AN EVALUATION OF THE LEADERSHIP IN FOCUS

TRAINING PROGRAM OF DLSU

FOR THE SCHOOLYEAR 1978-1979

04486

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the

Behavioral Sciences Department

De La Salle University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Arts

Josefina I. Esguerra March, 1980

AKLATANG EMILIO AGUINALDO ARCHIVES



ABSTRACT

A study was made to determine whether the Leadership in Focus Training Program in De La Salle University had, in its first year, accomplished the goals and objectives for which the program was conducted. The study evaluated whether LIFT 1 had: trained students with the abilities to model attitudes and behavior that affirm persons; trained students to generate attitudes and behaviors that affirm persons: trained students with the abilities to turn conflicts into creative problem solving techniques; trained a pool of students who have the abilities to balance personal and organizational objectives; trained students to evolve a systematic approach in managing task groups; trained a pool of students to use a repertoire of effective leadership styles in dealing with human and material resources. The study was also made so that recommendations may be made, based on the findings to further improve the program.

It was hypothesized that there were significant differences between Lifters and non-Lifters based on the above mentioned objectives.

A total of 34 DESU students were used. The subjects were divided into the experimental group (consisting of the participants of LIFT 1) and the control group (consisting of non-Lifters who were individually matched with the subjects in the experimental group in terms of grade point average, sex, course and year level and involvement in student organizations). Both groups were subjected the SRA Supervisory Index and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire.

The t-test for matched group design was used because of the type of study.

Results showed that there were significant differences between Eifters and non-Lifters on all the measured hypotheses at the .05 level. Only one hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level of significance.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chap:	<u>ter</u>	- 별하는 사람들이 문학생활을 하는	<u>Page</u>
e in Alexander Frank	24% 2.4		
1	INTR	ODUCTION	1
	1.1	Background of the Study	1
	1.2	Statement of the Problem	6
	1.3	Objectives of the Study	7
	1.4	Scope and Limitations of the Study	7
	1.5	Hypotheses	8
	1.6	Significance of the Study	9
	1.7	Definition of Terms	, 9
2	SURV	EY OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
	2.1	Leadership and Leadership Training	11
	2.2	Evaluation Defined	15
	2.3	Training and Evaluation Related	16
3	METH	ODOLOGY	18
	3.1	Type of Study Design and Sampling Scheme	18
	3.2	Testing Instruments	21
	3.3	The Questionnaire	23
	3.4	Statistical Test	24
4	RESU	LTS AND DISCUSSION	25
	4.1	The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire	25



	4.2 The SRA Supervisory Index	•	•	•	•	•	•	30
5	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	•	•	•	•	•	•	37
	REFERENCES	•	•	•	•	•	•	44
	A TOTO TOTO COM C							16





LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	<u>Description</u>	Page
** 1-1 ** * •	LIFT Participants for School-Year '78-'79	4
3-2	Number, Sex, Course and Year Level of Subjects in the Experimental and Control Groups	20
4-3	Computation for the t-value for the Dimension on Consideration of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire	28
4-4	Computation for the t-value for the Dimension on Structure of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire	29
4-5	Computation for the t-value for the Dimension on Management of the SRA Supervisory Index	33
4–6	Computation for the t-value for the Dimension on Supervisory of the SRA Supervisory Index	34
4-7	Computation for the t-value for the Dimension on Employee Relations of the SRA Supervisory Index	35
4-8	Computation for the t-value for the Dimension on Human Relations Practices of the SRA Supervisory Index	36
the control of the co		



LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description	<u>Page</u>
1	Summary of Results	47
2	Proposed Structure for the Leadership in Focus Training Program (Year 1)	48
3	Actual Structure for the Leadership in Focus Training Program (Year 1)	50
4	Actual Faculty and Staff	53
5	Expressed Needs of Actual Participants of LIFT 1	54
6	Survey and Opinion Questionnaire for LIFTers	56
7	Survey and Opinion Questionnaire for Non-Lifters	60

