

Table 8
Test of Correlation between Non-Suicidal Self Injury and Personality of the Respondents

Variables	Non-Suicidal Self-Injury		
	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Openness	-0.097	0.089	Not Significant
Conscientiousness	-0.004	0.051	Not Significant
Extraversion	-0.059	0.063	Not Significant
Agreeableness	0.152	0.105	Not Significant
Neuroticism	0.086	0.078	Not Significant

Legend: *$p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant*

Table 8 presents the test of correlation between personality traits and non-suicidal self-injury of the respondents. Result showed that there is no significant relationship between NSSI and openness to new experiences of the respondents. The p-value of 0.089 indicates that the respondents are open-minded and willing to consider new ideas. Rather than hurting themselves, they tend to be curious and imagine what they can do to cope with their problems. A person with this personality trait tends to be attentive to their inner feelings.

Result showed that there is no significant relationship between non-suicidal self-injury and conscientiousness. The p-value of 0.051 indicates that the respondents who are conscientious are more organized and disciplined. It also showed that there is no significant relationship between non-suicidal self-injury and extraversion, The p-value of 0.063 indicates that the respondents who are extraverted seem to be talkative and sociable and focus more on intrapersonal relationships. They are possibly not able to engage in self-harming because they are open about themselves and can use their socializing skills as a coping mechanism rather than hurting themselves.

Result showed that there is no significant relationship between non-suicidal self-injury and agreeableness, with a p-value of 0.105, which indicates that the respondents are not likely to engage in self-harming because they are optimists, kind, and friendly. They can communicate and

reflect on other people, which may not lead to self-hurt. Instead, they allow themselves to talk and share their thoughts with other people.

Result showed that there is no significant relationship between non-suicidal self-injury and neuroticism. The p-value of 0.078 indicates that the respondents are having anxiety, going through depression, and other negative feelings, but they are not on the high level of neuroticism; instead, they are only on a moderate level, which means they tend to control their negative emotions.

As a result of previous research, according to Olsen (2012), many of the personality traits were inconsistent with past studies, and the results were surprising because of the changes. Based on their results, conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness to new experiences, and neuroticism were not significantly correlated to self-harm, while extroversion was. On the other hand, the result of extroversion in our research was high and the positive attributes of this trait were possessed by our respondents.

In a study done by Holsen (2012), several of the personality variables were inconsistent with past studies and expectations. Conscientiousness, as expected, was significantly and negatively correlated with deliberate self-harm (DSH), also known as self-injurious behavior or self-injury, or the intentional, direct destruction of body tissue (most commonly by cutting, burning, scratching, self-hitting, and head banging) without conscious suicidal intent but resulting in injury severe enough for tissue damage to occur (APA, 2013). This means that when someone has a high score on the conscientiousness scale, the number of times they self-harm will be low.

5. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the results proved that there is no significant relationship between the profile of the respondents as to age, gender, and birth order and Non-Suicidal Self Injury (NSSI), while there is a significant relationship with religion. In addition, there is no significant relationship between the Non-Suicidal Self Injury and personality traits of the respondents. Furthermore, results showed that self-harming of the respondents has nothing to do with their age, gender, and birth order. It also has nothing to do with their personality.

References

Ackerman, C. (2021). Big Five Personality Traits: The OCEAN Model Explained. *Positive Psychology*. https://positivepsychology.com/big-five-personality-theory.

Allroggen, Grandclerc, S., De Labrouhe, D., Spodenkiewicz, M., Lachal, J., Moro, M.R. (2014) Apr 18. Relations between Nonsuicidal Self-Injury and Suicidal Behavior in Adolescence: A Systematic Review. PLoS One. 11(4):e0153760. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0153760.

Barrocas, A. L., Hankin, B. L., Young, J. F., & Abela, J. R. (2012). Rates of non-suicidal self-injury in youth: age, sex, and behavioral methods in a community sample. Pediatrics, *130*(1), 39-45.

Busser, J., Buser, T. Rutt, C. (2017). Nonsuicidal Self-Injury and Spiritual/Religious Coping. 39 (2): 132–148.

Che, O., Bogg, T., Roberts, B.W. (2018) Jun. The case for conscientiousness: evidence and implications for a personality trait marker of health and longevity. Ann Behav Med. 45(3):278-88. doi: 10.1007/s12160-012-9454-6.

Cherry, K. (2010). The Big Five Personality Traits. Very Well Mind. https://www.verywellmind.com/the-big-five-personality-dimensions-2795422

Deshong, X., García Herrero, A.M., Sánchez-Meca, J., Álvarez Muñoz, F.J., Rubio Aparicio, M., Navarro-Mateu, F. (2015) Aug. Neuroticismo e ideas suicidas: unestudio meta-analítico [Neuroticism and suicidal thoughts: a meta- analytic study*]*. Rev Esp Salud Publica. 92:e201808049. Spanish.

Goodyear, C., Lockwood, J., Daley, D., Townsend, E., and Sayal K. (2013) Apr. Impulsivity and self-harm in adolescence: a systematic review. Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 26(4):387-402. doi: 10.1007/s00787-016-0915-5. .

Greenstein, L. (2016). The Mental Health Benefits of Religion and Sprituality. https://www.nami.org/Blogs/NAMI-Blog/December-2016/The- Mental- Health-Benefits-of-Religion-Spiritual

Holzman, P. S. (2020). *Personality*. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/personality

Klonsky, E. D., Victor, S. E., Saffer, B. Y. (2014). Nonsuicidal self-injury: What we know, and what we need to know.

Liang, V., Laghi, F., Terrinoni, A., Cerutti, R., Fantini, F., Galosi, S., Ferrara, M., Bosco, F.M. (2014) Jul. Theory of mind in non-suicidal self-Injury (NSSI) adolescents. *Conscious Cogn*. 43:38-47. doi: 10.1016/j.concog.2016.05.004.

McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of personality*, *60*(2), 175-215.

Nguyen, V., Szcześniak, M., Rodzeń, W., Malinowska, A., Kroplewski, Z. (2013). Big Five Personality Traits and Gratitude: The Role of Emotional Intelligence. Psychol Res Behav Manag.13:977-988. doi: 10.2147/PRBM.S268643

Pargament, K. (2013). What role do religion and spirituality play in mental health? http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2013/03/religion-spirituality.aspx

Salmon, N., Deyoung, C.G., Carey, B.E., Krueger, R.F., Ross, S.R. (2012). Ten aspects of the Big Five in the Personality Inventory for DSM-5. Personal Disord. 7(2):113-23. doi: 10.1037/per0000170.

Sansone, R, Wiederman M. (2015). Religiosity/spirituality: Relationships with non-suicidal self-harm behaviors and attempted suicide. Int J Soc Psychiatry. 61(8):762-7. doi: 10.1177/0020764015579738.

Schacter, B., Vartanian, O., Wertz, C.J., Flores, R.A., Beatty, E.L., Smith, I., Blackler, K., Lam, Q., Jung, R.E. (2011). Structural correlates of Openness and Intellect: Implications for the contribution of personality to creativity. Hum Brain Mapp. 39(7):2987-2996. doi: 10.1002/hbm.24054.

Widiger, M., Rappaport, L.M., Flint, J., Kendler, K.S. (2017). Clarifying the role of neuroticism in suicidal ideation and suicide attempt among women with major depressive disorder. PsycholMed.; 47(13):2334-2344. doi: 10.1017/S003329171700085X.

Zetterquist, R., Rasmussen, S., Hawton, K., Philpott-Morgan, S., O'connor, R.C. (2018). Why Do Adolescents Self-Harm? Crisis. 37(3):176-83. doi:10.1027/0227-5910/a000369.

International Review of Social Sciences Research
Volume 1 Issue 4 December 2021
DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352595

Dress Code Policy Adherence and Self-Discipline of University Students

[1]Lyndonn Stephen D. Santos & [2]Portia R. Marasigan

Abstract

The new normal of online learning eventually changed how students dress for online classes. It also highlighted the concepts of self-management through the exercise of self-discipline. This study determined the dress code policy adherence and self-discipline of selected university students through a descriptive-correlational research design involving 100 purposively chosen students. The respondents are mostly young adults, female, third year level taking-up business administration. The researcher-made instrument measured the levels of dress code policy adherence and the self-discipline of the respondents. Results showed that students have high levels of dress code policy adherence and self-discipline. However, only age, sex, and course are significantly related to dress code policy adherence whereas only age and sex are significantly related to self-discipline. The study further reflected that past behavior is significantly related to the self-discipline. The results of the study may serve as inputs to the review of the institutional dress code policy in the new normal.

Keywords: *Dress Code, Dress Code Policy, Policy Adherence, Self-Discipline, University Students*

Received: October 28, 2021 **Revised:** December 2, 2021 **Accepted:** December 7, 2021

Suggested Citation: Santos, L.D. & Marasigan, P.R. (2021). Dress Code Policy Adherence and Self-Discipline of University Students. *International Review of Social Sciences Research*, Volume 1 Issue 4, pp. 44- 67. DOI: https://doi.org/10.53378/352595

About the authors:

[1]Student, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines
[2]Associate Professor 5, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

© The author (s). Published by Institute of Industry and Academic Research Incorporated.
This is an open-access article published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license, which grants anyone to reproduce, redistribute and transform, commercially or non-commercially, with proper attribution. Read full license details here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

1. Introduction

Dress code policies are regulatory policies, or mandates composed and adopted by a university administration, that limit the discretion of students, or otherwise compel them to follow certain types of behavior. The university primarily has the prerogative to regulate the appropriate or inappropriate actions through a policy, guideline, memorandum, etc. Adhering to these policies is seen as good behavior. Dress code policy adherence plays a major role in identification and application of an educational institution's core values that will guide and encourage its students. However, there are institutions that do not implement a dress code policy. Their students are responsible for their own clothing and self-expression (Renales, 2016; Ramirez, 2017). Indeed, every university are distinct and cultural factors could be involved as it regulates student behavior inside the campus (Kaveh et al., 2015).

Students are expected to adhere to this imposed policy. However, given the challenges brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic and the predicaments that students are facing, the university moved meetings to an online platform. Dress codes become a second thought and there is currently no dress code policy being implemented for online classes. There are only online classroom rules like, *"Dress appropriately. No sleeveless, no topless, and no wearing of shorts when attending the virtual class."* These virtual setting will inevitably change the way people dress for classes. The way people dress and present themselves during online meetings gives them a sense of normalcy in unusual times (Shepherd, 2020). Before this change occurs, it is equally important to have a comparable study about what the situation was like when students used to engage in face-to-face interaction. It could be beneficial for future research with similar variables whether for the new normal of online classes or adjusting to face-to-face meetings.

According to Sequeira et al. (2014), researchers conducting studies on dress codes are mostly focused on primary, middle school, and high school students, and very few studies have been done on dress code for college students and especially one that includes all departments. Brookshire (2016) also stated that researchers have not conducted follow-up studies, reviews, or evaluations on the impact of uniforms and concluded that future correlational research is vital in acquiring statistical data about whether school uniforms impact behavior. One aspect across the broad spectrum of behavior is self-discipline.

The pandemic forced students to change and this highlighted the importance of principles like good self-management that can be achieved by exercising self-discipline. In this context,

studies demonstrate the positive impact of self-discipline on a wide range of life outcomes, emphasizing the importance of students having and being taught self-discipline early in life (Garcia & Subia, 2019; Gelles et al., 2020; Şimşir & Dilmaç, 2021). Self-discipline can be defined as a practice, habit, or skill and is established as an important factor for success. It is the ability to both begin tasks and carry them through to completion. Self-discipline is the effort an individual exerts to regulate their own moods, that results in reducing their internal conflicts (Mihm & Ozbek, 2016). Students require sustained self-discipline to continue with their goal commitment and to successfully attain them.

The university administrators could consider strengthening student's self-discipline through reviewing and implementing a dress code policy that is adapted to the new normal (Momeni & Asghari, 2018). They could encourage the students to participate in policy-making. The students' past experiences could guide them to make suggestions (Villanueva, 2017). Most importantly, the university could extend their efforts by supporting and encouraging educators to employ self-regulation exercises and training programs. For instance, workshops for developing effective habits and routines in school and home is one strategy that could be followed to enhance self-discipline among students (APA, 2012). Studies also suggested providing appropriate feedback, better time management skills, creating and adhering to a schedule, removing distractions and setting boundaries can help (Momeni & Asghari, 2018; Garcia & Subia, 2019; Gelles et al., 2020). Furthermore, preparations could start to create guidelines for an updated dress code for when the students return to the university.

This study aimed to determine the dress code policy adherence and self-discipline of the selected college students of Laguna State Polytechnic University and to relate them. Specifically, it sought to identify the profile of the respondents as to age, sex, year level, and course, the levels of the dress code policy adherence of the respondents in terms of attitude, subjective norms, past behavior, and behavioral intention, and the levels of self-discipline of the respondents in accordance to standards, motivation, monitoring, and willpower. Moreover, this study aimed to investigate the relationship between the profile of the respondents and the variables: dress code policy adherence and self-discipline, and lastly, the relationship between the dress code policy adherence and self-discipline in terms of attitude, subjective norms, past behavior, and behavioral intention. Results of this study may provide valuable insight to the local site to create more informed decisions regarding the implementation of dress code policies.

2. Literature review

2.1. Dress Code Policy Adherence

Dress code policies are implemented by schools to protect the health and safety of the students, meet standards of community decorum, and promote discipline (Lunenburg, 2011). Students are generally identified about their level of education and affiliation from their school uniform. It adds to the reputation of the institution and adopting dress codes and uniforms creates social uniformity among students and induces them to behave in a disciplined manner (Sequeira et al., 2014).

The students of Laguna State Polytechnic University should observe the expected norm of behavior in accordance with the *Student Handbook 2014 Edition.* The dress code policy is included in Article 3 Miscellaneous Rules and Regulations. Section 1 School Uniforms. It states the permitted and strictly prohibited acts, and attires or apparels, as well as disciplinary action if students commit deviations from the dress code policy. (LSPU *Student Handbook,* 2014).

On the other hand, the University of the Philippines is known for its liberal education, which translates into freedom of expression (Ramirez, 2017). UP is a platform for self-expression and does not have any dress code. Students can make their own choices in deciding what to wear (Renales, 2016). In the university, both students and professors could dress themselves in the way they want every single day without judgments.

Villanueva (2017) investigated the perceived gaps in transmission of these policies and rules from the perspective of the policy actors, which are the students, parents, and authority (teacher/administration). When participants were asked regarding the origin or history of the dress code policy, Villanueva summarized that they simply were *"following or continuing what had already been established or what is being practiced."* Villanueva concluded that students get lost in translation on the phenomenon of uniform policies because *"policies in transmission may seemingly be misunderstood or get filtered."*

Sarwari (2020) believed that the virtual setting will inevitably change the way people dress for work and even in class. In a remote work setting, Smith (2020) found that about half of employees do not adhere to a modified dress code. If there is an existing dress code for the virtual setting, it should be consistently enforced and should provide guidelines that maintain professionalism. Resistance will be present when people get back into uncomfortable clothes from work. But on the other hand, there are people that may want to reinvent themselves again after the pandemic.

According to Momeni and Asghari (2020), students who had a lack of interest in their chosen field of study did not care about the goals of adherence to professional dress. Through appropriate educational methods and being constantly scrutinized in their implementation and compliance with engagement to policy actors, belief in dress codes can be internalized. Thus, the barriers against the student's adherence to professional dress can be overcome (Villanueva, 2017; Momeni & Asghari, 2020; Smith, 2020).

2.2. Self-Discipline

Self-discipline is the effort an individual exerts to regulate their own moods, that results in reducing their internal conflicts between normative preferences and temptations (Mihm & Ozbek, 2016). It is of pivotal importance for students to exercise this skill as sustained self-discipline is required to continue with their goal commitment and to successfully attain them. A lack of self-discipline may cause student's intellectual potential to shorten. However, there are relatively simple self-regulatory strategies students could learn to use that may substantially improve their ability to attain their academic goals. This further imply that educational institutions could consider if their missions and objectives should extend to directly optimizing self-regulatory strategies to their students, as well as opportunities to maintain and practice them (Duckworth et al., 2011). Furthermore, when students abide and conduct themselves accordingly, they can maintain self-discipline and uphold the LSPU system's policies, rules and regulations (LSPU Handbook, 2014).

A student's level of self-discipline is positively related to their level of emotional intelligence (Moneva & Gatan, 2020). They can identify several factors in coping with stress by employing their emotional intelligence and self-discipline. In addition, students could improve their intellectual capacities and associate themselves with positive affirmations and encouragements in facing problems they may encounter in school and in life.

Wu (2016) claimed that at the university level, students who want to understand and master a large number of operating rules and mainstream social values, put these rules and values into their own inner thoughts and motives, so that their actions are consistent with the requirements of society. Students' self-discipline is formed and developed under the influence of constraints. These constraints come from school, family, and society that forms a restraining force. So, the development of self-discipline encouraged students to better consciously accept the influence of external constraints that may lead to its improvement. Improving college students' self-discipline can achieve college students' self-management.

According to Han (2019), college students are in the critical period of personal growth and success. Students' personal growth and development totally depends on their own sense of self-discipline. Hence, the sense of self-discipline plays a particularly important role in their development. Students with strong self-discipline will make full use of resources, better plan their own time, study hard, and enrich their college life.

Surprisingly, studies have shown that women might have troubles with self-discipline. According to Meyers (2016), if a woman falls short of the expectations they have to meet, they often view their unsuccessful attempts as personal failures. This may be attributed to how women are presented with unreasonable standards that they have to achieve. These expectations may cause them overwhelming feelings of shame, stress, inadequacy, etc. Also, women tend to report stress more than men as stressful events have a different impact on women (Núñez-Rocha et al., 2020).

Various research revealed the positive impact of self-discipline on a wide range of life outcomes. According to Garcia and Subia (2019), self-discipline helps student athletes develop better time management skills. It also prepared them thoroughly for competitions and improved focus on their plans. Meanwhile, Gelles et al. (2020) found that most students identify time management, creating and adhering to a schedule, removing distractions and setting boundaries as actions rooted in being self-disciplined. Lastly, Şimşir and Dilmaç (2021) discovered that self-discipline makes a significant contribution to a peaceful life. It promotes numerous human behaviors with positive psychological outcomes.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

The study was anchored on Martin Fishbein and Icek Azjen's Theory of Reasoned Action (1975). According to this theory, a person's behavior is determined by their behavioral intention. It is described as the intention to perform a certain behavior in a specific way in certain situations. This theory also focused on a person's attitude towards a behavior and the subjective norms that potentially affects their behavior, attitude, views, and perception. These subjective norms are influenced by the beliefs of the people around them like parents, friends, partners, colleagues, etc. In addition, Ryu and Han (2010) found that attitude and past behavior were significant predictors of tourists' behavioral intention. They found that based from past studies, the inclusion of the past behavior as a predictor significantly enhanced the predictive ability of the TRA model in intentions and/or actual behaviors. Findings showed a positive causal relationship from past behavior to behavioral intentions.

According to Kaveh et al. (2015), the theory of reasoned action can be efficiently used in determining and studying students' behavior regarding university dress code. Based from the survey on 472 students of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, 26 percent of the students had negative attitude towards the dress code. For the student's subjective norms, the results were considerably far from the expected level as only 8 percent were informed about the dress code through professors and other students but 67 percent reported that it was important for them because of the support of parents, instructors, and peers. Meanwhile, the behavioral intention of the participants towards dress code-based dressing was relatively good, with 62.3 percent of the students adhering to the dress code, while 26.4 percent did not have the same intention. Most importantly, Kaveh et al. (2015) stated that subjective norms played a more critical role in explaining the dress code behavior among the students.

The Self-Regulation Theory by Roy Baumeister was also used to support the study. This theory outlines the system and process of conscious personal management where the mind exerts controls over its drives, functions, and states. It helps individuals to become in line with a preferred state on a regular basis, in both short- and long-term situations. There are four (4) components of SRT: (1) standards of desirable behavior, (2) motivation to meet standards, (3) monitoring of situations and thoughts that precede breaking standards and (4) willpower or internal strength to control urges. The SRT relates to self-discipline as it is a system and process where it can outline the effort an individual exerts to regulate their own moods, that results in reducing their internal conflicts (Mihm & Ozbek, 2016).

Self-regulation theory fits the investigation of self-discipline and how it is related to dress code policy adherence as an individual's goals can be attained by their standards, motivation, monitoring, and willpower. Further, Cepe (2014) used the delay of gratification theory to measure the self-discipline of college students but still required a multi-informant approach, while Mbaluka (2017) used the self-determination theory which also needed an additional questionnaire to gather reports from parents and teachers. Furthermore, the self-regulation theory, paired with the theory of reasoned action, seems to be the most appropriate theoretical approach in assessing student's perspectives and self-report on their self-discipline. Lastly, Walukouw and Simbolon (2019) stated there is a significant relationship between self-regulation and discipline. Thus, discipline requires self-regulation.

3. Methodology

The study used descriptive-correlational design since it described the behavior of the respondents and determined the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. The respondents of the study are 100 college students of Laguna State Polytechnic University – San Pablo City Campus. Using purposive sampling technique, the criteria set in the selection of respondents are as follows: (1) respondents must be a college student of LSPU-SPCC who has studied with face-to-face class for at least a semester in the university, and; (2) they must be willing to participate. Demographics of the participants showed that: 91% were 18 to 23 years old; 58% were female; 77% were in the third year level; and 30% were Bachelor of Science in Business Administration.

Researcher-made questionnaires were used to measure the level of dress code policy adherence and level of self-discipline of the respondents. The instruments were validated by experts in the field of psychology. Suggestions and recommendations were considered for refinement before going to the actual phase of the study, where the researchers selected college students qualified in the criteria set in choosing the respondents. The researchers explained the purpose of the study and were ensured that all answers gathered will be kept confidential. They were administered questionnaires through an online survey. After answering the provided test, the researcher gathered, tabulated, analyzed the results.

Lastly, the study used the following statistical tools: frequency and percentage distribution were used to describe the respondents' profile data. Mean was used to measure the average of the scores of the tests taken. Lastly, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to measure the relationship between dress code policy adherence and self-discipline.

4. Findings and Discussion

Table 1 shows the level of attitude of the respondents. Indicator 1 *"I feel confident when I'm wearing the prescribed uniform."* had the highest Mean = 3.45 and Standard Deviation = 0.72 interpreted as *"High"*. This implied that the respondents follow the dress code because the feelings of confidence surfaces when they do so. When they wear their uniforms, they view themselves with pride and honor.

Table 1

Level of Attitude of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I feel confident when I'm wearing the prescribed uniform.	3.45	0.72	High
2. Dress code policy restricts student's way of self-expression.	2.00	0.83	Low
3. I feel uncomfortable with the dress code policy.	2.64	0.87	High
4. Implementing dress code promotes a positive image to students.	3.44	0.72	High
5. Having a dress code makes it inconvenient to attend classes.	2.54	0.88	High
6. Following the dress code is beneficial for me.	3.22	0.69	High
7. I feel that complying with the dress code policy is no good.	2.99	0.82	High
8. I am satisfied following the dress code policy.	3.25	0.73	High
Overall	**2.94**	**0.92**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

On the other hand, Indicator 2 *"Dress code policy restricts student's way of self-expression."* had the lowest Mean = 2.00 and Standard Deviation = 0.83 interpreted as *"Low"*, which would likely mean that respondents may have a low level of dress code policy adherence because they believed that it interfered with their freedom of expression. Dress and grooming are generally viewed as a form of self-expression. Restrictions on these behaviors could make students feel that they have no freedom in expressing themselves.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 2.94 and a Standard Deviation = 0.92, it is implied that the respondents have high level of dress code policy adherence in terms of attitude. The respondents could have mixed feelings about the dress code. Most notably, the positive feeling is confidence and honor while the negative feeling can be restriction on self-expression. Nevertheless, the positive outweighs the negative when it comes to college student's attitudes, resulting in a high level of dress code policy adherence.

Table 2 shows the level of subjective norms of the respondents. Indicator 7 *"I am aware that the dress code policy should be followed as I am seeing my fellow students doing it."* has the highest Mean = 3.44 and Standard Deviation = 0.66 interpreted as *"High".* This indicates that college students become aware of following the dress code when they see people like them doing the same thing. If their peers adhere to the dress code policy, then they will likely perform the same behavior.

Table 2

Level of Subjective Norms of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am encouraged to follow the dress code policy imposed by the school.	3.41	0.55	High
2. I believe that adhering to the dress code policy is promoted in the school.	3.42	0.59	High
3. Most people tolerate me in what I want to wear in school.	2.61	0.90	High
4. I feel compelled to follow the dress code policy due to social pressure.	2.55	0.77	High
5. It is expected of me to not wear prohibited attires inside the campus.	2.76	0.99	High
6. I will not follow the dress code policy since there are school personnel who do not conform also.	3.16	0.83	High
7. I am aware that the dress code policy should be followed as I am seeing my fellow students doing it.	3.44	0.66	High
8. Most people whose opinions I value thinks that I should not comply with the university's dress code.	2.80	0.90	High
Overall	**3.02**	**0.86**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

In contrast, Indicator 4 *"I feel compelled to follow the dress code policy due to social pressure."* has the lowest Mean = 2.55 and Standard Deviation = 0.77 interpreted as *"High"*. This means that as college students, they feel that their actions partly comply to social norms but is not entirely reliant on them when it comes to deciding what actions to take in regards to their adherence to the dress code policy. It is also possible that they may choose to do so as well on their own volition.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 3.02 and Standard Deviation = 0.86, it can be understood that the respondents has high level of dress code policy adherence in terms of subjective norms. This implied that college students may perceive their fellow students as individuals that have important and effective expectations regarding the performance or avoidance of a behavior, particularly their dress code policy adherence. As they see them performing the stated behavior, they would be aware that they should follow the dress code. However, it is possible that college students understand and are aware of their own interests which could also influence their adherence. Nonetheless, the college student's subjective norms result in a high level of dress code policy adherence.

Table 3

Level of Past Behavior of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I wear the proper school uniform in every day classes.	3.62	0.55	Very High
2. I follow the standard hair policy adhered on the dress code.	3.44	0.70	High
3. I go to school wearing incomplete school uniform.	3.20	0.93	High
4. I borrow my classmate's Identification Card at times that I forgot mine.	3.42	0.82	High
5. I like to follow the on-trend hair styles not stated on the policy.	3.09	0.94	High
6. I wear my Identification Card in school at all times.	3.67	0.57	Very High
7. I wear accessories such as multiple piercings in school.	3.31	0.95	High
8. I don't wear unnecessary accessories in school so I look neat.	3.06	0.96	High
Overall	**3.35**	**0.84**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Table 3 shows the level of past behavior of the respondents. Indicator 6 *"I wear my Identification Card in school at all times."* had the Highest Mean = 3.67 and Standard Deviation = 0.57 interpreted as *"Very High"*. This implied that the respondents wear their Identification Card regularly as it allows them to enter the university and access the provided services. It could easily be placed on their body using lanyards or clips. Most importantly, it is part of the school uniform stated in the dress code policy that provides easy identification.

On the contrary, Indicator 8 *"I don't wear unnecessary accessories in school so I look neat."* had the lowest Mean = 3.06 and Standard Deviation = 0.96 interpreted as *"High"*. This implied that the respondents avoid wearing unnecessary accessories in school because it would give them an unpleasant appearance. They could prefer to keep things simple and decide that it is better to stay in line with what is prescribed to wear. Furthermore, they do not wear unnecessary accessories as it could possibly be a hindrance in their bodies as well as give them an unlikeable impression from other people.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 3.35 and Standard Deviation = 0.84, it implied that the respondents have high level of dress code policy adherence in terms of past behavior. Students may follow or continue to follow the dress code as it is what had already been established and what is being practiced. This indicated that past experience of following the dress code could strengthen college students' dress code policy adherence.

Table 4

Level of Behavioral Intention of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I like to follow the dress code policy of the school.	3.43	0.74	High
2. I want to violate the school dress code policy.	3.36	0.84	High
3. I plan to comply with the school's dress code.	3.03	0.90	High
4. I find it unclear on how students will be given sanctions imposed on the dress code policy.	2.53	0.86	High
5. I intend to adhere to the dress code policy.	3.10	0.69	High
6. I follow the dress code because I am required to.	1.49	0.63	Very Low
7. I find myself having a hard time following the dress code.	2.81	0.93	High
8. I understand that going with the dress code policy is needed for compliance.	3.41	0.73	
Overall	**2.90**	**1.00**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Table 4 shows the level of behavioral intention of the respondents. Indicator 1 *"I like to follow the dress code policy of the school."* had the Highest Mean = 3.43 and Standard Deviation = 0.74, interpreted as *"High"*. This implied that most of the respondents follow the dress code policy of the school because they like doing it. College students prefer to wear their uniforms because they enjoy them.

On the other hand, Indicator 6 *"I follow the dress code because I am required to."* had the lowest Mean = 1.49 and Standard Deviation = 0.63 which is interpreted as *"Very Low"*. This means that the respondents may have a very low level of dress code policy adherence because they are required by the university. Being a requirement means that following the dress code is mandatory for college students. The respondents may feel that they are forced to conduct adherence since the student's control over the behavior is incomplete. Therefore, they may not engage with the desired behavior.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 2.90 and Standard Deviation = 1.00, it means that the respondents have high level of dress code policy adherence in terms of behavioral intention. This implied that college students may decide to follow the dress code on their own due to them personally liking the uniforms and that they desire to have a pleasant appearance. However, they may also see that adhering to the dress code is not motivated by their own decisions as they are expected to do so as students of the university. Nonetheless, the college students' intention has a high level in following the dress code.

Table 5

Summary Results of Level of Dress Code Policy Adherence of the Respondents

Factors	Mean	Level
Attitude	2.94	High
Subjective Norms	3.02	High
Past Behavior	3.35	High
Behavioral Intention	2.90	High
Overall Mean	**3.05**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Table 5 shows the summary results of level of dress code policy adherence. It shows that majority of the respondents have a high level of adherence with an overall Mean = 3.05, with past behavior having the highest Mean = 3.35. This indicates that the respondents stay in line with the dress code as they follow what is prescribed to wear. This implied that most college students highly adhere to the dress code based from their previous behaviors, specifically in always wearing their Identification Card inside the campus as part of the school uniform.

Table 6 shows the level of standards of the respondents. Indicator 5 *"I admit my mistakes as part of learning."* had the highest Mean = 3.62 and Standard Deviation = 0.51 which is interpreted as *"Very High"*. This implied that the respondents own up to their mistakes in order to grow and become a better person. They have the potential to acknowledge the usefulness of mistakes. They recognized their setbacks and failure as lesson that make them continue with additional knowledge.

Table 6

Level of Standards of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I accomplish my daily tasks.	3.38	0.63	High
2. I find it difficult to set my plans on time.	2.37	0.80	Low
3. I am responsible of my actions.	3.61	0.51	Very High
4. I always make excuses for doing unpleasant acts.	2.96	0.82	High
5. I admit my mistakes as part of learning.	3.62	0.51	Very High
6. I blame others for my wrong actions.	3.52	0.70	Very High
7. I try to live up with my personal standards.	3.16	0.65	High
8. I live up to other people's expectations of me.	2.77	0.93	High
Overall	**3.17**	**0.82**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

On the other hand, Indicator 2 *"I find it difficult to set my plans on time."* had the lowest Mean = 2.37 and Standard Deviation = 0.80 which is interpreted as *"Low".* This means that the respondents may have a low level of self-discipline because they could have difficulties making plans and scheduling when to carry them out. Uncertain plans or conflicting schedules could cause them to struggle.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 3.17 and Standard Deviation = 0.82, it means that the respondents have high level of self-discipline in terms of standards. This implied that college students have personal standards for mistakes and plans. They could acknowledge mistakes as "lessons" that may help them grow deeper. Also, there could be failures in setting plans and processing schedules. Nonetheless, college students have personal standards, and set their goals and efforts towards them, making them disciplined.

Table 7 shows the level of motivation of the respondents. Indicator 8 *"I am motivated in fulfilling my goals."* had the highest Mean = 3.53 and Standard Deviation = 0.56 which is interpreted as *"Very High".* This implied that the respondents are motivated to fulfill their own goals. They could deal with tasks and challenges but they are motivated to overcome them for their goals and ambitions. Students that recognize the value of their goals will be motivated to invest effort.

On the other hand, Indicator 6 *"I feel overwhelmed in facing problems or challenge."* had the lowest Mean = 2.17 and Standard Deviation = 0.79 which is interpreted as *"Low".* This means that the respondents may have a low level of self-discipline because those who are faced with problems or challenges, feel overwhelmed by them. Students may be burdened with weighing and choosing among alternatives and solutions to problems and challenges. Thus, they may fail to achieve their goals.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 3.03 and Standard Deviation = 0.89, it means that the respondents have high level of self-discipline in terms of motivation. This implied that college students that has goals can become motivated. These goals can give them a clear view of what they want in the future. After they set a goal, the next step is to pursue it. However, they could face overwhelming challenges and problems along the way. Nonetheless, college students have a high level of motivation to overcome them.

Table 7

Level of Motivation of the Respondents

Indicators		Mean	SD	VI
1.	I find it demanding overcoming my difficulties in life.	2.38	0.83	Low
2.	I find it enjoying pushing myself towards challenging goals.	3.43	0.54	High
3.	Rewarding myself is a waste of time.	3.42	0.75	High
4.	I reward myself whenever I accomplished my tasks.	3.41	0.71	High
5.	I feel out of control doing improvement for myself.	2.50	0.86	High
6.	I feel overwhelmed in facing problems or challenge.	2.17	0.79	Low
7.	I approach challenges with a positive mindset.	3.41	0.59	High
8.	I am motivated in fulfilling my goals.	3.53	0.56	Very High
	Overall	**3.03**	**0.89**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Table 8 shows the level of monitoring of the respondents. Indicator 1 *"I am confident on keeping my progress on track."* had the highest Mean = 3.37 and Standard Deviation = 0.58, which is interpreted as *"High"*. This implied that the respondents that can track their progress, can often foster the feeling of confidence. They feel happy, proud, and energized in monitoring their actions towards their goals in life.

Table 8

Level of Monitoring of the Respondents

Indicators		Mean	SD	VI
1.	I am confident on keeping my progress on track.	3.37	0.58	High
2.	At times, I am loosing track of my goals.	2.12	0.74	Low
3.	I always show my true self to others.	3.26	0.69	High
4.	I always speak up for myself.	3.02	0.77	High
5.	I am not the person I always appear to other people.	2.33	0.83	Low
6.	I am afraid to tell what is on my mind.	2.18	0.85	Low
7.	I try to be the person I want to become.	3.36	0.64	High
8.	It bothers me when things are not the way I expect for myself.	1.92	0.68	Low
	Overall	**2.69**	**0.92**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Meanwhile, Indicator 8 *"It bothers me when things are not the way I expect for myself."* had the lowest Mean = 1.92 and Standard Deviation = 0.68, interpreted as *"Low"*. This means that the respondents may have a low level of self-discipline because they feel bothered when their

expectations about themselves are not what they see from their progress and the results they show. If the self falls short, they may cause feelings of frustration, inadequacy, and shame.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 2.69 and Standard Deviation = 0.92, this means the respondents have high level of self-discipline in terms of monitoring. This implied that college students are responsible for their individual progress. They monitor their behavior working towards the achievement of the goal. Keeping track of how much they improved towards specific goals could make them closer to reaching it, exercising their self-discipline.

This implies that the respondents are confident in keeping track of their individual progress as they work towards the achievement of their goals.

Table 9

Level of Willpower of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am open to different opportunities in life.	3.60	0.53	Very High
2. I set limitations for the things I need to focus on.	3.24	0.73	High
3. I am afraid to leave my comfort zone.	2.33	0.91	Low
4. I find it hard putting boundaries on what I want to do.	2.18	0.76	Low
5. I am optimistic in overcoming my challenges.	3.25	0.63	High
6. I have difficulty handling stress.	2.23	0.86	Low
7. I do not allow myself to lose patience.	3.00	0.71	High
8. I struggle working towards my goals.	2.08	0.75	Low
Overall	**2.74**	**0.93**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Table 9 shows the level of willpower of the respondents. Indicator 1 *"I am open to different opportunities in life."* had the highest mean=3.60 and Standard Deviation = 0.53, which is interpreted as *"Very High".* This implied that as college students, the respondents are open to life opportunities because they know that they should have the capacity to walk on different paths to reach their goals. They may seize opportunities in order to succeed.

In contrast, Indicator 8 *"I struggle working towards my goals."* had the lowest mean=2.08 and Standard Deviation = 0.75, which is interpreted as *"Low".* This means that the respondents may have low levels of self-discipline because they experience struggles in achieving their goals. College students may struggle to strive towards their goals because they may be pushed by their parents, and not their own selves.

With an Overall Weighted Mean=2.74 and Standard Deviation=0.93, it means that the respondents have high level of self-discipline in terms of willpower. This implied that college students have the willpower to seize opportunities and make healthy choices in various areas of life, and accomplish their dreams and goals. Thus, student who possess willpower would successfully work towards their dreams and goals.

Table 10

Summary Results of Level of Self-Discipline of the Respondents

Factors	Mean	Level
Standards	3.17	High
Motivation	3.03	High
Monitoring	2.69	High
Willpower	2.74	High
Overall Mean	**2.91**	**High**

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Table 10 shows the summary results of level of self-discipline. It shows that majority of the respondents have a high level of self-discipline with an Overall Mean=2.91, with standards having the highest Mean=3.17. This may indicate that respondents are highly disciplined to set goals, driven to reach them, monitor their progress, and be energized to successfully attain them. Most college students can practice self-discipline by following and evaluating their own standards of success and making sense of their personal strengths and resources.

Table 11

Test of Correlation between Profile and Dress Code Policy Adherence of the Respondents

Variables	Attitude		Subjective Norms		Past Behavior		Behavioral Intention	
	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value
Age	0.143	0.072	0.236	0.024*	0.197	0.066	0.127	0.063
Sex	0.101	0.068	0.226	0.021*	0.000	N/A	0.053	0.057
Year Level	0.154	0.055	0.026	0.111	-0.050	0.103	0.007	0.052
Course	0.230	0.026*	0.171	0.069	0.259	0.030*	0.115	0.059

*Legend: * = $p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant*

Table 11 presents the test of correlation between profile of the respondents and their dress code policy adherence. Among the variables, it is found out that the variable “Course” have a

positive significant relationship (r = 0.23, p = 0.026). In this study, those studying business administration are more likely to have a positive attitude towards following the dress code policy than other courses. According to Sequeira et al. (2014), college students in business administration believes that having uniforms, incorporates discipline among them and develop their image to suit the corporate world as professionals.

On the other hand, "Age" (r = 0.236, p = 0.024) and "Sex" (r = 0.226, p = 0.021) has positive significant relationship. As the age of the female students' increases, the level of their subjective norms increases. In this study, female college students who are ages 18 to 23 are more likely to be influenced by their peers than male students who are ages 17 or younger, and 24 or older in their dressing behavior. According to Kaveh et al. (2015), a student's type of dressing is influenced by their parents in lower ages. However, as the child ages and enters social networks, such as school and friends, the role of parents would diminish and replaced by that of peers. Kaveh et al. referred to the effect of peers on the dress code behavior in girl adolescents where female students were more affected by peers when compared to male students. The girls' higher scores of subjective norms in their study could also demonstrate the higher importance of social preferences in selection of type of dressing for girls.

For past behavior, it shows that only the variable "Course" is significant (r = 0.259, p = 0.030) and has a positive significant relationship. In this study, those studying business administration are more likely to have regularly wear their uniforms and adhered to the dress code policy than students in other courses. According to Sequeira et al. (2014) and Kaveh et al. (2015), for business administration students wearing the uniform reflects on their personality and adds to the reputation of the institution. Their past behavior could be a significant factor for determining their adherence as they explained that a college student's field of study may have different subcultures and may display different behaviors.

Table 12

Test of Relationship between Profile and Self-Discipline

Variables	Standards		Motivation		Monitoring		Willpower	
	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value
Age	0.236	0.038*	0.222	0.031*	0.166	0.073	0.127	0.068
Sex	0.024	0.052	-0.080	0.059	-0.200	0.036*	-0.060	0.082
Year Level	-0.110	0.079	-0.020	0.055	0.068	0.059	0.017	0.051
Course	0.163	0.082	0.132	0.071	0.177	0.062	0.065	0.089

*Legend: * = $p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant*

Table 12 presents the test of correlation between profile of the respondents and their self-discipline. It shows that all factors, aside from willpower, have a correlation with some profile factors. For standards, only age is significant (r = 0.236, p = 0.038) with a positive significant relationship. As the age of the respondent increases, the level of their standards increases. In this study, those who are ages 18 to 23 were more likely to be disciplined by having a clear and well-defined standard than the ages 17 or younger, or 24 or older. According to Bhana (2010), during the period of middle childhood and pre-adolescence, a student would have the ability to monitor their own behavior, and eventually adopt acceptable standards of good and bad behavior. In adolescence, they are finishing a bachelor's degree and are setting goals that require sustained self-discipline. (Duckworth et al. 2011).

For motivation, only age is significant (r = 0.222, p = 0.031) with a positive significant relationship. As the age of the respondents' increases, the level of their motivation increases. In this study, those who are ages 18 to 23 were more likely to be disciplined by being motivated to fulfill their goals than the ages 17 or younger, and 24 or older. According to Vicaria & Isaacowitz (2016), the aging process is naturally and inevitably associated with change, both physical and psychological. As life situations and mental capabilities transform, it is logical that older adults' motivations towards social goals may shift as well.

For monitoring, only sex is significant (r = -0.200, p = 0.036) with a negative significant relationship. This implies that female college students may have troubles on how they monitor themselves to achieve their goals in life than male students. According to Meyers (2016), women are presented with unreasonable standards that they have to achieve more than men. These expectations may cause overwhelming feelings of shame, stress, etc.

Table 13
Test of Correlation between Dress Code Policy Adherence and Self-Discipline of the Respondents

Variables	Standards		Motivation		Monitoring		Willpower	
	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value
Attitude	0.231	0.032*	0.260	0.028*	0.191	0.063	0.177	0.071
Subjective Norms	0.418	0.019*	0.385	0.023*	0.159	0.068	0.379	0.019*
Past Behavior	0.434	0.011*	0.367	0.024*	0.310	0.025*	0.202	0.021*
Behavioral Intention	0.315	0.027*	0.285	0.021*	0.202	0.020*	0.057	0.077

*Legend: * = $p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant*

Table 13 presents the test of correlation between dress code policy adherence and self-discipline of the respondents. From the variables which include standards (p=0.032), motivation (p=0.028), monitoring (p=0.063), and willpower (p=0.071), only standards and motivation have a significant relationship with dress code policy adherence as to attitude. This implies that as the respondents highly adhere to the dress code because of positive attitudes, they may likely have high standards and motivation. According to Coleman et al. (2011) and Kaveh et al. (2015), factors such as attitude and feelings could influence beliefs and that a university student would have a positive evaluation in following the dressing pattern, if they believed that it's beneficial. In addition, Wyer et al. (2012) found that operations for a goal-directed behavior could influence the plan that individuals select for attaining the goal they happen to be pursuing.

From the variables which include standards (p=0.019), motivation (p=0.023), monitoring (p=0.068), and willpower (p=0.019), only standards, motivation, and willpower have a significant relationship with dress code policy adherence to subjective norms. This implies that as the respondents highly adhere to the dress code because of high perceived social support, they may likely have high standards, motivation, and willpower. According to Heidarzadeh et al. (2019), the professional attire and student adherence to these clothes respects social standards and develops a positive professional image. Furthermore, Coleman et al. (2011) reported that subjective norms could motivate a person to take socially desirable action, and wide-ranging social implications are brought by willpower (APS, 2012).

The variables which include standards (p =0.011), motivation (p=0.024), monitoring (p=0.025), and willpower (p=0.021), all have a positive significant relationship with dress code policy adherence as to past behavior. This implies that previous adherence to the dress code, like regularly wearing their Identification Card, may likely increase their self-discipline. As part of the prescribed uniform, Identification Cards could be used by college students to highly set clear standards, be motivated, monitor their thoughts, situations, and past mistakes, and possess the strength to meet their goals, to assess and gather feedback and use this information to improve their self-discipline. According to Shepherd (2020), individuals could subconsciously remind themselves about their past behavior by practicing it in these virtual settings where it takes even more discipline to stay productive, now that there is less direct face-to-face interaction and supervision. In addition, goal-directed behavior in a past, albeit unrelated situation may influence an individual's plan for goal attainment (Wyer et al., 2012).

Lastly, from the variables which include standards (p=0.027), motivation (p=0.021), monitoring (p=0.020), and willpower (p=0.077), only standards, motivation, and monitoring have a significant relationship with dress code policy adherence as to behavioral intention. This implies that as the respondents highly intend to adhere to the dress code, they may have high standards and motivation, and highly monitor their situations, decisions, and progress to attain their life-goals. According to Norman & Conner (2017), an important aspect of intentions is awareness of standards which is often necessary to maintain an initiated behavior. Furthermore, a complete lack of intention to behave is at the lowest level of motivation along a continuum. College students could move their level of motivation along the continuum, and hopefully led to more self-determined forms of motivation (Yarborough & Fedesco, 2020). Also, if people have a high self-monitoring skill, they could be more sensitive to their external environment, and their behavioral intentions would have a greater degree of consistency with their behavior (Nantel & Strahle, 2021).

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings, respondents have both a high level of dress code policy adherence and a high level of self-discipline. Age, sex, and course are significantly related to factors of dress code policy adherence whereas only age and sex are significantly related to factors of self-discipline. Attitude is only significantly related to standards and motivation; subjective norms to standards, motivation, and willpower; and behavioral intention to standards, motivation, and monitoring. Finally, only past behavior is significantly related to the self-discipline of college students.

In view of the findings and conclusions drawn from this study, the following are hereby recommended: Consider a follow-up study using the same variables in other settings and with an increase in the number of participants. Other related factors which may influence students across all levels may be included in future studies. Also, educators may consider requesting students to wear their Identification Cards during online classes to improve their self-discipline in the current virtual setting. At the same time, college students may consider wearing their Identification Cards as it is easy to put, using a lanyard or clip, to help them remain disciplined. Lastly, the community or the university administrators may develop new and updated policies for the new normal or for the return of face-to-face classes to guide and encourage their students.

Acknowledgement

The present study was approved and financially supported by the Laguna State Polytechnic University and the Department of Science and Technology-Science Education Institute (DOST-SEI).

References

American Psychological Association. (2012, December 1). *What you need to know about willpower: The psychological science of self-control.* APA. http://www.apa.org/topics/personality/willpower

Association for Psychological Science - APS. (2012). *Where Does Self-Discipline Come From*. Psychological Science. https://www.psychologicalscience.org/news/full-frontal-psychology/where-does-self-discipline-come-from.html

Bhana, A. (2010). Middle childhood and pre-adolescence. *Promoting mental health in scare-resource contexts,* 124-142.

Brookshire, A. N. (2016). The Impact of School Uniforms on School Climate.

Cepe, M. (2014). The effect of Facebook use, self-discipline and parenting styles on the academic achievement of high school and university students.

Coleman, L. J., Bahnan, N., Kelkar, M., & Curry, N. (2011). Walking the walk: How the theory of reasoned action explains adult and student intentions to go green. *Journal of Applied Business Research* (JABR), 27(3), 107-116.

Duckworth, A. L., Grant, H., Loew, B., Oettingen, G., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (2011). Self-regulation strategies improve self-discipline in adolescents: Benefits of mental contrasting and implementation intentions. *Educational Psychology*, 31(1), 17-26.

Garcia, M. G. G., & Subia, G. (2019). High school athletes: Their motivation, study habits, self-discipline and academic performance. *International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health*, 6(1), 86-90.

Gelles, L. A., Lord, S. M., Hoople, G. D., Chen, D. A., & Mejia, J. A. (2020). Compassionate flexibility and self-discipline: Student adaptation to emergency remote teaching in an integrated engineering energy course during COVID-19. *Education Sciences*, *10*(11), 304.

Han, Y. (2019). Cultivating college students' self-discipline consciousness under the new media environment. *American Journal of Educational Research and Reviews*, *4*, 50-50.

Heidarzadeh, A., Mobasher, M., Nakhaei, N., Faseiherandi, M., & Haghdost, A. A. (2019). Investigation of Students' Attitudes toward Professional Dress Code and the Level of Adherence to This Code at Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran. *Health, Spirituality and Medical Ethics*, *6*(4), 10-15.

Kaveh, M. H., Moradi, L., Hesampour, M., & Zadeh, J. H. (2015). A survey of the effective factors in students' adherence to university dress code policy, using the theory of reasoned action. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, 3(3), 133.

Laguna State Polytechnic University-*Student Handbook* (2014). San Pablo City, Laguna.

Lino, C. (2016, October 2). *The Psychology of Willpower: Training the Brain for Better Decisions.* PositivePsychology.com. https://positivepsychology.com/psychology-of-willpower/

Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Can schools regulate student dress and grooming in school. *Focus On Colleges, Universities, and Schools*, *5*(1), 1-5.

Mbaluka, S. N. (2017). The Impact Of Student Self-Discipline And Parental Involvement in Students' Academic Activities on Student Academic Performance.

Meyers, L. (2016, March 28). *Falling short of perfect - Counseling Today*. Counseling Today. https://ct.counseling.org/2016/03/falling-short-of-perfect/

Mihm, M., & Ozbek, K. (2016). A model of self-discipline.

Momeni, N., & Asghari, F. (2020). Barriers of students' adherence to dress code policy in clinical settings: dental students' viewpoint. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine*, *13*.

Moneva, J. C., & Gatan, B. P. (2020). Emotional Intelligence and Self-Discipline in Senior HIgh School. *International Journal of Research-GRANTHAALAYAH*, 8(1), 69-77.

Nantel, J. A., & Strahle, W. (2021). The Self-Monitoring Concept: a Consumer Behavior Perspective. *ACR North American Advances*, *NA-13*. https://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/6470

Norman, P., & Conner, M. (2017). *Health Behavior ☆. Reference Module in Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology.* doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-809324-5.05143-9

Núñez-Rocha, G. M., López-Botello, C. K., Salinas-Martínez, A. M., Arroyo-Acevedo, H. V., Martínez-Villarreal, R. T., & Ávila-Ortiz, M. N. (2020). Lifestyle, Quality of Life, and Health Promotion Needs in Mexican University Students: Important Differences by Sex and Academic Discipline. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(21), 8024.

Ryu, K., & Han, H. (2010). Predicting tourists' intention to try local cuisine using a modified theory of reasoned action: The case of New Orleans. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 27(5), 491-506.

Sarwari, K. (2020). Will the COVID-19 pandemic change how people dress for work in the future? https://news.northeastern.edu/2020/12/14/will-the-covid-19-pandemic-change-how-people-dress-for-work-in-the-future/

Sequeira, A. H., Mendonca, C., Prabhu, K., & Narayan Tiwari, L. (2014). A Study on Dress Code for College Students. *Mandeep and Prabhu K., Mahendra and Narayan Tiwari, Lakshmi, A Study on Dress Code for College Students (September 29, 2014)*.

Shepherd, M. (2020, April 16). *Dressing for Online Meetings In The Coronavirus Era.* Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/marshallshepherd/2020/04/16/dressing-for-online-meetings-in-the-coronavirus-era/?sh=492ef3723855

Sieber, V., Flückiger, L., Mata, J., Bernecker, K., & Job, V. (2019). Autonomous goal striving promotes a nonlimited theory about willpower. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *45*(8), 1295-1307.

Şimşir, Z., & Dilmaç, B. (2021). The mediating roles of grit and life satisfaction in the relationship between self-discipline and peace: Development of the self-discipline scale. *Current Psychology*, 1-11.

Smith, A. (2020, September 29). *Dress-Code Policies Reconsidered in the Pandemic.* SHRM. https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/legal-and-compliance/employment-law/pages/coronavirus-dress-code-policies.aspx

Vicaria, I. M., & Isaacowitz, D. M. (2016). Age-related changes in motivation: Do they influence emotional experience across adulthood and old age? In T. S. Braver (Ed.), *Motivation and cognitive control* (pp. 361–380). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Villanueva, M. P. S. B. G. (2017). Dress Code Policy: Gaps in Transmission… Lost in Translation.

Walukouw, Y. R., & Simbolon, M. (2019, December). Self-Regulation and Discipline of Unai Girls Dormitory on 2018/2019 Proposed for A Program. In *Abstract Proceedings International Scholars Conference* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 860-867).

Wu, H. (2016). The Research on the Ideological Education and Self-Discipline of College Students.

Wyer, R. S., Xu, A. J., & Shen, H. (2012). The Effects of Past Behavior on Future Goal-Directed Activity. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 237–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-394281-4.00014-3

Yarborough, C. B., & Fedesco, H. N. (2020). Motivating students. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. Retrieved from https://cft.vanderbilt.edu//cft/guides-sub-pages/motivating-students/.