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INTRODUCTION

Research Overview

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) document the large amount of training and development activity that occurs in organizations. It is a pervasive enterprise. Practically all large organizations have formal, in-house training programs, and many corporate training budgets are comparable to the budgets of many large universities (Campbell, 1971).

Like all organizational systems, training and development imports various types of energy (e.g., money, information, and employees). In the course of moving from outside to inside a training program, there is likely to be interactions between the employee and the training department, instructor, or others involved in designing or organizing the effort. Depending on particular research interests, it is possible to view this process from either the employee's viewpoint or the organization's perspective. To date, most discussion and research in the training area have dealt with macro or organizational factors (e.g., assessing group training needs, selecting the appropriate training procedures, selecting the appropriate training media and learning
principles, determining how training should be evaluated, and analyzing transfer of training to the job setting; Goldstein, 1974). Little attention has been given to what factors surround an employee's expectations, attitudes, or decision to select training programs and how these factors might affect an employee's satisfaction with training, commitment, motivation to learn, and whether he/she applies the learned information or behavior afterwards.

Definition of Training and Development

Before examining some of these issues, it is necessary to define training. Depending on the particular source, training and development have slightly different meanings. While this is true, enough similarities exist to arrive at some kind of definition.

Training and development consist of the following general properties and characteristics (Campbell et al., 1970): (1) Training and development is a learning experience; (2) It is planned by the organization; (3) It occurs after the individual has joined the organization; and (4) It is intended to further the organization's goals. Therefore, training and development activities are planned programs of organizational improvement designed to bring about relatively permanent change in employee knowledge, attitudes, skills, or social behavior. The phrase "relatively permanent" is included in this definition to distinguish learning from
performance. The distinction is primarily a temporal one. Learning is a relatively permanent change in behavior that happens as a result of practice or experience (not simply maturation). Learning is the ability to perform, and it is available over a long period of time. On the other hand, performance deals with the demonstration of learning. It is observable, measurable behavior from which learning is inferred. Performance is often a function of an individual's physical, mental, or environmental state (Cascio, 1978).

**General Systems Theory**

With slight variations in the definition of training and development, most researchers proceed to discuss it within some type of general systems theory. For the past 10 years, general systems theory has been used as a framework for the discussion of training issues in educational organizations (Cogan, 1971), work organizations (U.S. Civil Service Commission, 1969), and military organizations (Montemerlo and Tennyson, 1976). While there are many systems approaches on the subject, most tend to emphasize the specification of instructional objectives, controlled learning experiences to achieve those objectives and criteria for performance and evaluation information. Other factors include an importance of feedback to provide information for continually modifying the training program, a research methodology to determine the achievements of the program,
a within-systems framework that looks at the interactions between components of the instructional system, and finally a recognition of the complex interactions between the training program and other characteristics of the organization (e.g., selection, placement, and control systems; Goldstein, 1974, 1980).

Most practitioners and researchers view the training department as the focus of analysis. Inputs (e.g., facilities, money, and staff resources, trainee availability, company policy regarding training) and outputs (e.g., determination of training needs and program design and implementation) are studied within a training department context. Typically, questions about training effectiveness are group based. For example, does the management training program improve the overall effectiveness of the company's management team? Is the training program for technicians successful in providing an obsolescent technician group with updated or changed skills?

Using a different framework, Hinrichs (1976) discussed an open systems approach that integrates the skill acquisition system first for the individual trainee, next for the training department, and finally for the entire organization in which the training department exists. It flows from the micro to the macro. From the individual's perspective, he identifies "cognitive" and "practice" as inputs. Cognitive inputs consist of information on the type of skills that
should be acquired. They are basically the educational component of training and may include a definition of training objectives and setting of performance goals and standards. The manipulation of cognitive inputs is the process of getting the individual to understand the nature of the final behaviors desired as a result of training. Practice in the behaviors that represent the objectives of the training process is the other class of signal inputs.

Hinrichs' other inputs include the factors an individual brings to the skill acquisition situation. Some of the variables in this group appear to be worthy of research. For example, how do an individual's attitudes, motivation, and freedom to select a training program affect the outputs of learning and formal achievement?

Following Hinrichs' open systems approach of examining the individual trainee, this study deals with the conditions surrounding the process of entering training programs and how these differences later affect training outcomes.

**Occupational; Organizational; and Training Program Entry**

The field of vocational psychology (e.g., Crites, 1969) has examined how individuals enter particular occupations. In fact, some of the theories of occupational choice can be applied to organizational and training choice. These three entry processes can be compared on a number of dimensions.
For most individuals, occupational entry occurs before entry into organizations and company-sponsored training programs. Crites (1969) has referred to this sequence as an "exclusion process," during which the number of possible occupations is continuously narrowed over time, culminating in a particular job type. Viewed in this way, entry into training programs is the last step in the exclusion process. Although conceptually helpful, this temporal sequence is not fixed because an individual may change occupations after entering a new organization. Or, after completing a training program, an individual may change organizations (Wanous, 1977).

A second difference between these three processes is that organizational and training entry are much more of a choice than a process. Typically, the entry into training programs takes place during a shorter period of time, is much more a conscious decision, and is easier to reverse. In contrast, the process of occupational entry is extended over a longer period of time (e.g., a decade or more; Wanous, 1977). Furthermore, it can be divided up into several critical choice points, such as high school graduation, choice of a college major, and college graduation. Besides including several choices, occupational entry is often influenced by non-conscious forces within the individual and by environmental events. In short, entry into
training programs and organizations is easier to study because it is more of an event than a process.

The third difference occurs due to the event-process distinction. Non-psychological theories of occupational entry (economic, sociological, cultural, or accident theories) are not as relevant for organizational or training entry (Wanous, 1977).

Although entry into organizations and company-sponsored training programs are somewhat similar, differences do exist. The decision about what training program to select is probably less important than the decision about what organization to select. The socialization process, influences of a peer group, length of time commitment and degree of risk are different. For instance, training programs usually last only a couple of days or, at most, a couple of months, while an individual's tenure at an organization could be much longer. So, the consequences for making a wrong decision about what organization to select could be much more severe.

Despite these dissimilarities, an exploration of research in organizational entry should give some indication about what variables may be worthwhile to apply to a training situation. Some of the questions that have been asked include: How do individuals develop preferences and choose new organizations? How accurate and complete is the information that outsiders have prior to actual entry?
What is the impact of recruitment activities on an individual's organizational choice, as well as on post-entry attitudes and behavior? Wanous (1977), for instance, reviewed 14 studies of job or organizational choice. These studies have considered what information is sought by individuals to help make the decision and how this information is used (e.g., Sheard, 1970; Vroom, 1966). Other studies have tested the predictive abilities of theories with regard to job choice. Huber, Daneshgar, and Ford (1971) tested expectancy theory, and Misra and Kalro (1972) tested cognitive dissonance theory predictions. Results of these and other studies generally support both expectancy theory predictions and the presence of a cognitive dissonance effect following organizational choice.

**Impact of Recruitment Practices on Organizational Entry**

This area of research included field studies that assessed the differences between realistic versus traditional job previews (Wanous, 1975a, 1975b). Traditionally, the job applicant receives a description of a position that concentrates almost exclusively on its attractive aspects. This procedure is justified by the assertion that presenting negative information may reduce the selection ratio. Recent evidence indicates that this assumption and preview technique may both be unsound. The realistic job preview represents a different philosophy, or strategy, for
recruitment of new members. Companies that have used it recognize the fact that entry is a mutual choice process (Porter, Lawler, and Hackman, 1975). Thus, the realistic job preview has been used to increase the amount and accuracy of information given to job applicants in an attempt to increase the overall quality of their organizational choices. Besides the anticipated improvement in these choices, the realistic job preview has been used to soften the "reality shock" that is often experienced by newcomers to an organization (Wanous, 1975a, 1975b).

Research about organizational entry from the organization's perspective has traditionally examined how well such recruitment and selection systems work to provide productive employees. In contrast, less research has been completed that deals with the effects of recruitment on the entry process from the individual's viewpoint. To assess this impact, such research has asked questions such as: What is the organization's ability to recruit newcomers? What are the initial expectations of recruits? What are their later job attitudes and job performance? And what is their "job survival"?

Realistic Job Preview Literature

Realistic previews have varied from providing applicants with brief work samples (Farr, O'Leary and Bartlett, 1973) to detailed booklets describing the typical day and
the organizational climate of a company (Weitz, 1956). Applicants have been shown films of the work place that emphasize both positive (e.g., friendly co-workers) and negative aspects (e.g., long hours) of the job (Wanous, 1973). Recently, an objective realistic preview technique has been devised (Reilly, Tenopyr, and Sperling, 1979). This technique includes a job analysis where current employees are asked to generate descriptive statements about their jobs and rate the statements' favorability. A realistic preview is defined as a preview that provides a number of neutral statements or statements with unfavorable ratings. In contrast, a traditional preview would contain a number of favorable statements. Different organizational settings have employed realistic previews including an insurance firm (Weitz, 1956), a military academy (Ilgen and Seely, 1974), and a clothing factory (Farr, O'Leary, and Bartlett, 1973). Regardless of the organizational setting or medium of presentation, a main feature of realistic previews is the attempt to present an accurate and complete picture of the job and organization.

Like the organizational setting or medium of presentation, the design and methodologies have varied. In the studies at West Point and of life insurance agents, the control groups were defined as those not receiving booklets. Whatever the normal policy was for new members, it was followed for these control groups. In other studies, more
effort was directed at manipulating the experiences of the control subjects. Similarly, some studies did realistic previews after the organization's selection decision, but prior to formal acceptance of it by the individual. Others sent realistic booklets to applicants prior to the selection decision by the organization.

While different organizations have been studied and particular preview techniques have varied, a number of investigations have found that the realistic preview is effective in reducing turnover (Wanous, 1977). A couple of explanations for the effectiveness of a realistic preview in reducing turnover have been offered. Ilgen and Seely (1974) list these explanations: (1) The realistic preview provides a self selection process because a better match between applicant and job is possible. The better matching of individuals and jobs results in fewer subsequent departures due to a misunderstanding of job outcomes and responsibilities. (2) The realistic preview provides more accurate and complete information. Thus, individuals will be more committed to decisions because they feel more responsible for making the decision to join the organization. Commitment to the decision may also be increased because a realistic preview may communicate "an air of honesty" to the applicant. It is viewed as cognitively dissonant to change a decision to join a company after being treated honestly or provided with plenty of information. (3) A
final explanation deals with the discrepancy between what a new applicant expects and what actually prevails in a company. Typically, a new employee's expectancies and beliefs concerning such factors as organizational climate and anticipated level of job satisfaction tend to be unrealistically high (Wanous, 1973). A realistic preview has been credited for bringing an individual's expectancies more in line with reality. With reduced expectancies, it may reduce the possibility of "reality shock." These inflated expectancies usually involve "intrinsic" rather than "extrinsic" job aspects (Wanous, 1976).

The evidence for competing explanations to explain the effects of the realistic preview is limited, but the reduced expectancy explanation has received the most support (Wanous, 1977). For example, Ilgen and Seely (1974) have produced this effect by providing realistic previews after the decision to join has been made but before organizational entry. While this would tend to disconfirm the explanations that emphasize how realistic previews influence the decision process, methodological problems with the study limits its generalizability. At least some evidence for the self selection exists (Farr, O'Leary, and Bartlett, 1973), but realistic previews have been shown to increase the number of job acceptances in other studies (e.g., Macedonia, 1969).

Besides the desirable outcomes of reducing turnover and increasing an applicant's commitment to the decision to
join an organization, the realistic preview has been shown to moderate job attitudes. For example, Youngberg (1963) found that 80% of the new employees who received realistic previews were satisfied with their jobs after 3 months, whereas only 64% of the control group were satisfied.

**Impact of Recruitment Practices on Entry Into Training Programs**

The benefits of having realistic previews for applicants entering organizations appear to have relevance to employees entering company-sponsored training programs. As noted by Campbell and others, training is fadish in the extreme. The fads center around the introduction of new techniques and follow a characteristic pattern. A new technique appears on the horizon and develops a large group of advocates who first describe its "successful" use in a number of situations. Practitioners write testimonials supporting its positive effects. A second wave of advocates busy themselves trying out various modifications of the basic technique. A few empirical studies may be carried out to demonstrate that the method "works." Then the inevitable backlash sets in and a couple of vocal opponents start to criticize the usefulness of the technique, most often without any data. Such criticism usually has very little effect. What does have an effect is the appearance of another new technique and a repetition of the same cycle.
Reeves (1968) has described the cycle of fads in human relations training since World War II. This cycle is illustrated with the fad not centered around a technique but of the discovery of minority and disadvantaged groups. Before 1968, there was practically no mention of disadvantaged and minority group training problems. After 1968, articles dealing with minority group training were written more frequently. As a fad, Blacks had caught on. Like other fads, it has run its typical course, replaced by another hot topic (Campbell, 1971).

The byproduct of fads deals with the type of information that is written about training programs. Much of this information is hard to believe. Descriptions found in brochures or in-house memos often accentuate the positive aspects about the programs. Dramatic changes in behaviors, attitudes, or job performance is assured (e.g., through testimonials). For example, a recent announcement is listed below:

The Use of Decision Tables in Task Analysis.
"A 1-day Workshop for those individuals involved in analyzing and organizing subject matter and tasks. Benefits: You will know for certain what additional information or decision you need prior to designing a training program and you will know for certain when you have gotten all the information you need to obtain the desired performance."

In the other extreme, if an employee fails to be blitzed with oversell or the positive aspects of the training programs, he/she may receive practically no information
at all. For example, a supervisor may write an employee's development plan for next year and put down as one of the learning goals "to better understand the administrative aspects surrounding contract research." To meet this learning goal, the supervisor may recommend that the employee take some kind of project management training program. When this program is eventually scheduled, the employee may attend it with practically no substantive information about its objectives or goals, how the program will be structured or organized, the instructor's training techniques, and how the experience or information should affect his knowledge, behavior, or attitudes.

Based on the research about organizational entry, neither of these pre-entry states is desirable. Instead of giving a participant either a glorified picture about what can be expected from completing a training workshop or no or very little information, what would happen if a more realistic presentation was offered? As discussed before, there are similarities between entry into organizations and entry into training programs. With this, predictions can be made.

It is surprising to find a lack of research that has looked at the role of expectations and perceptions of trainees prior to participation. A few studies have been carried out, though. In one study, Buxton (1979) found that police trainees had a much more positive view of most
aspects of the organization than employees who were presently in the organization. Furthermore, she found that trainees' perceptions moved in the direction of the on-the-job views as they went from the instructional program to the job. Although Buxton did not find a relationship between realistic expectations and training performance, other studies have found a relationship between more realistic expectations of trainees and performance in the training program or on the job (Goldstein, 1980).

Lefkowitz (1970) believed that a significant determinant of high rate of turnover among a group of female sewing machine operators was inadequate initial training. Two hundred and eight new trainees received either 1, 2, or 3 days of vestibule training. He found that with more training, there was a lower turnover rate, but lower productivity as well. Both effects were statistically significant, but the effects on productivity were deemed of less practical significance. Another significant determinant of resignations was employees encountering a job which was contradictory to their expectations. Turnover was second highest among those placed in jobs of inspector and work distributor. These jobs were "easier" than sewing machine operators. Lefkowitz believed that the explanation involved employee disillusionment stemming from initial job experiences being contradictory to their expectations from training. Since these women were trained as sewing machine
operators, he hypothesized they created expectancies to become sewing machine operators. The experience of being placed on nonmachine jobs would be contradictory to those expectations. Data existed which supported this interpretation.

In another study, Hoiberg and Berry (1978) looked at "expectations" and "perceptions" of the way the situation really was, and differences between these measures on 10 social climate dimensions. These differences were related to performance criteria for 7,989 enlisted Navy men during three phases of their enlistments—recruit training, technical school, and fleet assignment. The results pointed up the importance of expectations and perceptions in predictions of sailors' performance. Within recruit training, the recruits who left tended to have inaccurate expectations. There were indications that the media and others misinformed the dischargees about this unique setting. That is, to expect innovative training methods and minimal emphasis on efficiency and control was indeed inappropriate for the recruit training situation. When these recruits experienced the training environment as differing from their expectations, they became dissatisfied with being in the Navy, a consequence that could have resulted in their inappropriate behavior and subsequent separations from service. In general, Hoiberg and Berry found that perceptions were less favorable than expectations. They
recommended more emphasis be given to adequately prepare recruits about what to expect in recruit training, school, and work environments.

**Realistic Information About Training Programs and Training Outcomes**

Researchers have offered explanations for the effectiveness of realistic job previews in reducing turnover and changing other perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors. Some of these explanations have been tested with research. Based on these findings, how should giving realistic training information affect training outcomes? In particular, how should it affect the conditions helpful in learning training material (e.g., trainees' ability or readiness to master training material, their motivation to learn, their directed actions to learn and their attendance or participation)? To answer this question, this study has the mastery of training material as the major dependent variable, with motivation to learn, ability or readiness to master training material, commitment to their decision to attend training and their attendance as intervening processes associated with the major dependent variable.

**Motivation to Learn.** While there is less information about entry into training programs than about organizational entry, these two processes have similarities. With these similarities, it is helpful to borrow from the job
motivation literature to predict the impact of realistic information about training programs on trainees' motivation to learn. Due to the relationship between realistic pre-views and expectancies and attitudes, the expectancy theories of motivation provide a framework for understanding. There are many similar expectancy theories (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976). All of them maintain that the strength of a tendency to act in a certain way depends on the strength of an expectancy that an act will be followed by a given consequence (or outcome) and on the value or attractiveness of that consequence (or outcome) to the actor. The Lawler (1973) model is shown below:

```
       Ability
          ↓    (E→P) (P→O) V→Effort→Performance
                Role Clarity
```

Extending the Lawler model to the training context, it implies that an individual has preferences among the various actions that are potentially available to him (e.g., attend an external workshop on large program management, work on current job assignments, or attend an in-house program on persuasive oral presentations). Or if a trainee has selected a particular training program, he/she can put forth different amounts of effort to learn and master the material. Secondly, an individual has expectancies about the likelihood that his/her action (e.g., listening to the instructor, completing assignments, participating in group
exercises, or answering questions) will lead to the intended behavior or performance. Third, he/she has expectancies (instrumentalities) about the likelihood that certain outcomes (e.g., being able to carry out effective performance review discussions with subordinates) will follow his behavior. In any situation, the actions an individual chooses to take are determined by the expectancies and the preferences he has at the time. Two other variables in the Lawler model are ability to carry out tasks and role clarity or knowledge about what actions are expected in a particular situation.

There are a couple of ways that an individual forms expectancies or $E \rightarrow P$ (e.g., self esteem, past experiences, actual situation) and instrumentalities or $P \rightarrow O$ (e.g., past experiences, belief in internal vs. external control, actual situation). One of the most influential of these factors is communication by others about what is going on in an individual's environment. This communication is most likely to be influential when the person communicating the information is experienced or knowledgeable as a trainer would be about a training program. And, it is influential when the experience is relatively new or unfamiliar (e.g., when a trainee decides to participate in a new training program).

By giving people realistic training information prior to the program, they will have an opportunity to see in
what ways the program fits in their self development plans. This can happen through the following process. By getting accurate information about the training program, people will be in a better position to assess its goals and objectives, training strategies and procedures, instructors, training media, and so forth. And, they will have a better understanding of the expectancies and instrumentalities. Even with the bias that can occur with self evaluation, people can determine how or if the program will aid in acquiring valuable new skills or abilities. If trainees have the freedom to choose training, then they should believe that the selected program will satisfy their needs better than other possibilities. Also, with this better match, trainees should have a desire to learn.

**Role Clarity and Ability.** In addition to its effects on expectancies and instrumentalities, realistic training information is tied to other variables of the Lawler model. These variables are role clarity and ability. Based on the work by Buxton (1979), Hoiberg and Berry (1978) and others, a new trainee's expectancies concerning what skills and abilities will be learned, what training techniques will be used, or how new behaviors can be used back on the job may be unrealistic. A realistic preview has been shown to bring an individual's expectancies more in line with reality. This increase in role clarity or more realistic knowledge of what to expect from the situation should lead to better
preparation for coping (e.g., less "reality shock"]). With less reality shock, a trainee should spend less time adjusting to the situation, complete more assignments, and apply better study skills.

Although realistic training information has no direct effect on a trainee's ability to do well in training, it should help in another way. By describing the program's methods, techniques, and goals, a trainee will be ready to profit from the program. Fewer people should attend who already have the requisite skills or who do not have the minimum requirements to properly benefit from the program.

**Attendance Behavior.** A number of variables have been suggested as important factors affecting turnover, but few have been analyzed in the context of a realistic preview procedure. Once again, borrowing from the job turnover literature, this study looks at one set of factors known to be quite important. March and Simon (1958) have proposed a model of employee turnover where the decision to leave an organization is viewed as a function of the perceived ease of movement and the perceived desirability of movement. The perceived ease of movement, from a training standpoint, can include a number of training alternatives, supervisor pressure to take the program, and attitudes of a peer group if a trainee drops out before or during the program.
The perceived desirability of movement is most often linked to satisfaction. Research about job turnover documents a fairly consistent negative correlation between job satisfaction and turnover (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino, 1979). Other variables that may also affect perceived desirability of movement include the extent of organizational commitment, compatibility of the job with other roles, job consistency with self image, and predictability and clarity of the reward contingencies. Finally, intentions to quit and search for alternatives are also important in the turnover process (Mobley et al., 1979).

While Ilgen and Dugoini (Note 1) have suggested it would be naive to expect realistic previews to reduce turnover through job satisfaction, no research has directly confirmed or disconfirmed this association. Because satisfaction is an important variable in the entire turnover process, it is included in this study. As with turnover, there are many variables that may be determinants of satisfaction. However, a predominant variable in theories of satisfaction is the notion of discrepancies. Satisfaction appears to occur when no or small discrepancies exist between what an individual desires and what he/she perceives as being received (Locke, 1969). A variation of this discrepancy notion emphasizes the difference between what "should be" and what "is now" (Porter, 1961).
If trainees have the freedom to choose training, then with realistic training information, they should have a smaller gap between what is desired and what is perceived as being received in training. This smaller gap should lead to greater satisfaction with training and should result in fewer departures either before the program starts or sometime when the training is under way (e.g., when the program is split into segments over two or more days where trainees could leave after any segment).

**Degree of Choice or Freedom to Select Training**

Degree of choice deals with the employees' opportunity to select training opportunities based on their own needs and desires. Are they forced into particular programs by supervisors or other environmental factors? Is the decision one way, or are employees in the position to have a major voice about self development?

Degree of choice is an important variable for a couple of reasons. Although it has not been studied extensively in other studies, some researchers have found it to influence how successfully trainees were in grasping training material and to alter how frequently trainees voluntarily left the program before its conclusion. For example, Ryman and Biersner (1975) examined the relationship between trainees' attitudes before training and training success. This relationship was examined among Diver Second Class
and Preliminary Underwater Demolition Team trainees. A force behind their study was to see why training failure occurred so frequently in these two programs. A 25-item questionnaire, administered three days before training started, was used to measure attitudes about course expectations. The 25 items were factor analyzed and four factors were identified. One factor, "training concern," had high factor loaded items of "I'd like to wait several months before starting this training," and "My family is glad that I volunteered for this training" and other items dealing with the degree of choice to select training. Ryman and Biersner found that the "training concern" scale was negatively associated with success and positively associated with voluntarily quitting in validation and cross validation samples of Diver Second Class trainees. In other words, if trainees had the freedom to select/reject the training program, they did better on training tests and were not as likely to voluntarily leave before its conclusion.

Secondly, the degree of choice employees have to select training varies from company to company, and it varies from training program to training program within a company. For example, an interpersonal skills workshop may be required of all employees who are promoted to first line supervisor in a company, but supervisors may have the freedom to pick and choose other supervisory training programs
later on. With such variation, it would be helpful from a policy making standpoint to know how degree of choice affects the conditions for learning. Third, degree of choice is implicit in the expectancy theories of motivation and the realistic preview technique. For example, the Lawler model predicts that an individual will select the behavior or action with the highest "force to perform" value. With a lack of options or no options at all, an individual will not be in a position to select the most desirable behavior. He/she will be required to do what is available. And finally, "choice" is included in social information processing theory by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978). This theory proceeds from the premise that individuals, as adaptive organisms, adapt attitudes, behavior and beliefs to their social context and to the reality of their own past and present behavior and situation. "Choice" is linked with commitment to a situation or decision.

Why Should Degree of Choice to Select Training Affect Training Outcomes?

Besides its relevance to expectancy theories of motivation and the realistic preview technique, the freedom to select training can be examined using social information processing theory. It posits that it is possible to learn about an individual's behavior by studying the informational and social environment within which that behavior occurs.
and to which it adapts. Social information processing theory holds that attitude statements result from three causes: (1) the individual's perception and judgment of the affective components of the environment; (2) the information the social context provides about what attitudes are appropriate; and (3) the individual's self perception, mediated by processes of causal attribution of the reasons for his past behavior (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978). Under the third cause, commitment affects the formation of attitudes from behavior by constraining how individuals make sense of their reactions to their environment. Commitment occurs when behavior is made under conditions of choice, when it is public, and when it is explicit or can be shown undeniably to have occurred (Salancik, 1977). Without choice, an individual need not infer that the behavior has any implication for his attitudes. Publicness and explicitness bind the individual closely to the behavior. It has been shown that when individuals are committed to a situation, they tend to develop attitudes consistent with their commitment and their committing behavior (Kiesler, 1971; Salancik, 1977). For example, in one study (Comer and Laird, 1975), individuals committed to a situation expected to confront the task of eating a dead worm. After a brief interval to reconstruct the situation, they developed the belief that either (1) the worm was not so bad; (2) they deserved to suffer; or (3) by performing the task they
would serve mankind by advancing science. Their conceptions of the situation were so restructured that when later offered the choice of another task, most wanted to eat the worm.

As stated above, an important component of the process of commitment is choice. After all, an individual who has no choice in performing some act need not like it. Instead, he/she can explain his/her involvement on the basis of external pressures. Using social information processing theory, predictions can be made about the relationship between degree of choice to select training programs and satisfaction with training. Other things being equal, an employee who attends a training program because of external forces (e.g., company or supervisor requires an employee to take some kind of training) will be potentially less satisfied with training than someone who picks it from several possible actions. This result should hold regardless of the training content, method, instructor, etc. and regardless of whether, when confronted with options, the individual would have selected the same training program anyway.

The committing effects of choice are sometimes intentionally manipulated. For example, to develop support for a course of action, administrators may propose other options, though ones that are clearly less desirable. The mere presence of options should increase commitment and, consequently, satisfaction with the decision and action (Salancik
and Pfeffer, 1978). Thus, for an employee to be committed to a training program and motivated to learn, it is better that he choose from a large number of alternative actions. This forecloses the possibility that the employee can explain his behavior by the external constraint of lack of options.

Realistic Information About Training Programs and Degree of Choice

The type of preliminary information individuals receive about a training program and the amount of freedom they have to select training are two variables in the entry process. In addition to their independent effects on training outcomes (e.g., satisfaction with training, commitment, motivation to learn, turnover), these variables appear to be mutually reinforcing. This can be seen by reviewing some of the explanations for the effectiveness of realistic previews. In one explanation, by giving individuals realistic training information prior to a program, they will have an opportunity to see in what ways the program fits into their self development plans. Through the mechanism of self selection, individuals who do attend should believe the program will better meet their needs. Logically, self selection cannot occur without the freedom to pick and choose.
In another explanation, the realistic preview will provide more accurate and complete information. Thus, individuals should be more committed to their decisions because they feel more responsible for making the decision to attend. Having made a choice, and having made it with full information, individuals should be more committed to their decisions. It removes a rationale for not being committed to the decision--namely, that they did not have full knowledge at the time they chose it. But once again, this explanation is not possible without the freedom to pick and choose.

Diagrams of Linkages

The diagrams below summarize the linkages between type of preliminary training information and degree of choice with employees' expectancies of the events/activities of a training program, appropriateness of training, commitment to their decisions to attend, motivation to learn, and amount of learning.

One diagram shows the type of preliminary training information main effect on employees' expectancies of the events/activities of a training program, motivation to learn, and amount of learning. The other diagram shows the type of preliminary training information (x) degree of choice interaction on whether trainees will be ready to profit from training (i.e., appropriateness of training),
commitment to their decisions to attend, motivation to learn, and amount of learning.

Diagram of Linkages
Between Independent and Dependent Variables

Type of Preliminary Training Information → Accuracy of Expectancies of the Events/Activities
Main Effect → Motivation to Learn → Amount of Learning

Type of Preliminary Training Information (x) Degree of Choice Interaction
Commitment to a Decision to Attend to Learn Amount of Learning
Ready to Profit from Training (i.e., Appropriateness of Training)

Hypotheses

The research about realistic previews and degree of choice appears worthwhile to study in a training context. This study will examine the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1. Trainees who have expectations of events/activities more in line with actual experiences in the program will have more motivation to learn the training material and will learn more from the program.

Hypothesis 2. Participants will have more motivation to learn the training material and will learn more from the program when there is a better match of their ability to learn based on the training demands.
Hypothesis 3. Participants who have more commitment to the decision to attend the program will have more motivation to learn the training material and will learn more from the program.

A type of preliminary training information main effect is predicted in Hypotheses 4 to 6. Specifically, if trainees receive the "realistic" training preview prior to the program instead of the "traditional" training program announcement, then:

Hypothesis 4. Trainees' expectations of events/activities will be more in line with actual experiences in the program.

Hypothesis 5. Trainees will be more motivated to learn the training material.

Hypothesis 6. Trainees will learn more from the program.

A type of preliminary training information (x) degree of choice interaction is predicted in Hypotheses 7 to 11. One cell from the 2 (preliminary training information) (x) 2 (degree of choice) design should have significantly different scores compared to the other three groups. Specifically, if trainees receive the "realistic" training preview prior to the program, plus have the freedom to select what programs to attend, then:
Hypothesis 7. By describing the program's methods, techniques, and goals, trainees will be ready to profit from the program (i.e., it will satisfy their needs). Fewer people will attend who already have the requisite skills or who do not have the minimum requirements to properly benefit from the program.

Hypothesis 8. Participants will have more commitment to their decisions to attend the program.

Hypothesis 9. Participants will be more motivated to learn the training material.

Hypothesis 10. Participants will learn more from the program.

Hypothesis 11. Trainees will have a better attendance record.
METHOD

Sample

A large nonprofit research and development organization (Company A) with headquarters in Columbus, Ohio, was the site for this study. Its 3,000-plus employees work on research in many areas such as synthetic fuels, space systems, materials, and transportation.

Approximately 340 managers and supervisors work at Company A's Columbus Division. Out of this group, 101 managers signed up for the performance review training and attended at least part of the two-day program. Eighty-five managers completed the entire program. Some participants were from Service/Support Departments (e.g., Report and Library Services, Accounting and Budgets, Communications and Public Relations, Contracts, and Finance), while others were from Research Departments (e.g., Chemistry, Biological Sciences, Engineering and Manufacturing Technology, and Resource Management and Economic Analysis). Along with this mixture of departments, there was a mixture of management levels ranging from first-line supervisors to more senior levels. There was a heterogeneous group of managers in each training session.
Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop

Company A's Staff and Organizational Development Department developed a new training workshop. It covered how to write performance objectives, how to make accurate performance ratings, and how to effectively give performance review feedback to employees during performance review sessions. Data for this study were gathered from supervisors and managers who attended this Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop. It lasted for seven hours (i.e., 3 1/2 hours per day for two successive days). The first day started at 8:30 a.m. and ended at 12:00 noon. On this day, the workshop leaders presented information to participants (e.g., lecture and discussion), and there were some individual exercises. The workshop leaders covered "Objectives of Company A's Performance Review Program," "Staff Development Plans," "Performance Objectives," "Preparing Written Performance Reviews," "Subjective Performance Measures and Rating Errors," "Performance Review Feedback," and "Guidelines for Conducting Effective Performance Review Interviews." This ended the first day of the program. Each participant had a homework assignment to prepare a performance review on an employee. The performance review forms created for Company A's Performance Review Program were distributed to them for this assignment. Each manager also had the optional assignment to read Split Roles in
Performance Appraisal by Herbert H. Meyer, Emanuel Kay, and John R. P. French, Jr.

The second day of the workshop started at 8:30 a.m. and ended at 12:00 noon for one-half of the participants and 1:00 to 4:30 p.m. for the other half. Thus, each participant attended only one of the classes on the second day. On this day, the workshop leaders reviewed the key behaviors and "Guidelines for Conducting Effective Performance Review Interviews." Then, the workshop leaders instructed the participants to observe them role play a performance review interview/discussion. Up to this point, participants had learned the key aspects of performance review interviews and had observed a role play session. Next, they split into groups of three to role play performance review interviews themselves. One participant assumed the role of the "subordinate" and the other the role of the "supervisor" who gave performance feedback. The third person of the group was the "observer." The "observer" had an observation form to take notes and to provide a critique of the "supervisor's" interview. After the completion of this role play, the participants switched roles so that everyone had the opportunity to be the "observer," "subordinate," and "supervisor." All role play sessions were audio tape recorded.
Pilot Work

With Company A Employees. The experimenter met with nine Company A employees in order to collect preliminary information. It was important to develop materials necessary to create conditions to test the hypotheses. Specifically, the "low-choice" memo that upper level managers sent to their lower level managers and supervisors had to satisfy specific conditions. The "low-choice" memo limited the degree of choice that some managers had to select the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop. Also, the "realistic" training preview and the "traditional" training program announcement that the Staff and Organizational Development Department sent to managers and supervisors had to satisfy specific conditions.

The experimenter divided the nine Company A employees into three groups of three. He met with each group separately for approximately 2 1/2 hours. The experimenter began the sessions by giving them a brief explanation of this study.

The experimenter first asked the employees to describe the typical procedures for entering a training program. While there was some variation in the answers, the consensus was that they read the description in the company's weekly newsletter or the announcement from the Staff and Organizational Development Department and selected the ones fitting their development needs or interests at
the time. Following this discussion, the employees evaluated the typical procedures for entering a training program. They responded to a number of statements using a 6-point strongly agree, strongly disagree scale. Examples of these statements were, "I have the freedom to choose or not to choose this training workshop," "My supervisor is pressuring me to take this training workshop," and "I have justification for taking the training workshop." Next, the experimenter asked the employees to assume there were different procedures. In this case, "assume you receive a memo from your manager strongly recommending or commanding you to sign up for a particular training program." The experimenter wrote five alternative "low-choice" memos and placed them randomly on two pages. Each employee was asked to react to the same "low-choice" memos but in a different order (see Appendix A).

After the Company A employees made their ratings, the experimenter asked them general questions about the memos. For example, "How would you feel about attending a training program after receiving a memo like this?" Another was, "Which memo would limit the amount of your freedom to select a training program the most and least. Why?"

The other independent variable was the type of preliminary training information participants received about a program. The experimenter asked the employees to evaluate first drafts of a "realistic" training preview and
"traditional" training program announcement using three rating scales. The first 7-point scale dealt with how favorable/positive or unfavorable/negative the information was. Very negative was defined as "the information in the announcement promotes the workshop in a very negative way," and very positive was defined as "the information in the announcement promotes the workshop in a very positive way." The second 7-point scale dealt with whether or not the information was important to know before coming to class. A final yes or no rating focussed on if a piece of information was expected or unexpected by the person when thinking of what might take place in a Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop. For rating purposes, the announcements were broken down to one or more sentences that reflected a similar point. The Company A employees also made overall ratings for the entire announcements (see Appendix B). The experimenter followed these ratings with some general questions about the "realistic" training preview and the "traditional" training program announcement. For example, "For each announcement, what outcomes do you expect from the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop?" Another was, "Do you come away with an inflated sense of value of the program after reading the 'traditional' and/or 'realistic' announcements?" Others were, "To what extent is this program described in such a way that it is made to appear that everyone can benefit from it; seems to have many
desirable features and/or a general sense of being a terrific program?", "If you received the 'realistic' training preview, would you read it?", "Is it too long?", "Is there anything important that is missing from the 'realistic' preview?"

The experimenter closed each session emphasizing the need to keep the discussions confidential. All nine Company A employees gave their assurances they would do so.

With Company B Employees. After making some modifications to the "realistic" training preview and the "traditional" training program announcement, the manipulation check for this independent variable was examined. The experimenter selected ten employees who work for an insurance company (Company B) with headquarters in Columbus, Ohio. He wanted to check whether the two types of announcements had their intended effects. He explained to them that they were part of a pilot group and asked for their help. Five of the employees received the "realistic" training preview, and five received the "traditional" announcement. The experimenter asked them to place the materials in their in-baskets and read them as they would any announcements of this type. The announcements were not supposed to receive any special emphasis. About a week later, the experimenter gave the employees a questionnaire to complete. They were informed that the list of activities/events on their questionnaires might possibly occur in a Performance Review and
Interviewing Workshop. They were asked to use the 3-point rating scale to indicate if it was their understanding that the activities/events would occur in this workshop or not. The scale had the following headings, "I know this event/activity will occur in this workshop," "I know this event/activity will not occur in this workshop," and "Don't know." An example of an event/activity rated was, "Each participant will write performance objectives that his/her staff member should accomplish during the year." Three of the listed events did not take place but were included to provide a kind of lie scale. Next, the employees were asked to indicate if they read the memo/announcement, and, if so, did they read all of it, most of it, or some of it? Finally, they were asked to use a 7-point strongly agree, strongly disagree rating scale to indicate whether the preliminary information about the workshop promoted it in a positive way. The results from this pilot study showed the the Company B employees who received the "realistic" training preview compared to those who received the "traditional" announcement had a more accurate view of what would occur in the workshop. Also, the employees who received the "realistic" training preview thought it promoted the workshop in a less positive way.

With Friends of the Experimenter. The experimenter asked three friends to participate in a mini Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop for the purpose of
pretesting the achievement test. In addition to the presentation, they read notes from the workbook and overhead transparencies. At its conclusion, the friends completed a 4-part achievement test. They wrote one development/activity statement to be carried out by an employee to improve job performance and one performance objective. Also, they matched each rating error with its appropriate definition and matched each type of performance review interview with its appropriate description. The experimenter and friends discussed the questions and their responses. Refinements were made in the matching exercises. For instance, a few of the definitions for the rating errors were reworded to make them more understandable and more difficult to match with the rating errors.

With University Students. The experimenter selected six university students to help analyze some of the data. Specifically, they were responsible for the evaluation of an achievement test that was given to participants at the end of the workshop to measure their mastery of the material. And, they were responsible for the evaluation of the participants' audio tapes of their role play sessions. Before the students started with these assignments, they had an opportunity to pretest the evaluation forms. Two forms were created. The Achievement Test of Questionnaire II form was used to evaluate how well participants completed a 4-part achievement test (see Appendix C). The students
evaluated a couple of achievement tests using this form. They determined how well the staff development plans were written using the four dimensions of learning objectives, action verbs, statement of desired results, target dates for accomplishment, plus an overall rating. Following their ratings, the experimenter asked the students about the clarity of the dimensions and rating scales.

Next, the Performance Review Interview Role Play Tapes form was used to evaluate how well trainees followed the key behaviors when role playing performance review interviews. The students evaluated a couple of role play sessions using this form. They indicated how well the "supervisors" followed the key behaviors using a 5-point rating scale with the headings of poor, fair, good, very good, and excellent. Refinements in the Role Play form were made as a result of their ratings and comments. For example, a separate "did not try" category was added to the 5-point scale, and some of the key behaviors were reworded, refined, and/or split into more specific key behaviors (see Appendix D).

"Realistic" Training Preview

The information gathered from the pilot work helped the experimenter rewrite the "realistic" training preview. As described previously, three rating scales were used to evaluate the first draft. Some pilot group employees
thought the "realistic" training preview had too much detail and were afraid managers might not read it. To cut down on its length, some information was removed. The employees' ratings and comments identified what to do. A number of statements in the "realistic" preview were expected, positive, and not important to know before coming to class. They were removed. However, some statements were unexpected, negative, and important to know before coming to class. They were given greater emphasis. Specifically, three parts of the "realistic" training preview were explained with more detail. They were as follows: (1) Participants had to prepare a performance review on an employee and had an optional reading assignment. (2) Participants split into groups of three to role play a performance review interview. (3) The information gathered from this program was used to answer research questions about training, and each participant was asked to offer his/her comments and evaluation. This information was collected by questionnaires.

The "realistic" training preview contained five sections (see Appendix E). The first part covered motivational issues. It described what outcomes could be expected from the training program if a person decided to participate. For example, the preview explained that if trainees attended the program, they should know the advantages and disadvantages of the three types of performance review
interviews/discussions, how to write performance objectives that provide motivation and direction for the staff, and what biases can occur when making job performance ratings. The second part contained an outline of the program showing what topics the workshop leaders would discuss and informed trainees of their homework assignments. The third part explained that one workshop leader would gather some information from the program in order to answer research questions about training. The fourth part gave information about whether or not a person should take the training program. The preview noted that the workshop should be helpful for managers and supervisors who evaluate the job performance of employees, conduct performance review interviews, and have some familiarity with Company A's Performance Review Program. If managers did not know the administrative aspects pertaining to the Performance Review Program, they were instructed not to take it. The last part of the "realistic" training preview gave information about the workshop leaders and dates, times, and location.

"Traditional" Training Program Announcement

The experimenter made few changes to the first draft of the "traditional" training program announcement. The pilot group employees believed this announcement had a positive/favorable description of the workshop. It was more positive than the "realistic" preview.
The "traditional" announcement contained two sections (see Appendix F). The first part described the major features of the workshop (e.g., how to write performance objectives, how to make accurate performance ratings, how to effectively give performance review feedback to employees during performance review sessions, and practical skills training in carrying out performance review discussions). The second part of the announcement gave information about the dates, times, and location.

Degree of Choice

To limit the degree of choice that some Company A managers and supervisors had to select the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop, a few upper level managers sent "low-choice" memos to their lower level managers strongly recommending their participation.

The pilot group of employees evaluated five alternative "low-choice" memos and the typical procedures for entering a training program. The experimenter was looking for a "low-choice" memo where the pilot group agreed with the following statements: "My supervisor appears arbitrary in this memo;" "Not all supervisors/managers are requiring their managers to attend this training workshop;" "My supervisor has offered to help Staff and Organizational Development Department by ensuring participation of his/her managers in this training workshop;" and "My supervisor is
pressuring me to take this training workshop." But the experimenter wanted a "low-choice" memo where the raters disagreed with the following statements: "I have the freedom to choose or not to choose this training workshop;" "I have justification for taking this workshop;" "My supervisor believes that I need this training workshop for my present job or some future job;" and "My supervisor is endorsing this training workshop." No memo satisfied these conditions perfectly, but one was definitely the most desirable (see Appendix G).

The experimenter was looking for a "low-choice" memo where managers offered little or no justification (from a self development viewpoint) for their supervisors or managers to take the class. The only justification mentioned was that managers offered to help the Staff and Organizational Development Department by ensuring participation of their managers in this training workshop.

The pilot group of employees evaluated the typical procedures for entering a training program. The pilot group believed they had a lot of freedom to select training programs. Thus, a "choice" memo was not necessary because it would have been redundant with the present procedure.

Presumably, managers with choice would have some type of justification to take the class (self-determined or an endorsement from their managers). Thus, not only was there
a difference in the degree of choice between the two conditions, but also in how much justification there was.

Procedure

Four Groups of Managers. Four groups of supervisors and managers were included in this study based on the "type of preliminary training information" and "degree of choice." One group of managers ("realistic" training preview, high degree of choice) received the "realistic" training preview from the Staff and Organizational Development Department and did not have any pressure from upper level managers to take the program. A second group ("realistic" training preview, low degree of choice) received the "low-choice" memo from upper level managers commanding them to take the program, and then received the "realistic" training preview. A third group ("traditional" training program announcement, high degree of choice) received the "traditional" announcement from the Staff and Organizational Development Department and did not have any pressure from upper level managers to take the program. The "traditional" announcement briefly described the major features of the workshop and gave information about the dates, times, and location. This is the normal policy or typical amount of information employees receive about a training program. Weitz (1956), Youngberg (1963), Ilgen and Seely (1974), and Macedonia (1969) also used the "normal policy" in the traditional preview.
conditions in their studies. And finally, the fourth group ("traditional" training program announcement, low degree of choice) received the "low-choice" memo from upper level managers commanding them to take the program, and then received the "traditional" announcement. Managers from all groups participated in each of the four training sessions.

Features to Limit Contamination of Variables. Some features were incorporated in this study to limit the amount of discussion about the variables and content of the workshop by participants and others. The experimenter identified the floors and buildings where the employees from each department worked. He divided Company A's buildings and floors into four groups that housed a mixture of managers from various Research (physical and social sciences) and Service/Support Departments. With this initial grouping, there were approximately seven departments in each of the four groups. The experimenter randomly assigned one of the four groups to the "realistic" training preview, high degree of choice condition and the other three groups to the remaining three conditions. The employees who received the "low-choice" memo and "realistic" training preview worked in areas close to each other. This was true for the other three groups as well.

The experimenter predicted that more supervisors/managers who received the "low-choice" memo from upper
level managers commanding them to take the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop would attend it compared to managers with high degree of choice. So, before each of the four groups was randomly assigned to the experimental conditions, five departments from each of the four groups were identified as being isolated from other departments. Three out of the five departments in the "realistic" training preview, low degree of choice and "traditional" training program announcement, low degree of choice groups were randomly selected and randomly assigned to either the "realistic" training preview, high degree of choice or "traditional" training program announcement, high degree of choice groups.

After this procedure, there were 263 managers from 21 departments in the high degree of choice conditions and 77 managers from seven departments in the low degree of choice conditions. Forty-six out of 263 or 17% of the managers in the high degree of choice conditions attended the training program, whereas 55 out of 77 or 71% in the low degree of choice conditions attended. Twenty-five managers were classified as "realistic" preview, high degree of choice; 33 as "realistic" preview, low degree of choice; 21 as "traditional" announcement, high degree of choice; and 22 as "traditional" announcement, low degree of choice.

The experimenter randomly assigned departments, not individual managers, to the treatment conditions. But he
still assumed that the average and distribution of skills, knowledge, and abilities in carrying out the performance review process were approximately the same in each of the four cells before the training program started.

The experimenter asked for help from upper level managers who would distribute memos limiting the amount of choice of their managers. He discussed the content of the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop and how the information collected from managers' ratings, achievement test scores, and role play sessions would be used to test dissertation hypotheses. These upper level managers were instructed to keep this information confidential. All of them gave their assurances they would do so. Also, the experimenter briefed these upper level managers about what to say to their managers who might ask for more information about the program. They were instructed not to offer an endorsement of the program, but to say that they had talked to representatives from the training department about the new workshop and had offered to help them by ensuring participation of their managers.

The Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop was scheduled five times over a short period of time. Only 15 work days elapsed between the first and fifth workshop. This was done to decrease the probability of trainees discussing the workshop with managers who had not attended yet.
Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop
Questionnaires I and II

Each manager who attended the performance review training was asked to complete Questionnaire I at the beginning of the program (see Appendix H). It included a manipulation check for the two independent variables. It also included items that asked the trainees if they believed the workshop was the most appropriate for them to take compared to other training programs available and if they believed they made a good decision to attend the workshop.

At the end, trainees received Questionnaire II to report on how the program fared (see Appendix I). It included items that asked whether the participants were able to profit from this training, if they thought the preliminary information from the announcement accurately described what would happen in the workshop, if they were motivated to learn, and if they were satisfied with the training workshop. Another part asked participants the degree to which they learned various topics or behaviors (e.g., key parts of staff development plans, how to write performance objectives that provide motivation and direction to the staff) and for an overall rating about what was learned. The last part of this questionnaire was a 4-part achievement test to measure mastery of the training material.
Other Measures

Attendance Behavior. The experimenter collected an attendance measure. It was taken from the time the workshop actually started, but before it was finished. Since the workshop was split into two half-day sessions, most managers who left when the workshop was in progress did so after the workshop leaders made their presentations on the first day. Managers usually had excuses for their absence (e.g., "a sponsor/customer has made an unexpected visit to Company A, and I must meet with him"). The experimenter placed these excuses into the following five categories: (1) The secretary from the Staff and Organizational Development Department (S & OD) had to call the manager; he/she was at Company A, but had an excuse. (2) The secretary from S & OD had to call the manager; he/she was not at Company A. (3) The manager (or secretary) called S & OD; he/she was at Company A, but had an excuse. (4) The manager (or secretary) called S & OD; he/she was not at Company A. (5) The manager or supervisor was sick or absent from work.

Optional Homework Assignment. Each participant had the optional homework assignment to read Split Roles in Performance Appraisal. The experimenter recorded who asked for a copy of the article. This measure was viewed as another way to determine the participant's motivation to learn.
Readministration of Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop Questionnaire II. About twelve days after the series of workshops ended, the experimenter sent Questionnaire II to 20 participants. This was done to calculate test-retest reliability measures for the questionnaire items.

Learning and Behavioral Measures

Using Kirkpatrick's (1959) criteria for training effectiveness, the learning measures consisted of an achievement test with questions that dealt with material from the training program. It included short answers and matching.

The behavioral measures consisted of audio tape recorded role plays of supervisors/managers carrying out performance review discussions. Managers were assigned to groups of three and rotated their positions so that each trainee had the opportunity to give performance review feedback. They were given the appropriate set of learning points to use. This is because the trainees were encouraged to keep the learning points with them on their jobs.

Six university students who received independent study credits evaluated the audio tapes. They worked in groups of three and were blind as to which manager or supervisor fell into which 2 x 2 cell. Before these evaluations
started, the experimenter asked the students to participate in a mini Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop for the purpose of acquainting them with the material and discussing what to look for when evaluating the role play tapes and achievement tests. Following Latham and Saari's (1979) procedure, they evaluated the role play sessions by using learning points from the program.

Data Analyses

The model used to analyze most of the data gathered from this study was multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). It was a 2 (preview) x 2 (choice) design with a number of dependent measures. One MANOVA was performed for the manipulation check of "type of preliminary information" about the training program and another for the "degree of choice." A MANOVA with 11 dependent variables was performed to test some hypotheses. Correlations and regression analyses were produced to examine hypotheses specifying links between the dependent variables.
RESULTS

The results portion of this study will include the following sections: (1) identification of manipulation check items/measures; (2) manipulation checks; (3) identification of the dependent variables; (4) reliability of the dependent variables; (5) hypotheses tests dealing with correlations among the dependent variables; and (6) hypotheses tests dealing with the effects of the experimental manipulations on trainees' motivation to learn the training material, how much trainees learned from the workshop, trainees' readiness to profit from the program, participants' commitment to their decisions to attend the program, and trainees' attendance record.

Identification of Manipulation Check Items/Measures

The following items and rating scales from the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop Questionnaire I formed a manipulation check for the independent variable dealing with the "type of preliminary training information" participants received about the workshop (e.g., "realistic" training preview or "traditional" training program announcement).
Manipulation Check for
"Initial Expectations of Workshop"

We have listed activities/events that could occur in a workshop like this. Please use the scale below to indicate if it is your understanding that they will occur or not in this workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know this event/activity will occur in this workshop</th>
<th>I know this event/activity will not occur in this workshop</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Let's say you know that the workshop leaders will discuss the key parts of a staff development plan. You would circle "1" to the right of it.

In an individual exercise, each participant will use a rating form to rate the job performance of one of his/her current (or past) nonexempt staff members.

The workshop leader will present information about how to be a good listener.

Each participant will have a homework assignment to prepare a performance review on a current (or past) staff member.

In a group discussion, the workshop leader will ask participants to identify some specific political and social barriers that may affect managers' ratings.

In role play sessions, one participant will assume the role of the "subordinate" and the other the role of the "supervisor" who will give performance feedback. The third person of the group will be the "observer."

Each participant will write performance objectives that his/her staff member should accomplish during the year.

Each participant will make ratings about the nonverbal attending behavior of another person in the workshop.
The workshop leaders will role play a performance review interview/discussion.

Each participant will be asked to complete a questionnaire at the end of the workshop.

The workshop leader will discuss how to accurately distinguish between continuing and leading verbal responses in a discussion.

Each participant will have an optional reading assignment.

In a group discussion, the workshop leader and participants will evaluate how well several performance objectives were written.

Each participant's role play sessions will be audio tape recorded.

Participants' "Initial Expectations of Workshop" scores were calculated by awarding 2 points for every correct answer, 1 point for don't know, and 0 points for every incorrect answer. If a trainee knew whether or not each activity/event would occur in the workshop, he/she would receive a perfect score of 2 points x 13 items or 26 points. If a trainee circled all don't knows, he/she would receive 1 point x 13 items or 13 points, and if a trainee circled all the wrong answers, he/she would receive 0 points. The participants had "Initial Expectations of Workshop" scores ranging from 10 to 26.
Other Manipulation Checks for Initial Expectations of Workshop

Please indicate the strength of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the appropriate number. Be candid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Usefulness of Workshop"

Based on the preliminary information from Staff and Organizational Development's announcement, I was able to perceive the usefulness of this workshop for my self development needs.

"Promotes Workshop in Positive Way"

The preliminary information from Staff and Organizational Development's announcement promotes this workshop in a very positive way.

"Read Announcement"

Did you read the memo/announcement about this workshop that was sent to you from Staff and Organizational Development?

☐ Yes; I read all of it
☐ Yes; I read most of it
☐ Yes; I read some of it
☐ No; I did not read any of the announcement

These four measures acted as manipulation checks for the independent variable dealing with the "type of preliminary training information." They covered important features of this variable. They determined the
participants' knowledge of the program, whether the "traditional" training program announcement presented the workshop in a more positive way compared to the "realistic" preview, the usefulness of the preliminary information, and whether it was read.

The following items and rating scale from Questionnaire I formed manipulation checks for the independent variable dealing with "degree of choice." Managers used a 7-point strongly agree, strongly disagree rating scale to make their ratings on the items below.

Manipulation Check for "Degree of Choice"

"Outside Pressure"
I felt outside pressure (e.g., from supervisors, peers) to take this workshop.

"Freedom to Select Workshop"
I had the freedom to select or not select this workshop.

These two items tapped the amount of outside pressure to take this workshop and an overall sense of freedom to select it.

Manipulation Checks
Based on their ratings on Questionnaire I, the trainees perceived the experimental manipulations as predicted. Table 1 lists the means and standard
deviations of the manipulation checks for the type of preliminary information participants received about the workshop. Table 2 shows the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) computed on these manipulation checks. As expected, trainees who received the "realistic" training preview had more accurate information about what would occur in the workshop (F[1,98] = 124.30, p ≤ .01) and were better able to perceive the usefulness of it for their self development needs (F[1,98] = 17.80, p ≤ .01). Also, the trainees who received the "traditional" announcement believed the preliminary information promoted the workshop in a more positive way compared to the "realistic" preview group (F[1,98] = 15.68, p ≤ .01).

Some people who helped with the pilot work expressed concern that the "realistic" training preview might not be as thoroughly read compared to the "traditional" announcement. "Read Announcement" was added to Questionnaire I to see if this were true. The findings revealed there was no difference in how thoroughly the two groups of participants read the announcements. Both groups read most to all of it.

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of the manipulation checks for degree of choice to attend the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop. It shows a large difference in how the two groups of participants perceived their degree of choice. The trainees of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manipulation Checks</th>
<th>&quot;Realistic&quot; Training Preview</th>
<th>&quot;Traditional&quot; Training Program Announcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Initial Expectations of Workshop&quot;</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>N=58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 to 26 range, where 26 is a perfect score)</td>
<td>21.03 (2.53)</td>
<td>15.44 (2.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Usefulness of Workshop&quot;</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree)</td>
<td>5.26 (1.66)</td>
<td>4.07 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Promotes Workshop in Positive Way&quot;</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree)</td>
<td>4.33 (1.32)</td>
<td>5.28 (0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Read Announcement&quot;</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = yes; I read all of it, 4 = no; I did not read any of the announcement)</td>
<td>1.84 (0.90)</td>
<td>1.84 (0.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
Multivariate Analysis of Variance
MS, F Values, and Significance Levels of Type of Preliminary Training Information on Manipulation Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects of:</th>
<th>On: &quot;Initial Expectations of Workshop&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Usefulness of Workshop&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Promotes Workshop in Positive Way&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Read Announcement&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Preliminary Training Information</td>
<td>766.78</td>
<td>124.30**</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>17.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all measures df = 4,95  F = 41.67**
* Significant at p ≤ .05
** Significant at p ≤ .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manipulation Checks</th>
<th>N=46</th>
<th>N=55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Outside Pressure&quot;</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reversed scored, where 7 = strongly</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree and 1 = strongly agree)</td>
<td>(1.52)</td>
<td>(2.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Freedom to Select Workshop&quot;</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree)</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.36)</td>
<td>(1.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**Multivariate Analysis of Variance**
**MS, F Values, and Significance Levels of Degree of Choice on Manipulation Checks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects of:</th>
<th>On:</th>
<th>&quot;Outside Pressure&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Freedom to Select Workshop&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS 239.25</td>
<td>MS 323.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F 63.77**</td>
<td>F 129.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² (.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all measures df = 2,98  F = 64.23**
* Significant at p ≤ .05
** Significant at p ≤ .01
the "choice" conditions tended to moderately to strongly agree with the statement about the freedom to select the workshop (Mean = 6.30 out of 7). On the other hand, the trainees of the "no choice" condition tended to slightly to moderately disagree with it (Mean = 2.71 out of 7).

This was a statistically significant difference (F [1,99] = 129.73, p ≤ .01). Similarly, the participants of the "choice" condition perceived less outside pressure (e.g., from supervisors, peers) to take the workshop (F [1,99] = 63.77, p ≤ .01) (see Table 4).

These results document the significant differences in the trainees' initial perceptions.

**Identification of Dependent Variables**

Managers used a 7-point strongly agree, strongly disagree rating scale to make their ratings on the items below.

"Commitment to Decision to Attend"

I believe I made a good decision to attend this workshop.

"Appropriateness of Training"

At this time, I believe this workshop is the most appropriate for me to take compared to other training programs/workshops available.

"Expectancies"

The preliminary information from Staff and Organizational Development's announcement accurately described what would happen in this workshop.
Nothing in this workshop contradicted what I thought would occur.

"Motivation to Learn"
I was motivated to learn the training material in this workshop.
I tried to learn as much as I could from this workshop.

"Profit from Training"
I was able to profit from this training.

"Satisfaction with Training"
I was satisfied with this training workshop.

"Turnover"
Managers who attended the first day of the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop, but not the second, were placed in one group. Managers who attended the first and second day of the workshop were placed in another. Because of the relatively low turnover rate between the first and second days, the five categories of excuses for not attending were collapsed into one.

"Optional Homework Assignment"
Each trainee had the optional homework assignment to read Split Roles in Performance Appraisal. This measure was viewed as another way to determine the trainee's motivation to learn. In other words, did a manager show extra effort to read this article before he/she had to role play a performance review interview, knowing it
contained information that might be useful for role play purposes?

"Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned"

We presented information on various topics, and you had the opportunity to talk to participants and practice behaviors (e.g., in role play sessions). Please indicate the degree to which you learned these topics/behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I did not learn anything about this topic through my participation in this workshop</th>
<th>I experienced a moderate degree of learning through my participation in this workshop</th>
<th>I learned a great deal about this topic through my participation in this workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The entire Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop (an overall rating).

This overall measure, "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned," correlated highly with the participants' ratings of how much they learned about each of the topics/behaviors presented in the training program by workshop leaders (e.g., key parts of staff development plans, what actions to take to provide on-the-job related development opportunities for the staff). The average correlation
between this overall measure and the participants' ratings of how much they learned about each of the topics/behaviors was $r = .60$. The range of correlations was from $r = .52$ to $r = .83$. Also, this overall measure correlated highly with another measure of how much participants reported they learned. It was calculated by averaging their ratings of how much they learned about each of the six topics/behaviors. This correlation was $r = .81$ (see Table 5).

"Achievement Test"

At the end of the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop, participants completed a 4-part achievement test. The students, who evaluated these achievement tests and other materials, made a rating from 0 to 9 for each part reflecting the quality of the answers. If a participant received a perfect score, he/she would receive 4 parts x 9 points = 36 points (see Appendix I). Three students evaluated each achievement test. The three overall scores for each trainee's achievement test were summed and divided by 3, keeping the possible range of overall scores from 0 to 36 points. The trainees had "Achievement Test" scores ranging from 6.33 to 33.33 with a mean of 22.41 and standard deviation of 5.85.

The "Achievement Test" scores correlated significantly with the participants' scores on each part of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Items</th>
<th>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key parts of staff development plans</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What actions to take to provide on-the-job related development opportunities for the staff</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to write performance objectives that provide motivation and direction to the staff</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What biases can occur when making job performance ratings</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advantages and disadvantages of the three types of performance review interviews/discussions</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to conduct effective performance review interviews</td>
<td>.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score from the specific items</td>
<td>.81**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p ≤ .05
** Significant at p ≤ .01
test. The average correlation between "Achievement Test" scores and the scores on each part of the test was \( r = .73 \). The range of correlations was from \( r = .61 \) to \( r = .80 \) (see Table 6). Also, since three students evaluated each achievement test, an interrater reliability coefficient could be determined. It was \( r = .89 \).

"Role Play"

In addition to the two learning measures from Questionnaire II, the trainees left a behavioral measure to reflect how well they were able to apply the information and material covered in the workshop to a role play setting. On the second day of the workshop, they split into groups of three to role play a performance review interview. One person assumed the role of the "subordinate" and the other the role of the "supervisor" who gave performance feedback. The third person was the "observer." The role play sessions were audio tape recorded. The students evaluated how well the "supervisor" followed the "key behaviors." The item and rating scale used was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way the supervisor performed in the performance review interview (an overall rating)
TABLE 6

Correlations Between the "Achievement Test" and Parts of the Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts of the Test</th>
<th>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Plan</td>
<td>.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Objective</td>
<td>.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Errors</td>
<td>.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Performance Review</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p ≤ .05
** Significant at p ≤ .01
Three students evaluated each audio tape. Before making this overall rating of performance, the students evaluated how well the "supervisors" followed eleven "key behaviors" (e.g., the "supervisor" explained the reason for the performance review interview; the "supervisor" explained what he/she expected to accomplish). The students' overall ratings of performance correlated highly with their ratings on how well the "supervisors" followed the "key behaviors." Also, their overall rating of performance correlated highly with another measure of how well "supervisors" did in the role play sessions. It was calculated by averaging the three students' ratings on the eleven "key behaviors." This correlation was $r = .90$ ($p \leq .01$).

The overall indices measuring what the trainees believed they learned from the training program, how they performed on an achievement test, and how they followed the "key behaviors" when role playing performance review interviews correlated well with the specific items measuring similar learning points. These three overall measures were used to test hypotheses dealing with how well the participants learned the training material.

Another consideration was how these three overall measures of learning correlated with each other. The average correlation among them was $r = .02$. The range of correlations was from $r = -.06$ to $r = .07$ (see Table 7).
TABLE 7

Correlations Between the Three Overall Measures of Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Role Play&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Role Play&quot;</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p \leq .05$
** Significant at $p \leq .01$
Thus, the lack of correlation is consistent with, but does not directly indicate, they tapped different parts of the mastery of training material. The lack of correlation could mean other things in addition to a lack of construct validity.

Although some degree of association between these three overall measures of learning was predicted, this type of finding was not surprising considering that one measure asked participants to report how much they learned while the other two required the participants to demonstrate what they learned. Also, two measures were paper and pencil oriented, while the other was a behavioral measure, and all three of them tried to measure how well participants learned different topics/behaviors presented.

**Reliability of the Dependent Variables**

Coefficients of stability were calculated for the measures/items from Questionnaire II. About twelve days after this series of workshops ended, the experimenter sent Questionnaire IIs to 20 participants. This was done to calculate test-retest realibility measures for the questionnaire items. Fifteen participants completed the questionnaire for the second time.

This was an "opportunity sample" in that 20 of the participants of the last two workshops could be identified because they were the only ones from their departments to
attend. Participants wrote their department numbers on 
Questionnaire IIs.

Once again, the students, who received independent study credits for evaluating the achievement tests, made a rating from 0 to 9 on each of its four parts to indicate the quality of the responses. Three students evaluated each achievement test.

Coefficients of stability were calculated for dependent variables of this study. This included "Expectancies," "Motivation to Learn," "Profit from Training," "Satisfaction with Training," "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned," and "Achievement Test." The coefficients of stability ranged from $r = .71$ for "Profit from Training" to $r = .88$ for "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned." The average coefficient of stability was $r = .81$. The coefficients are reported in Table 8.

In short, the items/measures from Questionnaire II exhibited a respectable degree of reliability. As anticipated, the "averaged" measures had slightly higher coefficients of stability than the individual items.

Hypotheses Tests

Hypothesis 1 (H1). Trainees who have expectations of events/activities more in line with actual experiences in the program will have more motivation to learn the training material and will learn more from the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure/Item</th>
<th>Test-Retest Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Expectancies&quot;</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Motivation to Learn&quot;</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Profit from Training&quot;</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Satisfaction with Training&quot;</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to adequately test this hypothesis, it was necessary to split it into three separate statements. These statements were as follows: Trainees who have expectations of events/activities more in line with actual experiences in the program will have more motivation to learn the training material. Trainees with more motivation to learn the training material will learn more from the program. And finally, trainees who have expectations of events/activities more in line with actual experiences will learn more.

The correlation between "Initial Expectations of Workshop" and "Motivation to Learn" was $r = .22$ ($p \leq .05$). And, the correlation between "Expectancies" and "Motivation to Learn" was $r = .50$ ($p \leq .01$). The correlations between "Motivation to Learn" and the three overall measures of learning varied from $r = -.06$ to $r = .62$ with an average of $r = .20$ (see Table 9). Based on these correlation coefficients, the participants' motivation to learn what was presented in the workshop was positively correlated with only their self report ratings of what they learned.

The correlations between "Initial Expectations of Workshop" and the measures of learning varied from $r = -.15$ to $r = .08$ with an average of $r = -.01$. The correlations between "Expectancies" and the measures of learning varied from $r = -.08$ to $r = .27$ with an average of $r = .07$. This
### TABLE 9

Correlations Between "Motivation to Learn" and the Overall Measures of Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Motivation to Learn&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Role Play&quot;</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations Between "Initial Expectations of Workshop" and the Overall Measures of Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Initial Expectations of Workshop&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Role Play&quot;</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations Between "Expectancies" and the Overall Measures of Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Expectancies&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Role Play&quot;</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p \leq .05$
** Significant at $p \leq .01$
reflected a lack of association between the trainees' initial expectations about what would take place in the workshop and what they learned.

In order to examine how much variance "Expectancies," "Motivation to Learn," and "Expectancies" (x) "Motivation to Learn" interaction accounted for in the three overall measures of learning, multiple regressions were performed. The multiple correlation coefficients between these process measures and the overall measures of learning were not significant except for "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned." No beta weights for the process measures were significant (see Table 10 for multiple correlation coefficients and regression equations).

Hypothesis 2 (H2). Participants will have more motivation to learn the training material and will learn more from the program when there is a better match of their ability to learn based on the training demands.

An item from Questionnaire I measured the participants' ability to learn the training material based on the training demands. The correlations between "Appropriateness of Training" and the three overall measures of learning varied from $r = -0.09$ to $r = 0.22$ with an average of $r = 0.07$ (see Table 1). Although this reflected a lack of association with these dependent variables, "Appropriateness of Training" scores correlated significantly with the participants' motivation to learn the training material. The correlation coefficient was $r = 0.28$ ($p \leq 0.01$).
Regression Equations with Standardized Beta Weights:

Multiple Correlation Coefficients:
"Expectancies," "Motivation to Learn,"
"Expectancies" (x) "Motivation to Learn" Interaction
With the Overall Measures of Learning

- .67 "Expectancies" + .05 "Motivation to Learn" +
1.1 "Expectancies" (x) "Motivation to Learn" =
"Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned" \[ R = .66^{**} \]

- .20 "Expectancies" + .08 "Motivation to Learn" +
.06 "Expectancies" (x) "Motivation to Learn" =
"Achievement Test" \[ R = .14 \]

-1.17 "Expectancies" + -1.22 "Motivation to Learn" +
2.06 "Expectancies" (x) "Motivation to Learn" =
"Role Play" \[ R = .24 \]

* Significant at \[ p \leq .05 \]
** Significant at \[ p \leq .01 \]
### TABLE 11

**Correlations Between "Appropriateness of Training" and the Overall Measures of Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Role Play&quot;</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p \leq .05$

** Significant at $p \leq .01$
In order to examine how much variance "Appropriateness of Training," "Motivation to Learn," and "Appropriateness of Training" (x) "Motivation to Learn" interaction accounted for in the three overall measures of learning, multiple regressions were performed. The multiple correlation coefficients between these process measures and the overall measures of learning were not significant except for "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned." No beta weights for the process measures were significant (see Table 12 for multiple correlation coefficients and regression equations).

**Hypothesis 3 (H3).** Participants who have more commitment to the decision to attend the program will have more motivation to learn the training material and will learn more from the program.

In order to adequately test this hypothesis, it was helpful to split it into three separate statements. These statements were as follows: Participants who have more commitment to the decision to attend the program will have more motivation to learn the training material. Trainees with more motivation to learn the training material will learn more from the program. And finally, participants who have more commitment to the decision to attend the program will learn more.

The correlation between "Commitment to Decision to Attend" and "Motivation to Learn" was $r = .29$ ($p \leq .01$). As discussed previously for Hypothesis 1, the participants' motivation to learn what was presented in the workshop
### TABLE 12

Regression Equations with Standardized Beta Weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Correlation Coefficients:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Appropriateness of Training,&quot; &quot;Motivation to Learn,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Appropriateness of Training&quot; (x) &quot;Motivation to Learn&quot; Interaction With the Overall Measures of Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[-.63 \text{ "Appropriateness of Training"} + .31 \text{ "Motivation to Learn"} + .74 \text{ "Appropriateness of Training" (x) "Motivation to Learn"} = \text{ "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned"} \quad R = .67**\]

\[.06 \text{ "Appropriateness of Training"} + -.14 \text{ "Motivation to Learn"} + .23 \text{ "Appropriateness of Training" (x) "Motivation to Learn"} = \text{ "Achievement Test"} \quad R = .22\]

\[.36 \text{ "Appropriateness of Training"} + .26 \text{ "Motivation to Learn"} + -.59 \text{ "Appropriateness of Training" (x) "Motivation to Learn"} = \text{ "Role Play"} \quad R = .12\]

* Significant at $p \leq .05$

** Significant at $p \leq .01$
was positively correlated with only one overall measure of learning. This was their self-report ratings of what they learned.

The correlations between "Commitment to Decision to Attend" and the measures of learning varied from $r = -.16$ to $r = .17$ with an average of $r = .02$. This reflected a lack of association between the participants' beliefs of making good decisions to attend this workshop and what they learned (see Table 13).

In order to examine how much variance "Commitment to Decision to Attend," "Motivation to Learn," and "Commitment to Decision to Attend" (x) "Motivation to Learn" interaction accounted for in the three overall measures of learning, multiple regressions were performed. The multiple correlation coefficients between these process measures and the overall measures of learning were not significant except for "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned." No beta weights for the process measures were significant (see Table 14 for multiple correlation coefficients and regression equations).

If trainees receive the "realistic" training preview prior to the program, then:

Hypothesis 4 (H4). Trainees' expectations of events/activities will be more in line with actual experiences in the program.

Hypothesis 5 (H5). Trainees will be more motivated to learn the training material.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Commitment to Decision to Attend&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Role Play&quot;</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p \leq .05$
** Significant at $p \leq .01$
TABLE 14

Regression Equations with Standardized Beta Weights:
Multiple Correlation Coefficients:
"Commitment to Decision to Attend." "Motivation to Learn." "Commitment to Decision to Attend"
(x) "Motivation to Learn" Interaction
With the Overall Measures of Learning

-.21 "Commitment to Decision to Attend" + .44 "Motivation to Learn" + .35 "Commitment to Decision to Attend" (x)
"Motivation to Learn" =
"Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned"   R = .65**

.09 "Commitment to Decision to Attend" + .08 "Motivation to Learn" + -.09 "Commitment to Decision to Attend" (x)
"Motivation to Learn" =
"Achievement Test"   R = .05

.34 "Commitment to Decision to Attend" + .41 "Motivation to Learn" + -.73 "Commitment to Decision to Attend" (x)
"Motivation to Learn" =
"Role Play"   R = .17

* Significant at p ≤ .05
** Significant at p ≤ .01
Hypothesis 6 (H6). Trainees will learn more from the program.

If trainees receive the "realistic" training preview prior to the program, plus have the freedom to select what programs to attend, then:

Hypothesis 7 (H7). By describing the program's methods, techniques, and goals, trainees will be ready to profit from the program (i.e., it will satisfy their needs). Fewer people will attend who already have the requisite skills or who do not have the minimum requirements to properly benefit from the program.

Hypothesis 8 (H8). Participants will have more commitment to their decisions to attend the program.

Hypothesis 9 (H9). Participants will be more motivated to learn the training material.

Hypothesis 10 (H10). Participants will learn more from the program.

Hypothesis 11 (H11). Trainees will have a better attendance record.

Table 15 provides the means and standard deviations for "Commitment to Decision to Attend," " Appropriateness of Training," "Expectancies," "Motivation to Learn," "Profit from Training," and "Satisfaction with Training." Table 16 provides the means and standard deviations for "Turnover," "Optional Homework Assignment," "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned," "Achievement Test," and "Role Play." In Table 15, it should be noted that the means for the dependent measures had a possible distribution from 1 to 7. A higher mean indicated the trainees (1) had more commitment to their decision to attend the workshop; (2) believed the workshop was more appropriate for them to take compared to other training programs/workshops available; (3) believed the preliminary information from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>&quot;Realistic&quot; Preview, High Degree of Choice</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Commitment to Decision to Attend&quot;</td>
<td>6.16 (1.37)</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Appropriateness of Training&quot;</td>
<td>6.08 (1.41)</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>(1.59)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>(1.36)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Expectancies&quot;</td>
<td>6.12 (1.04)</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>(0.99)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>(1.59)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Motivation to Learn&quot;</td>
<td>6.14 (0.76)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Profit from Training&quot;</td>
<td>6.28 (0.68)</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Satisfaction with Training&quot;</td>
<td>6.20 (0.82)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>(1.78)</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>&quot;Realistic&quot; Preview, High Degree of Choice Mean (SD)</td>
<td>&quot;Realistic&quot; Preview, Low Degree of Choice Mean (SD)</td>
<td>&quot;Traditional&quot; Announcement, High Degree of Choice Mean (SD)</td>
<td>&quot;Traditional&quot; Announcement, Low Degree of Choice Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Turnover&quot; (Range 1 to 2)</td>
<td>1.92 (0.28)</td>
<td>1.79 (0.42)</td>
<td>1.81 (0.40)</td>
<td>1.77 (0.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Optional Homework Assignment&quot; (Range 1 to 2)</td>
<td>1.68 (0.48)</td>
<td>1.55 (0.51)</td>
<td>1.67 (0.48)</td>
<td>1.55 (0.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot; (Range 1 to 7)</td>
<td>5.48 (1.16)</td>
<td>4.52 (1.70)</td>
<td>5.25 (1.06)</td>
<td>4.18 (0.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Achievement Test&quot; (Range 1 to 36)</td>
<td>24.19 (6.49)</td>
<td>21.99 (6.07)</td>
<td>23.04 (4.57)</td>
<td>19.88 (4.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Role Play&quot; (Range 1 to 5)</td>
<td>2.97 (0.75)</td>
<td>3.08 (0.57)</td>
<td>3.49 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.03 (0.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff and Organizational Development's announcement more accurately described what would happen in the workshop; (4) were more motivated to learn; (5) were more able to profit from the training; and (6) were more satisfied with the training workshop.

In Table 16, the ranges for the means are listed next to the dependent variables. For "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned," "Achievement Test," and "Role Play," a higher mean indicated the participants (1) reported they learned more from the workshop; (2) received higher achievement test scores; and (3) received higher ratings on their role play sessions of performance review interviews. For "Turnover," trainees who attended the first day of the workshop, but not the second, were given a 1. Trainees who attended the first and second days of the workshop were given a 2. And finally, for "Optional Homework Assignment," if a manager asked for the article, he/she received a 1. If not, he/she received a 2.

Four groups of managers were included in this study based on the type of preliminary training information and degree of choice. All means and standard deviations for the dependent variables are broken down by this grouping.

In order to test Hypotheses 4 to 11, a MANOVA was performed. The MANOVA solution searches for the linear combination of dependent variables that maximizes the variance between degree of choice and type of preliminary
training information groups and minimizes the variance within them. With a MANOVA, it was possible to analyze degree of choice and type of preliminary training information main effects and a degree of choice (x) type of preliminary training information interaction. The dependent variables were "Commitment to Decision to Attend," "Appropriateness of Training," "Expectancies," "Motivation to Learn," "Profit from Training," "Satisfaction with Training," "Turnover," "Optional Homework Assignment," "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned," "Achievement Test," and "Role Play."

Although a MANOVA was performed on all dependent variables simultaneously, only a subset of these results are listed on any page. Specifically, Table 17 contains univariate F-tests for these variables dealing with a given hypothesis and an overall multivariate F-test. The significance criterion for the multivariate F-test was based on the Wilks-Lamda criterion.

Before determining the extent to which Hypotheses 4 to 11 were supported, the multivariate tests were examined for significance. It was found that the multivariate tests for degree of choice and type of preliminary training information main effects were significant at the .01 level. But there was no degree of choice (x) type of preliminary training information interaction. The following three statements are based on these multivariate tests. First,
TABLE 17

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

MS, F Values, and Significance Levels of Degree of Choice,
Type of Preliminary Training Information, and Interaction on
Commitment to Decision to Attend, Appropriateness of Training, and Expectancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects of:</th>
<th>On:</th>
<th>&quot;Commitment to Decision to Attend&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Appropriateness of Training&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Expectancies&quot;</th>
<th>Multivariate Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>4.57*</td>
<td>22.39</td>
<td>11.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Preliminary Training Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>16.51**</td>
<td>34.78</td>
<td>17.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Choice (x) Type of Preliminary Training Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (.22) (.27) (.36)

* Significant at p ≤ .05
** Significant at p ≤ .01
TABLE 17 (Continued)
Multivariate Analysis of Variance
MS, F Values, and Significance Levels of Degree of Choice,
Type of Preliminary Training Information, and Interaction on
Motivation to Learn, Profit from Training,
Satisfaction with Training, and Optional Homework Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects of:</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>&quot;Motivation to Learn&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Profit from Training&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Satisfaction with Training&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Optional Homework Assignment&quot;</th>
<th>Multivariate Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.55</td>
<td>32.86**</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>5.25*</td>
<td>22.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Preliminary Training Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>25.54**</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>17.97**</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Choice (x) Type of Preliminary Training Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² (0.03) (0.16) (0.07) (0.08)

* Significant at p ≤ .05
** Significant at p ≤ .01
### TABLE 17 (Continued)

Multivariate Analysis of Variance
MS, F Values, and Significance Levels of Degree of Choice, Type of Preliminary Training Information, and Interaction on Turnover, Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned, Achievement Test, and Role Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects of:</th>
<th>On:</th>
<th>&quot;Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Achievement Test&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Role Play&quot;</th>
<th>Multivariate Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>13.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Preliminary Training Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Choice (x) Type of Preliminary Training Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \begin{array}{c} \text{(.44)} \\ \text{(.24)} \\ \text{(.18)} \end{array} \text{ (}0.05) \]

* Significant at \( p \leq .05 \)
** Significant at \( p \leq .01 \)
trainees who had high degree of choice made ratings/scores on the dependent variables that were significantly different than the ratings/scores made by trainees who had low degree of choice to take the workshop. Second, trainees who received the "realistic" preview made ratings/scores on the dependent variables that were significantly different than the ratings/scores made by trainees who received the "traditional" announcement. And third, the ratings/scores for the dependent variables did not exhibit any type of interaction.

The findings from the MANOVA partially supported the predictions made in Hypotheses 4 and 5. There was a type of preliminary training information main effect on "Expectancies" (F[1,78] = 41.21, p ≤ .01) and "Motivation to Learn" (F[1,78] = 25.54, p ≤ .01). Specifically, trainees who received the "realistic" training preview had expectations of events/activities more in line with actual experiences in the program compared to trainees who received the "traditional" training program announcement. Also, trainees who received the "realistic" preview were more motivated to learn the training material compared to trainees who received the "traditional" announcement.

"Optional Homework Assignment" was viewed as another way to determine the managers' motivation to learn. But unlike "Motivation to Learn," this dependent variable did
not show a type of preliminary training information main effect.

While the findings from the MANOVA partially supported the predictions made in Hypotheses 4 and 5, they did not support Hypothesis 6. There were no differences on the three overall measures of learning based on the type of preliminary training information managers received from Staff and Organizational Development.

Because the significance for the multivariate tests had only been established for the two main effects, but not the interaction, Hypotheses 7 to 11 were not supported. However, these hypotheses were examined to see if there were degree of choice and/or type of preliminary training information main effects.

For Hypothesis 7, there were type of preliminary training information and degree of choice main effects on "Profit from Training" (F[1,78] = 17.97, p ≤ .01), (F[1,78] = 5.25, p ≤ .05) and "Appropriateness of Training" (F[1,78] = 17.19, p ≤ .01), (F[1,78] = 11.07, p ≤ .01). Specifically, trainees who received the "realistic" training preview believed the workshop was the most appropriate for them to take and were better able to profit from training compared to trainees who received the "traditional" announcement. Also, trainees who had high degree of choice to attend the workshop believed it was the most appropriate for them to take and were better able to profit
from training compared to trainees whose upper level managers sent them "low-choice" memos strongly recommending their participation.

For Hypothesis 8, there were type of preliminary training information and degree of choice main effects on "Commitment to Decision to Attend" (F [1,78] = 16.51, p ≤ .01), (F [1,78] = 4.57, p ≤ .05). Specifically, managers who received the "realistic" training preview believed they made good decisions to attend the workshop compared to trainees who received the "traditional" announcement. Also, managers who had high degree of choice to attend the workshop believed they made good decisions to attend the workshop compared to managers whose upper level managers sent them "low-choice" memos strongly recommending their participation.

As discussed previously, there was a type of preliminary training information main effect on "Motivation to Learn," but not on "Optional Homework Assignment." Also, there was a degree of choice main effect on "Motivation to Learn" (F [1,78] = 32.86, p ≤ .01). Participants who had high degree of choice to attend the workshop were more motivated to learn the training material compared to trainees who had low degree of choice.

For Hypothesis 6, there were no differences on the three overall measures of learning based on the type of preliminary training information participants received
from Staff and Organizational Development. However, for Hypothesis 10, there was a degree of choice main effect on two of three overall measures of learning (i.e., "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned" and "Achievement Test"). Specifically, participants who had high degree of choice to attend the workshop reported that they learned more from it and received higher achievement test scores than participants who had low degree of choice. There were no significant main effects or interaction on "Role Play."

For Hypothesis 11, there were no significant main effects or interaction on the dependent variable "Turnover." Few managers who attended the first day of class failed to show up for the second day.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study reported in the previous chapters was to analyze how "type of preliminary training information" and "degree of choice" influenced managers' expectations of events/activities from the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop, commitment to their decisions to attend, motivation to learn the training material, amount of learning, and attendance record. Two major groupings of variables and relationships were analyzed: (1) If trainees received the "realistic" training preview prior to the program, plus had freedom to select what programs to attend, did this increase/improve their readiness to profit from the program, commitment to their decisions to attend, motivation to learn, amount of learning, and attendance record? (2) What was the relationship between expectations of events/activities from the workshop, match of their ability to learn based on the training demands, and commitment to their decisions to attend with motivation to learn the training material and amount of learning? Specific hypotheses were made and tested in each of these areas, and the results were reported in the previous chapter.
The main purpose of this chapter is to interpret the findings of these tests. The chapter is divided into three parts. Part one consists of a summary and interpretation of the findings. Part two outlines potential limitations of the study, and the third part presents conclusions and suggestions for practice and future research.

Summary of Major Findings (Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3)

Hypothesis 1 (H1). The degree of accuracy of managers' expectations of what would take place in this workshop was positively correlated with their motivation to learn the training material. But the managers' motivation to learn was positively correlated with only one overall measure of learning. This was their self-report ratings of what they learned. Also, there was a lack of association between the trainees' initial expectations about what would take place and what they actually learned.

Hypothesis 2 (H2). Managers' initial beliefs that this workshop was the most appropriate for them to take compared to other training programs/workshops available were positively correlated with their motivation to learn what was presented. Their beliefs of the appropriateness of the training were positively correlated with only one overall measure of learning. This was the managers' scores on the achievement test.
Hypothesis 3 (H3). Managers' commitment to their decisions to attend the workshop was positively correlated with their motivation to learn. There was a lack of association between the trainees' beliefs of making good decisions to attend and what they learned.

Interpretation of the Results

Based on statistical significance tests, the correlational data supported the links between participants' expectations of events/activities of the workshop, the appropriateness of the training, and their commitment to their decisions to attend with motivation to learn the training material. The correlation coefficients varied from $r = .22$ to $r = .50$. These findings supported the research and predictions of the realistic job preview literature (Wanous, 1977), expectancy theories of motivation (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976), and social information processing theories (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978). However, there was probably some covariation in this data resulting from common method variance. The data were gathered via Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop Questionnaires I and II.

As noted previously, managers had the optional homework assignment to read Split Roles in Performance Appraisal. This measure was viewed as another way to determine the managers' motivation to learn. The correlation between
"Optional Homework Assignment" and "Motivation to Learn" was $r = .36$ ($p \leq .01$). But, unlike "Motivation to Learn," there were no positive correlations between "Optional Homework Assignment" with "Initial Expectations of Workshop," "Expectancies," "Appropriateness of Training," and "Commitment to Decision to Attend." These correlation coefficients varied from $r = -.04$ to $r = .19$ with an average of $r = .03$. Why were there unexpectedly low correlations between "Optional Homework Assignment" with "Initial Expectations of Workshop," "Expectancies," etc.? These findings can be explained by one or more of the following reasons: (1) There was, in reality, no correlation between motivation to learn and the other measures; (2) "Optional Homework Assignment" failed to tap the construct in question. In other words, perhaps it did not measure participants' motivation to learn but instead measured their attempts to avoid being embarrassed when role playing. Or, participants who were motivated felt little need for optional reading because they already learned the key behaviors for role playing and other pertinent information; and (3) There was a lack of association between them because "Initial Expectations of Workshop," "Expectancies," etc. were paper and pencil oriented while "Optional Homework Assignment" was a behavioral variable.

There was only a slight degree of association between motivation to learn and the three overall measures of
learning. This was true for "Motivation to Learn" plus "Optional Homework Assignment." They were correlated with only "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned" (r = .62 and r = .53 respectively, p ≤ .01). The zero order correlation between motivation to learn and managers' performance during role play sessions might have been caused by the restriction of range for "Role Play." This restriction of range reduced the chance of having a significant correlation coefficient.

In addition to likely common method variance, it was not surprising to find a larger correlation between motivation to learn and "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned" compared to "Achievement Test" and "Role Play." It is useful to place these overall measures of learning on a continuum reflecting the managers' opportunity to influence them. It was easy for managers to control their self-report ratings about how much was learned. But it was harder for them to do well on an achievement test and probably even harder still for them to do well during role play sessions. In this setting, managers had to perform based on the verbal responses of "subordinates" while being watched by "observers."

Similarly, it is useful to place these overall measures of learning on another continuum reflecting whether they measure learning or performance. At one extreme, "Self-Report Measure of What Was Learned" asked
managers what they learned from the workshop, while at the other extreme, "Role Play" required managers to perform. This was a demonstration of learning. By definition, performance is an observable, measurable behavior from which learning is inferred. It is often a function of an individual's mental, physical, or environmental state (Cascio, 1978). Thus, if participants indicated they were trying to learn, they would probably report they learned something. This would result in a high positive correlation between motivation to learn and learning unless the workshop was totally worthless. If participants indicated they were trying to learn, they would have a more difficult time demonstrating this by earning high achievement test scores or by following key behaviors in role play sessions.

Summary of Major Findings (Hypotheses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11)

Hypothesis 4 (H4). As expected, managers who received the "realistic" training preview had expectations of events/activities more in line with actual experiences in the program compared to trainees who received the "traditional" training program announcement.

Hypothesis 7 (H7). Managers who received the "realistic" training preview believed the workshop was the most appropriate for them to take and were better
able to profit from it compared to trainees who received the "traditional" announcement. Plus, managers who had a lot of choice to attend the workshop believed it was the most appropriate for them to take and were better able to profit from the training compared to managers who had low degree of choice.

Hypothesis 8 (H8). Managers who received the "realistic" training preview believed they made good decisions to attend the workshop compared to managers who received the "traditional" announcement. Plus, managers who had a lot of choice to attend the workshop believed they made good decisions to attend compared to managers who had low degree of choice.

Hypotheses 5 and 9 (H5 and H9). Participants who received the "realistic" preview were more motivated to learn the training material than participants who received the "traditional" announcement. Also, participants who had high degree of choice to attend the workshop were more motivated to learn the training material than trainees who had low degree of choice. These main effects were only significant for the motivation to learn items from Questionnaire II. The "Optional Homework Assignment," while viewed as another way to determine managers' motivation to learn and was positively correlated with the motivation to learn items from Questionnaire II, did not show any significant main effects or an interaction.
Hypotheses 6 and 10 (H6 and H10). There was no type of preliminary training information main effect on the three overall measures of learning. But participants who had high degree of choice to attend the workshop reported they learned more from it and received higher achievement test scores than participants who had low degree of choice.

Hypothesis 11 (H11). There were no significant main effects or an interaction on the measure of attendance behavior.

Interpretation of the Results

Based on statistical significance tests, there were differences in how the four groups of participants viewed the intervening processes associated with the major dependent variable (i.e., mastery of the training material). As explained by the research and predictions of the realistic job preview literature (Wanous, 1977), expectancy theories of motivation (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976), social information processing theories (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978), there were differences in how they viewed their commitment to the decision to attend, appropriateness of the training, expectation of what would happen in this workshop, being able to profit from training, and motivation to learn.

There was no degree of choice (x) type of preliminary training information interaction for the intervening processes or major dependent variable. It was hypothesized
that in addition to their independent effects on training outcomes, degree of choice and type of preliminary training information would be mutually reinforcing. This was predicted based on some of the explanations for the effectiveness of realistic previews. For instance, in one explanation, by giving individuals realistic training information prior to a program, they should have an opportunity to see in what ways the program fits into their self development activities. By the mechanism of self selection, individuals who do attend should believe the program will better meet their needs. Logically, self selection cannot occur without the freedom to pick and choose. In another explanation, the realistic preview should provide more accurate and complete information. Thus, individuals should be more committed to their decisions because they feel more responsible for making the decisions to attend. Having made a choice, and having made it with full information, individuals should be more committed to their decisions.

When comparing the two extreme groups (i.e., "realistic" preview, high degree of choice vs. "traditional" announcement, low degree of choice) on these intervening variables and mastery of training material, a pattern did emerge. Managers in the "realistic" preview, high degree of choice group tended to have more favorable scores on "Commitment to the Decision to Attend," "Appropriateness
of Training," "Expectancies," "Motivation to Learn," and "Profit from Training." This was also true for two of three measures of learning. Thus, while there was no statistically significant interaction, the pattern of results supported the hypotheses.

Ryman and Biersner (1975) examined the relationship between trainees' attitudes before training and training success. This relationship was analyzed for Diver Second Class and Preliminary Underwater Demolition Team trainees. They found if trainees had the freedom to select/reject the training program, they did better on training tests and were not as likely to voluntarily leave before its conclusion. The findings from this study partially supported their research. Managers who had high degree of choice reported they learned more from the workshop and performed better on an achievement test.

March and Simon (1958) have proposed a model of employee turnover where the decision to leave an organization is viewed as a function of the perceived ease of movement and the perceived desirability of movement. The perceived desirability of movement is often linked to satisfaction. Research about job turnover substantiates a fairly consistent negative correlation between job satisfaction and turnover (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino, 1979). It was hypothesized if participants had the freedom to choose training, then with realistic training
information, they should have a smaller gap between what is desired and what is perceived as being received in training. This smaller gap should lead to greater satisfaction with training and should result in fewer departures sometime when it is under way. There were no significant main effects or an interaction on the measure of attendance behavior.

A "Satisfaction with Training" item was included in Questionnaire II. Table 15 (page 89) provides the means and standard deviations for it. A higher mean indicated the trainees had a higher level of satisfaction. It was included in the MANOVA that was performed to test Hypotheses 4 to 11. The subset of results showing the effects of degree of choice and type of preliminary training information on "Satisfaction with Training" are on page 94. There was a degree of choice main effect. Managers who had the freedom to select/reject the training program had higher levels of satisfaction with training compared to managers with how degree of choice.

In short, degree of choice had stronger effects on the overall measures of learning than type of preliminary training information. One possible explanation for this, in addition to the obvious explanation that degree of choice had stronger effects on what managers learn in training, pertains to the way the two independent variables were manipulated. At Company A, managers who had low
degree of choice to attend the workshop had something taken away from them. They typically have the freedom to pick and choose training programs. On the other hand, managers who received the "traditional" announcement had nothing taken away from them. They typically receive this type of preliminary training information (i.e., description of the major features of the workshop and information about the dates, times, location). Thus, the relationship of the manipulation of degree of choice to the status quo was different than the manipulation of type of preliminary training information to the status quo.

Potential Limitations of this Study

As was noted in the first chapter of this report, a number of precautions were taken to help insure the internal validity and generalizability of the obtained results. Despite these precautions, some threats may remain as possible alternative explanations for the obtained results. However weak these potential factors may be, they are presented here out of concern for complete scientific recording. Although the experimenter does not view these factors as threatening to the findings or conclusions, the reader is welcome to draw his/her conclusions.
Using Campbell and Stanley's (1963) classification scheme of experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research, this study was a modified "Posttest-Only Control Group Design." In general, Campbell and Stanley believed this design did not have many threats to internal and external validity. They stated, "While the pretest is a concept deeply embedded in the thinking of research workers in education and psychology, it is not actually essential to true experimental designs...randomization can suffice without the pretest...[it] is usually to be preferred."

Since this study was a modified Posttest-Only Control Group Design, there may be some potential concerns about internal validity and generalizability.

The experimenter identified the floors and buildings where the employees from each department worked. He divided Company A's buildings and floors into four groups that housed a mixture of managers from various Research and Service/Support Departments. The experimenter randomly assigned each block of buildings and floors to one of the four treatment conditions. Also, the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop was scheduled five times over a short period of time. Only 15 work days elapsed between the first and fifth workshop. Both of these steps were designed to limit the amount of discussion about the variables and content of the workshop by participants. Another feature designed to prevent these types of
discussions focussed on when this workshop was offered. It was held in late winter when managers were attending a fair number of other training courses. This workshop probably did not stand out as a salient topic of conversation.

While steps were taken to reduce the chance that managers would discuss this workshop, it was possible managers compared notes. The extent of this occurring probably was minimal, however, considering the fact that no manager approached the workshop leaders about why he/she received one type of training program announcement or "low-choice" memo and someone else received another or none at all.

The experimenter asked for help from upper level managers who sent memos limiting the amount of choice of their managers. He discussed the content of the workshop and how the information collected from managers' ratings, achievement test scores, and role play sessions would be used to test dissertation hypotheses. Thus, in addition to peer group exchange of information, it was possible that upper level managers could divulge information about this study. They were instructed to keep this information confidential. All of them gave their assurances they would do so.

The experimenter randomly assigned departments, not individual managers, to the treatment conditions. But he
still assumed that the average and distribution of skills, knowledge, and abilities in carrying out the performance review process were approximately the same in each of the four cells before the training program started. This assumption was not checked by testing the managers before they attended. Since 17% of the managers in the high degree of choice conditions and 71% in the low degree of choice conditions decided to take the workshop, it was possible that these differences in participation rates corresponded to differences in initial skill levels. For example, managers in the high degree of choice conditions, who were more selective in taking the training program, may have needed it more because of lower initial skill levels. But, if this were true, it would have made it more difficult to show statistical significance for some hypotheses.

Some potential threats to the external validity of this study should also be noted. These threats can involve poor generalizability due to subjects, setting, independent variable manipulations and dependent measures. While all of these threats are possible within any study, the strength of these threats is the critical issue.

Numerous features were included in this study for the expressed purpose of increasing generalizability. For example, (1) managers from an actual work organization served as subjects; (2) the workshop was needed by
managers in order to effectively carry out the performance review process; (3) actual trainers served as workshop leaders; (4) Company A trainees usually evaluate training programs by filling out questionnaires/evaluation forms at the end of courses. These evaluation forms resembled Questionnaire II; (5) it was similar to other Company A training programs in terms of length, format, and location.

Even the features to insure this study's generalizability do not permit generalizing these results to any subjects, company or training program, or any operationalization of the independent variables. The representativeness of the present subjects, company, and training program must be considered. Just how "unique" or "typical" were the present managers, company, or training program? Were these employees quite similar to other employees in other types of work organizations? Clearly, the answers to these questions must be somewhat subjective.

For example, the present site was typical of other R & D organizations. But an analysis of managers from R & D organizations revealed differences between them and managers from other organizations. While no specific figures were available, managers at R & D organizations probably have more years of education, are more comfortable with taking achievement tests, and have more favorable views of research studies.
The three largest factors limiting generalizability of this study were: (1) distributing Questionnaire I to the participants at the beginning of this workshop asking them if they made good decisions to attend, their beliefs if this workshop was the most appropriate for them to take compared to other training programs/workshops available, and asking them about other perceptions of the entry process; (2) approximately one half of the participants knew that information gathered from this workshop would answer research questions about training. The "realistic" training preview explained they would be "subjects" and asked them to offer comments and evaluations. This information would be collected by questionnaires; and (3) sample size.

Because relatively few research studies have tracked the relationship between the process of entering training programs from the participant's perspective and training outcomes, it was important to have a mechanism to verify if the manipulations of the independent variables had their intended effects. Also, if the hypotheses of this study were not supported considering trainees consciously made ratings of their attitudes and perceptions about the entry process after manipulations of the independent variables but before the workshop started, then future research in this area would not be strongly encouraged. While this design feature was helpful to isolate relationships/effects,
it reduced the generalizability of the findings. Few training programs ask participants to make ratings on these types of items/questions before training begins.

Approximately one half of the participants knew that information gathered from this program would answer research questions about training. This was included in the "realistic" training preview because the experimenter discovered that his pilot group perceived this as unexpected, negative, and important to know before coming to class. This information made the "realistic" preview more realistic and informative of what would happen to participants. While this feature made an independent variable more potent, it reduced generalizability of the findings. Trainees usually are not included or aware they are part of a research study.

Finally, statistics books recommend there should be approximately 5 to 10 subjects or cases for each variable in multivariate analysis of variance. While this occurred in this study, the reader should be somewhat cautious about applying these findings to similar research studies or modifying training practices, since there were about 8 subjects for each dependent variable.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Practice and Future Research

Two major conclusions emerged from this study. First, participants who received the "realistic" training preview
were more motivated to learn the training material compared to participants who received the "traditional" announcement. Second, participants who had high degree of choice to attend the workshop were more motivated to learn, reported that they learned more, and received higher achievement test scores compared to trainees who had low degree of choice.

As discussed previously, not much research has been done analyzing the process of entering training programs from the participant's perspective. And this study had its limitations. While acknowledging this, some recommendations can be made to training practitioners. Simply put, instead of giving participants either a glorified picture of what can be expected from completing a training workshop or no or very little information, they should offer a more realistic presentation of what will happen. Specifically, training practitioners should write "realistic" training previews covering specific topics. Some important topics seem to be (1) description of what outcomes can be expected from training if a person decides to participate, (2) an outline of the training program showing what topics the workshop leaders will discuss, and (3) information about whether or not a person should take the training program.

Instead of having some administrative rule requiring that employees take a particular course based on their job
titles, departments, etc., or be forced into a program by supervisors, there should be attempts made to have employees believe there is a need to attend. Considering the strong influence of degree of choice on the dependent variables in this study, this factor should be kept in mind when managers develop "self development" plans for their subordinates.

A desirable objective for supervisors/managers who must evaluate the job performance of their subordinates, point out deficiencies, and recommend training, is to try to convince their subordinates who need to change that particular training programs are appropriate to help them improve. Supervisors need to create a sense of choice and commitment so that their subordinates come to the conclusion that training is needed. Subordinates/employees must have the desire to learn, develop, and improve.

The present findings partially support previous research by Hoiberg and Berry (1978) and Ryman and Biersner (1975). The major recommendation is that future researchers and training practitioners pay more attention to the conditions surrounding the process of entering training programs from the participant's perspective. As a first suggestion, it would be desirable to replicate this study in other work organizations, with different employees and training programs. Numerous contextual variables may operate
differently within diverse settings. It is suggested that contextual factors be identified and measured so that these may also be experimentally manipulated in the future. For example, instead of presenting preliminary training information in written form, possibly show them an abbreviated film of the course that emphasizes both positive and negative aspects (Wanous, 1973). Or, instead of having managers receive a "low-choice" memo from upper level managers commanding them to take the course with little justification, possibly use a "low-choice" memo that has some justification (e.g., to improve abilities and skills necessary to carry out the performance review process).

As a second suggestion, future research in this area needs to analyze how such factors as degree of choice and type of preliminary training information compare to other variables in altering trainees' motivation to learn and learning of the material. Other variables such as how does training conflict with employees' job responsibilities or activities, degree of satisfaction with the company's training department, work group norms, etc., may be more important. Also, future research should compare how expectancies, appropriateness of training, commitment to the decision to attend, and motivation to learn compare with ability, skills, and other factors influencing how much trainees learn. Perhaps trainees' initial ability to grasp the training material may be more important than
the process of entering training programs or motivation to learn in determining how much trainees learn.

As a third suggestion, future research in this area needs to analyze how the process of entering training not only affects motivation to learn and learning of the material measured by achievement tests or self report measures, but how does it affect transfer of training to the job setting. Longitudinal follow-up studies would be helpful.

In short, several areas are seen as meriting further attention by researchers. These include (1) replicating this study in other contexts, (2) comparing the effects of degree of choice and type of preliminary training information with other possible independent variables, and (3) analyzing how the process of entering training affects transfer of training to the job setting.
APPENDIX A

Five Alternative "Low-Choice" Memos
and Rating Form
Staff and Organizational Development has developed a new training workshop that deals with how to write performance objectives, how to make accurate performance ratings, and how to effectively give performance review feedback to your staff during performance review sessions. This Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop is scheduled during February and March, 1982. You will receive more information about the workshop in a memo that will be sent to you in a few days.

Members of Staff and Organizational Development have discussed the content of this new training workshop with me. They have asked for my support to ensure management participation, and I have agreed to do so. With your input, this workshop will be evaluated to see if it is beneficial for managers/supervisors who are involved with the Performance Review Program. You will help decide if it should be continued next year. Therefore, make every effort possible to attend this workshop. Select one of the times in February or March to go.

Members of Staff and Organizational Development have discussed the content of this new training workshop with me. They have asked for my support to ensure management participation, and I have agreed to do so. Therefore, it is required that you attend this workshop. Select one of the times in February or March to go.
MEMORANDUM
To: Department 760 Managers
From: Department Manager

January 1982

I have been asked to ensure management participation in this workshop. I have agreed to do so. Therefore, make every effort possible to attend this workshop.

I have been asked to ensure management participation in this workshop. I have agreed to do so because I consider evaluation of staff performance to be a serious responsibility of the manager's job. Therefore, make every effort possible to attend this workshop. Select one of the times in February or March to go.

Members of Staff and Organizational Development have discussed the content of this new training workshop with me. A couple other managers and I have been asked to ensure management participation. I have agreed to do so. With your input, this workshop will be evaluated to see if it is beneficial for managers/supervisors who are involved with the Performance Review Program. Therefore, make every effort possible to attend this workshop. Select one of the times in February or March to go.
## Selection of Training

Let's say your boss gives you this memo. Please state how you would react to the following statements using the disagree-agree scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have the freedom to choose or not to choose this training workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor appears arbitrary in this memo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have justification for taking the training workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all supervisors/managers are requiring their managers to attend this training workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor has offered to help Staff and Organizational Development by ensuring participation of his/her managers in this training workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor believes that I need this training workshop for my present job or some future job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is endorsing this training workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is pressuring me to take this training workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

First Drafts of "Realistic" Training Preview and "Traditional" Training Program Announcement and Rating Form
I. Staff and Organizational Development has developed a new training workshop that deals with how to write performance objectives, how to make accurate performance ratings, and how to effectively give performance review feedback to your staff during performance review sessions.

The workshop is targeted primarily for managers and supervisors.

It will give you practice writing performance reviews.

It will give you practical skills training in carrying out performance review discussions.

Each session will consist of two half day classes.

Each session will consist of a morning class of 3-1/2 hours and either a morning or afternoon class of 3-1/2 hours.

Each session will be limited to 25 participants.

It will be very helpful and informative, and will even include techniques you can use to handle difficult performance review situations.

The entire Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop announcement.

II. What outcomes do you expect to get from the Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop?
I. Staff and Organizational Development has developed a new training workshop that deals with how to write performance objectives, how to make accurate performance ratings, and how to effectively give performance review feedback to your staff during performance review sessions.

The workshop will last for seven hours (i.e., 3-1/2 hours per day for two successive days).

The first day will start at 8:30 a.m. and will end at 12:00 noon. All participants will be expected to attend this part of the workshop.

On the first day, the workshop leaders will present information to the participants (e.g., lecture and discussion), and there will be some individual and group exercises.

The workshop leader will discuss the key parts of a development plan.

The leader will identify on-the-job development resources (i.e., some on-the-job actions a supervisor can take to provide job-related development opportunities for his/her staff).

The leader will discuss the key parts of performance objectives.

In a group discussion, the leader and participants will evaluate how well a couple of sample performance objectives are written.
Each participant will write performance objectives that his/her staff member should accomplish during the next year.

After each participant completed writing performance objectives, he/she will be placed in a small group to discuss how well they are written.

There will be two 15 minute breaks in the workshop.

The leader will discuss the political and interpersonal barriers that interfere with making accurate performance ratings.

In a group discussion, the leader will ask participants to identify some specific political and social barriers that may affect manager's ratings.

In an individual exercise, each participant will use a rating form to rate the job performance of one of his/her current (or past) nonexempt staff members.

The leader will outline the advantages and disadvantages of the three types of performance review interviews.

Each participant will have a homework assignment to prepare a performance review on a current (or past) staff member.
Each participant will have an optional homework assignment to review the guidelines for conducting effective performance review interviews and to read more information about the three types of performance review interviews.

The second day of the workshop will start at 8:30 a.m. and will end at 12:00 noon for one-half of the participants and 1:00 to 4:30 p.m. for the other half. Thus, each participant will only attend one of the classes on the second day.

The workshop leaders will role play a performance review interview. One leader will assume the role of the "subordinate" and the other the role of the "supervisor" who gives performance feedback.

In a group discussion, there will be time to discuss whether the key behaviors were followed by the leaders in their interview.

Participants will be split into groups of three to role play performance review interviews themselves.

In the role play sessions, one participant will assume the role of the "subordinate" and the other the role of the "supervisor" who gives performance feedback. The third person of the group will be the "observer."
In the role play sessions, the performance review session will focus on the performance review the "supervisor" prepared the night before.

In the role play sessions, the participants will switch roles so that everyone has the opportunity to be the "observer," "subordinate," and "supervisor" who gives performance feedback.

In the role play sessions, the "observer" will have an observation form to take notes and will provide a critique of the "supervisor's" interview.

All role play sessions will be audio tape recorded.

Each participant will be asked to complete a questionnaire at the end of the workshop.

Information gathered from this workshop will be used to answer research questions about training. Each participant will be asked to offer his/her comments and evaluation.

Each session will be limited to 24 participants.

The entire Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop announcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Very Important To Know Before Coming to Class</th>
<th>Very Important To Know Before Coming to Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes You Can Expect From This Workshop</td>
<td>Not Very Important To Know Before Coming to Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete one new Performance Review form for a staff member.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will know:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advantages and disadvantages of the three types of performance review interviews/discussions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to conduct effective performance review interviews.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The key parts of self development plans.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What actions you can take to provide on-the-job related development opportunities for your staff.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to write performance objectives that provide motivation and direction for your staff.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What biases can occur when making job performance ratings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rating Scale
Definitions

Very negative=Does this information promote the workshop in a negative way?

Very positive=Does this information promote the workshop in a positive way?

Not very important to know before coming to class=not very important for you to know before coming to class.

Very important to know before coming to class=very important for you to know before coming to class.
APPENDIX C

Achievement Test of Questionnaire II Form
Staff Development Plan Exercise

- Learning Objective(s)  
  Poor  Fair  Good  Very Good  Excellent
- Action verb(s)  
  Poor  Fair  Good  Very Good  Excellent
- Statement of desired results  
  Poor  Fair  Good  Very Good  Excellent
- Target date(s) for accomplishment  
  Poor  Fair  Good  Very Good  Excellent

OVERALL RATING

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Poor  Excellent

Performance Objective Exercise

- Action verb(s)  
  Poor  Fair  Good  Very Good  Excellent
- Statement of desired results  
  Poor  Fair  Good  Very Good  Excellent
- Target date(s) for accomplishment  
  Poor  Fair  Good  Very Good  Excellent
- Performance objectives should be important, challenging, specific, consistent with responsibility and authority, and measurable.

OVERALL RATING

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Poor  Excellent

ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORE

- Staff Development Plan Exercise  
- Performance Objective Exercise  
- Rating Errors  
- Type of Performance Review  
  Total  

135
APPENDIX D

Performance Review Interview Role Play Tapes Form
Please evaluate how well the "supervisor" followed the "key behaviors". Note: A poor rating indicates that the "supervisor" tried the behavior but did poorly. Circle DNT or did not try if he/she did not even attempt to follow the behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did Not Try</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "supervisor" explained the reason for the performance review interview:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" explained what he/she expected to accomplish:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" protected the staff member's dignity and self-esteem:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" gave candid feedback about staff member's performance:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" gave specific feedback about staff member's performance:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" listened attentively for the staff member's feelings and own view of why things happened:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" used a "we" approach when discussing staff member's problems or difficulties:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" kept the interview on track:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" and staff member agreed on plans for improving the staff member's job performance:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" closed the performance review interview in a positive way:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The "supervisor" scheduled a date for the Performance Plan:

DNT 1 2 3 4 5

The way the "supervisor" performed in the performance review interview (an overall rating):

1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX E

"Realistic" Training Preview
Date: January 28, 1982

To: BCL Managers and Supervisors

From: Staff and Organizational Development

Subject: Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop

Staff and Organizational Development has developed a new training workshop that deals with how to write performance objectives, how to make accurate performance ratings, and how to effectively give performance review feedback to your staff during performance review sessions.

OUTCOMES YOU CAN EXPECT FROM THIS WORKSHOP

- The advantages and disadvantages of the three types of performance review interviews/discussions.
- How to conduct effective performance review interviews.
- The key parts of staff development plans.
- What actions you can take to provide on-the-job related development opportunities for your staff.
- How to write performance objectives that provide motivation and direction for your staff.
- What biases can occur when making job performance ratings.
- Complete one new Performance Review form for a staff member.

CONTENT

The workshop will last for seven hours (i.e., 3-1/2 hours per day for two successive days). The first day will start at 8:30 a.m. and will end at 12:00 noon. On this day, the workshop leaders will present information to the participants (e.g., lecture and discussion), and there will be some individual and group exercises. An outline of the workshop is presented below.

I. Introduction; Questionnaire; Purposes of the Workshop.

II. Objectives of Performance Review Program.

III. Staff Development Plans/Performance Objectives.
   A. Staff Development Plans
   B. Performance Objectives
      - Group Discussion: Workshop leader and participants will evaluate how well several sample performance objectives were written.
      - Individual and Group Exercise: Each participant will select a current (or past) staff member he/she supervises. This person should be involved in work that is not too technical so that others in the workshop can understand his/her responsibilities. Each participant will write two or more performance objectives that this staff member should accomplish during the year and develop specific plans and methods to achieve these objectives. Then, each participant will be placed in a small group to discuss how well they were written.

IV. Performance Reviews.
   A. Preparing Written Performance Reviews
   B. Subjective Performance Measures and Rating Errors
Group Discussion: Workshop leader will ask participants to identify some specific political and social barriers that may affect managers' ratings.

Individual Exercise: Each participant will use a rating form to rate the job performance of one of his/her current (or past) nonexempt staff members. Leader will use this exercise to help illustrate the problem of rating errors.

V. Performance Review Feedback.

VI. Guidelines for Conducting Effective Performance Review Interviews.
   A. Before Interview
   B. During Interview; Do's and Don'ts

This will end the first day of the program. Each participant will have a homework assignment to prepare a performance review on the current (or past) staff member selected before. The new performance review forms will be used for this assignment. Each participant also will have an optional reading assignment.

The second day of the workshop will start at 8:30 a.m. and will end at 12:00 noon for one-half of the participants and 1:00 to 4:30 p.m. for the other half. Thus, each participant will only attend one of the classes on the second day.

VII. Review of "Guidelines for Conducting Effective Performance Review Interviews".

VIII. Role Play-Model (Workshop leaders will role play a performance review interview/discussion.)

   Group Discussion: Were the key behaviors followed in the leaders' performance review interview?

   Break

IX. Role Play by Participants (Up to this point, participants will have learned the key aspects of performance review interviews and will have observed a role play session. Next, they will split into groups of three to role play performance review interviews themselves. One participant will assume the role of the "subordinate" and the other the role of the "supervisor" who will give performance feedback. The third person of the group will be the "observer". The "observer" will have an observation form to take notes and will provide a critique of the "supervisor's" interview. After the completion of this role play, the participants will switch roles so that everyone has the opportunity to be the "observer", "subordinate", and "supervisor" who gives performance feedback. All role play sessions will be audio tape recorded.

EVALUATION OF THIS WORKSHOP

The Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop is new. As such, and because one leader will use some information gathered from this program for answering research questions about training, each participant will be asked to offer his/her comments and evaluation. This information will be collected by questionnaires that will be given out at the beginning and end of the workshop. Completion of the questionnaires will be voluntary, and the information will be kept strictly confidential. Results will be analyzed for groups only so no individual responses can be identified.

WHO SHOULD ATTEND?

This workshop should be helpful for managers, supervisors, and others who:
   • evaluate the job performance of staff members, or
   • conduct performance review interviews and
   • have some familiarity with Performance Review Program. (Details about the administrative aspects pertaining to the Performance Review Program will not be covered. This type of information will be presented in another training program.)
WORKSHOP LEADERS, DATES, TIMES, LOCATIONS

- Frank Leppert, Manager of Staff and Organizational Development, and Bill Hicks, Senior Personnel Advisor of Staff and Organizational Development, will be the workshop leaders.
- You have the opportunity to attend one of the four sessions below. Each session will consist of two half-day classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 17, 1982 8:30 to 12:00 noon Conference Room H</td>
<td>Monday, February 22, 1982 8:30 to 12:00 noon Conference Room H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 of the Participants</td>
<td>Thursday, February 18, 1982 8:30 to 12:00 noon Conference Room A or 1:00 to 4:30 p.m. Conference Room A</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 23, 1982 8:30 to 12:00 noon Conference Room A or 1:00 to 4:30 p.m. Conference Room A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 3, 1982 8:30 to 12:00 noon Training Center Rm. 203, Bldg. A</td>
<td>Monday, March 8, 1982 8:30 to 12:00 noon Conference Room G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 of the Participants</td>
<td>Thursday, March 4, 1982 8:30 to 12:00 noon Conference Room A or 1:00 to 4:30 p.m. Conference Room A</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 9, 1982 8:30 to 12:00 noon Conference Room A or 1:00 to 4:30 p.m. Conference Room A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each session will be limited to 24 participants. To participate, complete the coupon at the bottom of this page, and return it to Connie Freeman, Room 209, by Thursday, February 4.

COUPON
Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop
Connie Freeman, Rm. 209

Name _____________________________
Room __________________ Ext. ______

Which session do you want to attend? (Circle one)
A  B  C  D
APPENDIX F

"Traditional" Training Program Announcement
Date: January 28, 1982

To: BCL Managers and Supervisors

From: Staff and Organizational Development

Subject: Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop

Staff and Organizational Development has developed a new training workshop that deals with how to write performance objectives, how to make accurate performance ratings, and how to effectively give performance review feedback to your staff during performance review sessions. The workshop is targeted primarily for managers and supervisors. It will give you practice in writing performance reviews and practical skills training in carrying out performance review discussions. It will be very helpful and informative and will even include techniques you can use to handle difficult performance review situations.

You have the opportunity to attend one of the four sessions below. Each session will consist of two half-day classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 17, 1982, 8:30 to 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Conference Room H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 of the participants, Thursday, February 18, 1982, 8:30 to 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Conference Room A or 1/2 of the participants, 1:00 to 4:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Monday, February 22, 1982, 8:30 to 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Conference Room H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 of the participants, Tuesday, February 23, 1982, 8:30 to 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Conference Room A or 1/2 of the participants, 1:00 to 4:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 3, 1982, 8:30 to 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Training Center Rm. 203, Bldg. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 of the participants, Thursday, March 4, 1982, 8:30 to 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Conference Room A or 1/2 of the participants, 1:00 to 4:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Monday, March 8, 1982, 8:30 to 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Conference Room G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 of the participants, Tuesday, March 9, 1982, 8:30 to 12:00 noon</td>
<td>Conference Room A or 1/2 of the participants, 1:00 to 4:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each session will be limited to 24 participants. To participate, complete the coupon at the bottom of this page, and return it to Connie Freeman, Room 209, by Thursday, February 4.

---

**COUPON**
Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop
Connie Freeman, Rm. 209

Name ________________________________ Room _______ Ext. _______

Which session do you want to attend? (Circle one) A B C D
APPENDIX G

"Low-Choice" Memo
Date January 26, 1982
To Department 960 Managers, Supervisors
From Bruce Davis
Subject Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop

Staff and Organizational Development has developed a new training workshop that deals with how to write performance objectives, how to make accurate performance ratings, and how to effectively give performance review feedback to your staff during performance review sessions. This Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop is scheduled during February and March, 1982. You will receive more information about the workshop in a memo that will be sent to you in a few days.

Members of Staff and Organizational Development have discussed the content of this new training workshop with me. They have asked for my support to ensure management participation, and I have agreed to do so. Therefore, it is required that you attend this workshop. Select one of the times in February or March to go.

BD:vs
APPENDIX H

Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop
Questionnaire I
PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND INTERVIEWING WORKSHOP

QUESTIONNAIRE I

We are interested in finding effective ways to announce training workshops to staff members. We would like to know what information you obtained from Staff and Organizational Development's announcement. Also, what expectations did you have prior to your arrival in this workshop?

We have listed activities/events that could occur in a workshop like this. Please use the scale below to indicate if it is your understanding that they will occur or not in this workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know this event/activity will occur in this workshop</th>
<th>I know this event/activity will not occur in this workshop</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Let's say you know that the workshop leaders will discuss the key parts of a staff development plan. You would circle "1" to the right of it.

In an individual exercise, each participant will use a rating form to rate the job performance of one of his/her current (or past) nonexempt staff members.

The workshop leader will present information about how to be a good listener.

Each participant will have a homework assignment to prepare a performance review on a current (or past) staff member.

In a group discussion, the workshop leader will ask participants to identify some specific political and social barriers that may affect managers' ratings.

In role play sessions, one participant will assume the role of the "subordinate" and the other the role of the "supervisor" who will give performance feedback. The third person of the group will be the "observer."

Each participant will write performance objectives that his/her staff member should accomplish during the year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know this event/activity will occur in this workshop</th>
<th>I know this event/activity will not occur in this workshop</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each participant will make ratings about the nonverbal attending behavior of another person in the workshop.

The workshop leaders will role play a performance review interview/discussion.

Each participant will be asked to complete a questionnaire at the end of the workshop.

The workshop leader will discuss how to accurately distinguish between continuing and leading verbal responses in a discussion.

Each participant will have an optional reading assignment.

In a group discussion, the workshop leader and participants will evaluate how well several performance objectives were written.

Each participant's role play sessions will be audio tape recorded.

Did you read the memo/announcement about this workshop that was sent to you from Staff and Organizational Development?

- Yes; I read all of it
- Yes; I read most of it
- Yes; I read some of it
- No; I did not read any of the announcement
Please indicate the strength of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the appropriate number. Be candid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Let's say you moderately agree with the statement, "I believe this workshop should be scheduled for two successive days." You would circle "6" to the right of it.

Based on the preliminary information from Staff and Organizational Development's announcement, I was able to perceive the usefulness of this workshop for my self development needs.

I felt outside pressure (e.g., from supervisors, peers) to take this workshop.

The preliminary information from Staff and Organizational Development's announcement promotes this workshop in a very positive way.

I had the freedom to select or not select this workshop.

I believe I made a good decision to attend this workshop.

At this time, I believe this workshop is the most appropriate for me to take compared to other training programs/workshops available.
APPENDIX I

Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop
Questionnaire II
PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND INTERVIEWING WORKSHOP

QUESTIONNAIRE II

We would like your reactions to the workshop. Please answer the following questions. Be candid.

Please indicate the strength of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was able to profit from this training. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The preliminary information from Staff and Organizational Development's announcement accurately described what would happen in this workshop. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I was motivated to learn the training material in this workshop. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I will use the information/behaviors I learned in this program and apply them back to the job setting. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Nothing in this workshop contradicted what I thought would occur. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Before I came to this workshop, I had some expectations about what I hoped to get from it. Thinking back to that point compared to how I feel now, my expectations about this training matched what I did get from it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I tried to learn as much as I could from this workshop. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I was satisfied with this training workshop. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
We presented information on various topics, and you had the opportunity to talk to participants and practice behaviors (e.g., in role play sessions). Please indicate the degree to which you learned these topics/behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I did not learn anything about this topic through my participation in this workshop</th>
<th>I experienced a moderate degree of learning through my participation in this workshop</th>
<th>I learned a great deal about this topic through my participation in this workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Let's say you experienced a moderate degree of learning about "What biases can occur when making job performance ratings." You would circle "4" to the right of it.

The key parts of staff development plans.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

What actions to take to provide on-the-job related development opportunities for the staff.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

How to write performance objectives that provide motivation and direction to the staff.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

What biases can occur when making job performance ratings.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

The advantages and disadvantages of the three types of performance review interviews/discussions.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

How to conduct effective performance review interviews.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

The entire Performance Review and Interviewing Workshop (an overall rating).

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
We would like to know how effective we were in presenting the workshop material to you. Since it is a new workshop, we need to know if there is a need to make changes in our methods of instruction. Please answer the following questions and exercises as well as possible.

Staff Development Plan Exercise: Write one development/activity statement to be carried out by a staff member to improve job performance, increase knowledge or skills, or prepare for other job assignments.

Performance Objective Exercise: Write one performance objective for a staff member.

Match the rating error with its appropriate definition. Write the letter for the correct rating error in the spaces provided.

_____ The evaluator/ supervisor gives similar ratings on job dimensions that appear to be rationally related. It results from an apparent rational association of various job dimensions, irrespective of staff members.

_____ The evaluator's tendency to give only favorable ratings on job dimensions.

_____ The evaluator gives ratings based only on the staff member's previous job performance (e.g., of previous years).

_____ The evaluator avoids using the high and low extremes of a rating scale and tends to cluster all ratings about the center of the scale (e.g., "everyone is average").

_____ The evaluator makes more similar ratings on job dimensions that are adjacent or close together on the rating form than ratings on job dimensions that are farther apart.

a. Recent Incident Effect
b. Severity Error
c. Logical Error
d. Leniency Error
e. Halo
f. Proximity Error
g. Personal Compatibility/ Incompatibility
h. Past Record Effect
i. Central Tendency Error
j. Stereotyping Effect
The evaluator assigns ratings on the basis of a global impression of the ratee. A staff member is rated either high or low on many job dimensions because the evaluator knows (or thinks he/she knows) that the staff member is high or low on some factor. The evaluator fails to distinguish among levels of performance on different job dimensions.

The evaluator gives ratings based only on recent job performance information.

The evaluator's tendency to give only unfavorable (or at least less than average) ratings on job dimensions.

The evaluator makes ratings that are influenced by whether he/she has or does not have good rapport with a staff member.

Match the type of performance review interview with its appropriate description.

The staff member is told what his/her strengths and weaknesses are by the supervisor during the first half of the interview. During the second half of the appraisal interview, the supervisor tries to persuade the staff member to change his/her job behavior by following the recommendations and/or objectives he/she has planned for the forthcoming year.

The staff member is given maximum participation in the appraisal interview. Rather than sitting passively and having to listen to his/her strengths and weaknesses, the staff member freely discusses with the supervisor his/her performance over the past year. The supervisor uses nondirective, open-ended questions as a stimulus to encourage the staff member to express his/her ideas and opinions about potential solutions to job difficulties.

The staff member is told what his/her strengths and weaknesses are by the supervisor during the first half of the interview. Later, the staff member has the opportunity to express his/her opinions about the supervisor's performance evaluation. This reduces some of the staff member's frustration since he/she is "free" to express any negative feelings.
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