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ABSTRACT

Evaluating communication skills training presents a challenge to communication researchers. First, this thesis provides some background information about training and some of the difficulties involved in evaluating developmental programs. Three general assumptions which bring communication skills training into the realm of communication research are then presented. A discussion of two approaches to training and of three models for training evaluation indicates that training research is not usually theoretically-grounded, empirical, and generalizable. In examining training as a process of persuasion, Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) Theory of Reasoned Action offers an alternative for assessing training effectiveness.

Using the theory of reasoned action, this pilot study measures the relationship between the beliefs, the intentions and the behaviors of supervisors who participated in an interpersonal skills training program at two Veteran's Administration hospitals. No
interaction effects between the components of Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) model were detected. In other words, training did not have the anticipated effect upon trainees' intentions to perform the training behaviors. The one month and three month behavioral follow-up investigations compared the trainees' performance of the training behaviors to that of the control group, and no differences were found. Possible explanations for these results are discussed.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION: RATIONALE AND REVIEW

Communication skills training plays an extensive role in the workings of many public and private organizations. However, the nature and function of this aspect of the organizational process has not received adequate attention in terms of research. In fact, evaluating training programs in terms of their effectiveness upon participants' behavior and, in turn, participants' impact upon their organizations presents a complex challenge to communication researchers. This chapter provides a framework for accepting this challenge. After a brief overview of the nature and the extent of training, the rationale for investigating training within the framework of communication research is presented. Then, in search of a model for training evaluation, an overview of training and development approaches and existing evaluation models is provided. Finally, by treating training as a communication process of
persuasion, Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action is offered as one model for conducting theoretically grounded, empirical training research.

The Extent and Expense of Training

The amount and types of training programs conducted reflects the interest of organizations in the managerial and communication abilities of their managers. Zemke (1983) reports that 60 percent of all businesses having 50 or more employees retain a full-time trainer. Some of the most common types of training programs provide supervisory skills, management skills and development, and communication skills (Zemke, 1983). For example, many managerial development programs focus upon interpersonal skills inherent to leadership, assertiveness, and conflict management practices. In addition, communication training programs attempt to enhance managers' ability in terms of improving manager-employee relationships, setting job standards, conducting performance appraisals, and handling complaints, to name just a few. In essence, training addresses a large number of job-related activities.

Specific reasons for conducting particular training programs and for retaining trainers vary from company to company. However, the assumption that
companies will be more successful if training and development is properly performed is held in the training field as well as in the organizations which subsidize training for employees (Melucci, 1988; Yaeger, 1971). In other words, if a training and development program is well-designed and properly administered, positive reactions, increased knowledge, behavior change, and organizational results are expected (Noe, 1986).

Essentially, those training programs which focus upon human relations issues such as supervision, attitudes, and communication are implemented in order to improve relationships between organizational members and to augment productivity and employee performance (Goldstein and Sorcher, 1974). Latham (1988) explains the philosophy behind organizational training as follows:

In the case of a training philosophy, the organization is primarily interested in identifying and overcoming existing performance deficiencies for employees on their present jobs (p. 548)

In terms of training expenditures, companies are currently spending billions of dollars each year in order to train and develop their managers (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970). Although the actual amount has been calculated as upwards of $30 billion (Huber, 1985; Melucci, 1988), William Yeomans, president of the American
This finding justifies Campbell et al.'s (1970) point that:

The major question at this point concerns how long organizations will follow a policy that is best characterized as spending millions for training but not one penny for training evaluation (p. 49).

Given the investment of time and money that training requires, more and more companies are demanding that trainers be more explicit in describing and "proving" the effectiveness of managerial training programs. Failure to do this can perhaps damage the reputation of trainers as well as of the seminars. In an article that presents some of the myths as well as the realities of communication consulting, Stewart (1983) likens the training seminar to a revival meeting: "Its primary objective is to generate enthusiasm and then quickly pass the plate" (p. 158) The point here is not to discredit revival meetings or the training programs themselves, but to draw attention to the fact that those trainers who empirically measure the effectiveness of their programs and take the time to follow up on the results of their efforts are far outnumbered by those who do not.

In light of such criticism, training specialists, organizations, and researchers are currently focusing upon methods to effectively evaluate training. Latham's (1988)
review of training literature, which integrates articles published in scientific journals between 1983 and 1987, indicates that behavioral scientists, economists, and industrial relations personnel are giving more attention to rigorous evaluation of training. Noe (1986) supports the assertion that training and development is receiving increased attention in these communities. However, Latham (1988) expresses the concern of some researchers that advancements in this area have yet to affect the practices of training practitioners and some practitioner journals.

One serious problem with training research is that much of what exists in research literature lacks criterion reliability and a thorough methodology description (Burke & Day, 1986; Latham, 1988). As Yaeger (1971) points out, one of the reasons why this research area has not been adequately investigated is due to the absence of a useful, generalizable framework for determining the value of training programs.

Deshler (1984) offers some insight into another difficulty involved in conducting training research that is both scientific and practical within the organizational setting: "Evaluations have tended to serve a broad range of purposes, and each purpose may require a different model and instrumentation" (p. 84). In other words, since
approaches to training vary greatly, methods to evaluate programs are not usually generalizable. In addition, since most trainers attempt to tailor their programs to the unique needs of an organization, it is difficult to accurately replicate applied studies in this area.

**Rationale**

Given the demands of corporations for training "results," as well as the methodological difficulties discussed above, the field of corporate training represents a virtually unexplored testing-ground for communication theories and models in terms of applied communication research. Marital communication research examines workshops where couples learn about their communication skills and habits; research on small groups and group dynamics explores the communication exchanges that occur in classroom and therapy group settings. Similarly, research on persuasion, transfer of learning, organizational culture, and interpersonal communication in general have much to gain from exploring communication training programs.

With respect to the needs of the academic field of communication research as well as those of the corporate world, questions such as "Does training work?" and "Is
communication training valuable?" are too general and simplistic to satisfy quests for valid information about the communication phenomena embedded in training programs. This is because training content varies greatly from trainer to training group to the training and organizational contexts themselves. Yet this does not imply that what happens during training and the results it can achieve are not measurable. Nor does it suggest that, once measured, the effects of training programs cannot be generalized to enrich knowledge about communication processes.

What are the pragmatic effects of training? To what extent are the attitudinal reactions of trainees to the training sessions reflected in immediate, intermediate, and long-term behavioral effects? Are trained employees more or less likely to try to apply techniques presented in the workshops? With an understanding of what trainees bring with them to a training seminar and what they derive from it, can predictions be made concerning the general, long-term outcome of a specific training seminar? The answers to questions such as these point to information that is useful to communication scholars and corporate administrators alike.
Placing communication skills training within the realm of communication research opens up many new possibilities for analysis. This investigation treats communication skills training as a communicative/persuasive process of organizational communication. As such, the following general assumptions regarding training are offered:

1. **Training is a communication process.** As a process of communication where meanings are created and exchanged, all individuals involved in training exhibit behaviors which coincide with the specifications of communication models and theories.

2. **Training is a process of persuasion.** Its primary goal is to influence trainees' behaviors. While a training program may or may not cause the behavioral changes it sets out to change, each program has some persuasive element embedded in its general purpose.

3. **Training takes place within the context of the organizational system.** Regardless of where or when a seminar is held, participants bring to it part of the culture of the overall organization, engage in organizational activity while at the seminar, and must then return to the non-training culture.

With the background information, the proposed rationale for communication research in this area, and the assumptions outlined above in mind, examining the various approaches used in training as well as some models used for training evaluation provides an idea of what has actually been accomplished to date in this area.
Approaches to Training

This section will discuss two of the many approaches to training: the Applied Learning Approach and Leader Match. The first approach was selected because it is one of several which utilizes Bandura's (1969) social learning theory—a very popular "guiding force" for program design in the training industry. The Applied Learning Approach is particularly useful in illustrating how programs using behavior modeling have been/can be evaluated.

Leader Match was selected because both Burke and Day (1986) and Latham (1988) draw special attention to it in their respective reviews of training literature. This approach is highlighted due to its effectiveness and its generalizability across organizations. It is important to this article because it focuses upon the relationship between trainees and their work situations.
The Applied Learning Approach

The Applied Learning approach offers a training technique which recommends keeping track of changes in trainees' behaviors. As Goldstein and Sorcher (1974) define it:

The Applied Learning approach consists of the procedures necessary for learning and on-the-job application: imitation of effective behaviors, intensive and guided practice of new and unfamiliar behaviors, reinforcement or recognition for application of specific behaviors, and transfer learning (p. 22).

This approach is grounded in social learning theory (Bandura, 1969). Basically, social learning theory suggests that three elements (a person's behavior, environment, and his or her interaction with others) affect each other equally. It follows from the theory that a manager who adopts a new behavior can affect the way others respond to him or her, and this, in turn, can change the work environment.

Consistent with this theory, the Applied Learning Approach is organized around the psychological concepts of behavior modeling, role-playing, social reinforcement, and transfer learning. Overall, this approach provides a logical format for conducting training programs.
More specifically, the Applied Learning Approach advocates teaching trainees not only how to enact specific behaviors, but also the results the trainee can expect when performing or applying each behavior in his or her work situation. In addition, this approach strongly recommends "major participant involvement" (Goldstein and Sorcher, 1974, p. 22.) in the training session as opposed to a lecture format.

Goldstein and Sorcher (1974) suggest an experimental design for the assessment of the transfer of what is learned to the trainees' workplace. Their design involves random assignment of subjects to experimental and control groups, and compares the time it takes trained versus untrained employees to learn a specific task.

Goldstein and Sorcher (1974) tested their method of training using nurses in a public hospital and also in several industrial settings. A "significant difference" in trainees versus untrained employees' communication skills was recorded in each situation (actual figures not reported). In the three industrial settings described by the researchers, training effectiveness was measured using before/after analysis of turnover rates, observation of worker behavior, and/or analysis of industrial data regarding productivity and workgroup performance.
While the manner in which training is set up draws from social learning theory, a theoretical base is not carried through into the evaluation of the programs. In other words, although the Applied Learning Approach describes how training should work, it does not suggest how one can tell if it works. A specific approach to training evaluation is not prescribed.

In an effort to enhance Goldstein and Sorcher's (1974) model, Hogan, Hakel, and Decker (1986) focused upon trainees' retention processes. Using subjects in a large mid-western teaching hospital, they compared the coding of trainer-provided instructions by a small group of trainees to another small group's trainee-generated rule coding. Training consisted of a one-day, behavior modeling workshop.

In the trainer-provided condition, the trainer provided "learning points" of information, i.e., a step-by-step breakdown of the behaviors that trainees were supposed to learn and use. In the trainee-generated coding condition, trainees were directed to develop their own methods (rule codes) for performing the behaviors. One week after training, trainees were videotaped as they role-played a situation that could utilize the training
behaviors. Two trained coders used a seven-point semantic differential scale to rate the videotaped performances.

Perhaps assisted by the small sample size ($N = 7$ and $N = 8$), Hogan et al. (1986) attributed 78% of the variance between the two conditions was due to the treatment. Based upon their experiment, Hogan et al. (1986) suggest that "self-generation leads to significantly better performance on generalization tests given one week after training" (p. 472). In other words, the Applied Learning Approach, in emphasizing hands-on training and trainee-generated ideas, appears to have an impact upon trainees' future behavior.

The fact that the Applied Learning Approach has been empirically tested and published makes it a useful and popular method for training managers. However, this approach does not provide a reliable and generalizable model for evaluation that can be applied to various training settings. This leaves the problem of determining if and how trainees apply training behaviors up to the creative abilities and the experience of the individual trainers and researchers. In addition, the Applied Learning Approach ignores intentions of trainees as well as norms in the workplace which may affect the transfer of training behaviors. Instead, the assumption here is that
if trainees know or "learn" the appropriate behaviors, they will apply them to their respective work situations. This ignores the notion that trainees must also agree to perform certain behaviors, and that other members of the organization may influence trainees' performance.

Leader Match

Another approach that has gained support in terms of effectiveness is termed "Leader Match." This approach utilizes a self-paced program in which trainees assess their individual leadership styles, diagnose their work situation, and then change the situation to accommodate their personalities (Burke & Day, 1986).

After his examination of training research failed to find a correlation between leadership training and the performance of the groups led by the trainee's, Fiedler (1973) commented upon the following assumption which many trainers and organization make:

We generally think of organizations and leadership slots as fixed, and we tend to think of the individual as infinitely malleable. We give him a course of 10 lectures, put him into an intensive training workshop, and expect to turn out a person who will be able to adapt himself to any demands of the organization (p. 25).
Fiedler (1973) suggests that because training serves multiple functions within any particular organization, everyone in a company can be trained. But after training, Fiedler emphasizes the importance of matching a subject's style and abilities with appropriate job situations.

Leader Match is based upon Fiedler's (1973) Contingency Model, which asserts that "leadership effectiveness depends upon the leader's style of interacting with his group members and the favorableness of the group-task situation" (Fiedler & Chemers, 1973, p.81). Assisted by the training program, the "leader" attempts to match his or her preferred style of interaction with the amount of control the leader has in a work situation. As Fiedler and Chemers (1973, p.130) assert: "The effect which leadership experience and training have on performance will depend upon the type of situation within which the leader has to operate."

The main assets of "Leader Match" are its ability to account for the personality features of those who are trained, and its sensitivity to the fact that the working conditions to which a trainee returns after training may or may not be conducive to the trainee's manner of performing the training behaviors. In their analysis of
training effectiveness research, Burke and Day (1986) recommend this approach as it appears to generalize across various training situations.

Although "leadership development" requires attention to a variety of abilities and behaviors, leadership development is not the number one objective of all training programs. The degree to which a key training behavior fits the Leader Match approach is more or less a judgement call on the part of the trainers. While it does not specify an approach to evaluation, this model is set up to allow for pre-/post-assessment of behavior change or evaluation against alternative training methods (Latham, 1988). Long range effectiveness is not known.

**Models for Training Evaluation**

While several articles make suggestions about how to conduct training research, it is difficult to locate empirical, comprehensive, theoretically-based evaluation models. The three models discussed below have been constructed upon interesting premises regarding the manner in which training is supposed to "work."
Cost-Benefit Models

What has been described as the "black box" approach to training research, i.e., where inputs are compared to outputs without any analysis of the process by which changes occur, is no longer prevalent in its true form (Deshler, 1984). However, those training evaluations that emphasize cost/benefit analysis can utilize this approach in terms of arriving at the dollars and cents utility of training.

Kearsley and Compton (1981) discuss four models that can be applied to training evaluation: resource requirement models, life cycle models, benefit models, and productivity models. To some extent, all of the models offer suggestions for appropriately identifying training costs and savings, and all of them assume that a causal relationship exists between what goes into training and what training can "produce."

The resource requirement model compares and contrasts training costs with four categories of resources: personnel, equipment, facilities, and materials. Kearsley and Compton’s (1981) life cycle model attempts to measure savings over a larger, cyclical period of time, i.e., from the pilot test of a new training
approach through the "phasing out" of the program as a new one is introduced to company practices. The benefit model proposes a method for assessing the consequences of inadequate training by seeking causal relationships between the organizational parameters of training and its benefits.

The productivity model, as outlined by Kearsley and Compton (1981), is particularly interesting because it attempts to account for what it is that makes a training program successful:

The amount of training accomplished (e.g., as measured by the number of graduates) is a function of the number and skills of the trainer, the nature of the training procedures used to design and deliver the training, and the nature of the training delivery system itself (e.g., classroom-based mediated self-study) (p. 57).

Based upon the above quotation, it appears that the productivity model is consistent with the idea that if everything goes well with the trainer and the training program itself, trainees will exhibit appropriate responses. Because it does not deal with the trainees' abilities, attitudes, or behaviors, a true test of this assumption cannot be derived from this model. The assumption that if a company spends $x$ amount of dollars and if a trainer adequately performs $y$, training can be
considered "efficient" and "effective" is a naive one. Such cost/benefit analysis excludes the key element by which change ("results") can occur: the trainees themselves.

It is important to point out that efforts to measure human relations training in terms of cost/benefit analysis can make a significant contribution to training effectiveness research (Weinstein & Kasl, 1982; Kirkpatrick, 1967). Recent research in this area is beginning to include the trainees in the analysis. One example of this is the report of Paquet, Kasl, Weinstein, and Waite (1987). Drawing upon the suggestions of Kearsley and Compton (1981) and using Weinstein's (1982) and Weinstein and Kasl's (1982) cost model, Paquet et al. (1987) performed what they refer to as an "impact evaluation," or one that studies "whether an educational intervention brings about intended results" (p. 27).

Basically, this group of researchers attempted to ascertain the "chain of impact" linking trainees' opinions about training, what they've learned in training, their post-training behavior in the workplace, and work-unit performance results. Although they claim to have obtained "proof" of training effectiveness by their methods, there are some problems with their research. Paquet et al.'s
(1987) article discusses only three of fourteen cases included in their pilot study. Here they report that the general organizational climate was factored out of their recorded results; the use of any type of control group was not indicated.

The study relied heavily upon trainees' self reports. In fact, participants were taught how to record the results the investigation intended to measure. One problem with this is that trainees' ability to record results may have been independent of what they learned in training. No test regarding the possibility of confounded results was reported in the article. Inferential links were established between work-unit productivity records and reports of behavior change, and these were extended to a larger population.

Lacking the criteria and the documentation of scientific research, the Paquet et al. (1987) study does not provide a sound methodology which can be replicated and generalized to other programs. The significance of this study is that the relationships between the process of training and those who are being trained are being investigated within the realm of the organization. Trainees' involvement and behaviors are being included in the analysis of training.
Research focused upon the relationship between the behavior of trainees and efficiency and productivity within a company can provide extremely useful information. Latham (1988) states that recording these changes in trainees and subsequently their effect upon the work environment is vital to the need for trainers to establish the significance of their programs:

The hypothesis offered here is that seeing a positive behavior change on the part of subordinates will result in upper management treating training seriously--more seriously than if presented with dollar estimates that justify time spent on training (p. 561).

Kirkpatrick's Model for Training Evaluation

Kirkpatrick (1967) presents a model for training evaluation designed to be applied to any training program. Although Kirkpatrick (1967) admits that several variables influence training results, his evaluation procedure is focused upon the trainee from the trainer's perspective.

In order to determine a training program's effectiveness, Kirkpatrick (1967) explains that the seminar must be evaluated according to four distinct levels or steps: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. While this model does not assume a relationship between these steps, the truly effective training program
is presumably the one which achieves behavior change and, ultimately, organizational results.

First, an evaluator must determine subjects' reactions to the training program, i.e., whether or not they liked it. This can be accomplished by having the trainees fill out reaction sheets. Then a paper-and-pencil test can be administered to indicate what participants learned in terms of training content.

Determining the extent to which behaviors are learned/changed during training and are carried back to the workplace is more difficult to assess according to this model. Although Kirkpatrick does not indicate which approach should be selected under training-specific circumstances, nine studies employing various approaches are cited. The importance of using of control groups and before-and-after statistical analysis when assessing behavior change is emphasized in this article. Kirkpatrick's (1967) suggestions concerning a methodology for determining the positive behavioral impact of training seem general and yet more complicated than his recommendations for evaluating reactions and learning. The model provides even less direction for obtaining concrete indications of training results.
In terms of communication research, another problem with the model is that it does not fall within a theoretically-based framework. A training evaluation procedure that is not built upon some theoretical framework, that fails to acknowledge its inherent assumptions regarding the training process itself, and that lacks a method for transforming the outcomes of training into meaningful measures sacrifices reliability and validity to chance. The value of Kirkpatrick's (1967) model, then, lies in the fact that he divides training evaluation into four components.

**Noe's Model for Training Evaluation**

Taking Kirkpatrick's (1967) model into consideration, Noe (1986) presents a more comprehensive, hierarchical model for training evaluation. This model assumes that trainees possess certain attitudes and attributes which ultimately affect training effectiveness (Latham, 1988). Noe's (1986) model suggests that whether or not training is effective is closely related to the willingness of trainees to behave in a particular way:

Trainees' motivation to learn may be influenced by beliefs concerning effort-performance and performance-outcome relationships, career-job attitudes, and reactions to skill needs assessment. Assuming similar ability levels, it is hypothesized that trainees who are enthusiastic about attending the program and
desire to learn the content of the training program are likely to acquire more knowledge and skills and demonstrate greater behavior change and performance improvement than trainees not motivated to learn (p. 743).

Noe's (1986) model represents an attempt to assimilate the training evaluation research that preceded it. As a result, it includes the content and knowledge acquisition aspects of training. It also considers the notion that a trainee must perceive that his or her work setting provides the necessary resources if the behavior learned during training is to be enacted (Latham, 1988). As Noe (1986) phrases it:

Any measure of motivation to transfer should include items designed to assess trainees' confidence in the use of new skills and their perceived applicability of trained skills on the job (p. 734-44).

Despite its assumptions, Noe's model is not based in any particular theory from the social sciences. In addition, while the model points out the relationship between different levels of "effectiveness," it does not prescribe procedures which can consistently be applied to measure the strength of these relationships.

**The Theory of Reasoned Action**

Although some approaches to training are based in social scientific theory, none prescribe an evaluation
technique which is both theoretically-grounded and empirically-based. Specific models for training evaluation also tend to have this same shortcoming. Without a theoretical framework that acknowledges the underlying assumptions about the process of training and what it can accomplish, the attempt to evaluate the "impact" of training upon trainees and the organizations to which they return are "shots in the dark."

Given the three assumptions of training as a process of communication outlined earlier, Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action provides a model grounded in persuasive theory. This model relates a person's beliefs to attitudes, social norms, beliefs, intentions, and behaviors. Greater understanding of these relationships is central to the theory, and from this understanding, predictions can be made. Both the components and the results achieved in its application to other areas of research suggests that the theory of reasoned action may offer an important alternative to the models typically used to evaluate training programs.

Background Information

From investigations such as those of Corey (1937), Doob (1947), and Thurstone (1931), and from Wicker's
(1969) review of related literature, comes the assertion that the relationship between a person's attitudes and his or her behaviors is a weak one, especially where predictions regarding behaviors are concerned. Rejecting this idea, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) pointed out that most investigations conducted in this area in this past did distinguish between beliefs, intentions, feelings, or attitudes, and thus measured these variables interchangeably. After defining each of these terms carefully, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) the ability to predict a specific behavior on the basis of a person's attitude toward performing the behavior. The result of their research is their theory of reasoned action.

The theory of reasoned action holds that one's intention to behave or not to behave in a certain way is the key determinant of whether or not one actually will behave in a specific way (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). A person's intentions are shaped through communication, or, more specifically, persuasion.

According to the theory of reasoned action, the two determinants of intention are a person's attitude toward performing an action (in this case, training behaviors) and the subjective norm or perceived situational consequences of performing the action (i.e.,
how the trainee looks at the training behavior(s) in relationship to his or her work situation.). Both the attitudinal component and the social norm component are considered to be a function of a person's beliefs. As Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) explain:

Generally speaking, individuals will intend to perform a behavior when they evaluate it positively and when they believe that important others think that they should perform it (p. 6)

In the formula below, trainees' attitudes (A) toward performing each behavior equal their beliefs (b) about the consequences of their performing them times their evaluation (e) of these consequences. The subjective norm (SN) component is represented by trainees' motivation to comply (mc) with salient referents in the workplace regarding their performance of the behaviors.

\[ b(e) + mc = I \]

\[ A = (b)(e) \]

\[ SN = mc \]

Because in different situations attitudinal considerations may be more important than normative forces, or vice versa, relative weights are assigned to these components.

The theory of reasoned action has received considerable attention and respect in the field of
the "fat me" rationale. A pilot study of an independent sample of 40 college women generated a list of behaviors associated with dieting and with physical activity which leads to weight loss. Direct measures of the intention of the 88 women to diet and exercise correlated with the behavioral index of dieting (r = .60 for dieting and r = .66 for physical activity; Sejwacz et al., 1980).

Several studies applied the theory of reasoned action to family planning behaviors. Jaccard and Davidson (1972), for example, used the theory to predict the likelihood that women in a sample would use birth control pills. Davidson and Jaccard (1975) applied it to intentions concerning family size.

The latter study dealt with family planning intentions and not actual behaviors. This study provides a strong argument against the utility of measuring demographic or personality variables to make predictions concerning family size. Consistent with the theory of reasoned action, the attitude component and the subjective norm component accounted for an average of 60 percent of the variance of intentions. Results of this study are based upon a random sample of 270 married women; multiple correlations on behavioral intention ranged from .639 to .862 (Davidson & Jaccard, 1975).
A later study used the theory of reasoned action to predict actual family planning behavior as well as intention (Vinokur-Kaplan, 1978). Respondents consisted of 141 married couples having either one child (N = 71 couples) or two children (N = 70 couples). Twelve months after they were interviewed regarding their intentions to have another child, a mailed questionnaire was administered to determine actual planning behavior (239 of 282, or 85%, of the sample returned the questionnaires). Again, resulting multiple correlations were statistically significant, from .31 to .85 over time. As Vinokur-Kaplan (1978) indicates:

The results provided substantial support for the model; both behavioral intention and actual behavior were successfully predicted from the attitudinal and normative components of the model. It was also shown that the behavioral intention mediates the relationship between the model's attitudinal and normative components and actual behavior (p. 29).

Results which support the theory of reasoned action were also obtained in studies aimed at predicting and understanding women's career intentions (Sperber, Fishbein, & Ajzen, 1980), voting behavior in American elections (Fishbein, Ajzen, & Hinkle, 1980) and in British elections (Fishbein, Bowman, Thomas, Jaccard, & Ajzen, 1980), consumer behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1980), and a program designed to change the behavior of alcoholics.
(Fishbein, Ajzen, & McArdle, 1980). All of these incorporate the attitudinal and normative components central to the theory.

Because it has been applied so successfully and in several different contexts, the theory of reasoned action offers a promising approach to training evaluation. What this theory defines as determinants of behavioral intention and of behavior itself offers a methodology for what is called for in the training literature: The ability to understand and to predict the likelihood that training has a positive behavioral impact in the work environment.

Implications for Training Research

With regard to communication skills training, the theory suggests that a change in trainees' beliefs about performing the training behaviors will increase the probability that their actual behaviors will change. Based upon the assumption that training is a communicative/persuasive process, the extent to which training influences trainees' intentions can be then measured as specified in the theory.

Although several approaches to training and training evaluation have been interested in trainees'
attitudes toward training programs, the theory of reasoned action investigates trainees' attitude toward performing training behaviors. Focusing upon behaviors means that regardless of the training topic/program/setting, the attitudinal component of trainees' intentions can be systematically assessed.

The social norm component of the theory is of particular interest and value because it places the probability of training effectiveness within the context of the larger organizational system. This aspect of the theory corresponds to the assumption that training occurs as a part of the culture of an organization. As suggested by the theory, whether or not trainees will apply behaviors learned in training to their work situation depends not only upon trainees' attitudes, but also upon their perceptions of organizational norms, which can constrain their behavior.

The various components of the training and training evaluation models discussed earlier in this chapter would, in most cases, be handled in one of two ways by the theory of reasoned action. Variables concerning trainees' reactions, attitudes, or perceptions of social norms within the workplace are incorporated into the attitudinal or subjective norm assessments of the
theory. Components which do not fit into the theory would be classified as "external variables" that do not directly influence behavioral intentions. It follows that they would not be considered to be factors which determine trainees' intentions, behaviors or the behavioral outcomes of training.

In terms of training evaluation, the theory of reasoned action is unique in that it neatly ties together the relationship between trainees' attitudes, their beliefs about their work situation, their intentions, and their actual behaviors. In addition, Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) carefully prescribe how the theory can be applied to a variety of persuasive situations; it is a generalizable, empirically-based theory.

Summary and Conclusion

Managerial training, particularly that which teaches communication skills, is an extensively-used and an expensively-priced occurrence in many organizations. However, the effects of training have not been adequately researched. In other words, the training industry has advanced more quickly than its methods for program evaluation.
Generally speaking, training research that has focused upon some particular approach to training has relied upon experimental or quasi-experimental, general (i.e., non-training-specific) research methods of evaluation. As a result, methods of training evaluation applied to one approach are usually not applicable to other programs.

For example, Goldstein and Sorcher's (1974) Applied Learning Approach utilizes behavior-modeling techniques which makes each behavior "performable" for trainees. Based upon a contingency model, Leader Match (Fiedler, 1973) brings attention to the important relationship between the behavior of trainees and their work situation. Although the effectiveness of these approaches has been empirically investigated, the evaluation procedures employed are not "built into" the respective approaches; neither approach provides replicable and generalizable framework for evaluation.

The three models for training evaluation described in this article (Cost-Benefit Models; Kirkpatrick's (1967) Model; Noe's (1986) Model) have not been linked to any particular theory drawn from the social sciences. Finding empirical ways to test the utility of these models is, at best, difficult.
One of the reasons why research in this area has been so difficult is that it has not defined assumptions regarding the training process. This chapter suggested three training assumptions. The first of these assumptions was that communication skills training is a communication process where meanings are created and shared. Second, communication training is a persuasive process, the purpose of which is to influence attitudes and behaviors. Finally, training is not an isolated event, but is part of the ongoing system and culture of an organization. Trainees must not only learn to focus upon their own communication behavior, but must also agree to perform new training behaviors by introducing them to organizational culture.

The assumptions proposed regarding training as a process of persuasive, organizational communication, places training evaluation within the parameters of communication research. Within this framework, one alternative for evaluation is based upon Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) Theory of Reasoned Action. In correspondence with the needs of the training and development field, the advantages of incorporating this
theory into a training evaluation model are that the model would be theory-based, empirically prescriptive, and generalizable across various training/organizational contexts.

**Research Hypotheses**

Given the considerations outlined in this chapter, we can now turn to a pilot investigation that applies the theory of reasoned action to a training program. Participants in a training program can be compared to members of an organization who are not trained on the basis of each of the components of Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1975) model. Such an application of the theory of reasoned action to an interpersonal skills training program suggests the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Trainees’ intentions to perform the training behaviors will be significantly stronger than the intentions of the members of the control group.

Hypothesis 2: Trainees will perform the training behaviors more often than the control group members.

The rationale behind the first hypothesis is that training will positively influence the intentions of members of the participants in a training program, i.e., the experimental group for this study. The second hypothesis, in accordance with the theory of reasoned
action, suggests that the behavioral intentions (I) of subjects in the Experimental Group and in the Control Group will be the best predictor of subjects' behaviors. As such, members of the experimental (trained) group will recognize the opportunity to perform the training behaviors more often than those in the control (not trained) group. As a result, experimental group members will perform the training behaviors more often than control group members. The process of testing these hypotheses is explained in detail in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

This study examined the relationship between the beliefs, the intentions, and the behaviors of trainees. In accordance with the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), information regarding trainees' intentions was used to predict the extent to which what was learned during training will be transferred to the workplace. Then, the behaviors of trainees in the workplace was assessed to test this prediction.

Subjects

Participants for this study consisted of supervisors in Veterans Administration Hospitals located in Wilmington, Delaware, and in Perry Point, Maryland. Twenty-eight supervisors from the Wilmington VA Center participated in the pilot study used to assess the modal salient beliefs upon which the questionnaires for training evaluation were developed. Eleven supervisors from the Wilmington hospital, and twelve from the Perry Point
hospital took part in the training program, and as such there were twenty-three participants in the experimental group. Finally, because there were no control group participants available at the Wilmington VA Center, eleven supervisors from the Perry Point VA Center comprised the control group for this research.

All trainees (experimental and control) were selected by the trainers involved in presenting the program at each hospital. The trainees represent the first set of supervisors "hand-picked" for the first round of the newly purchased supervisory training program. At the Wilmington site, the most important criterion for selection was previous participation in training: Supervisors who had not participated in supervisory training before were selected. At the Perry Point site, those supervisors considered by the trainers as the "most important" to train, based upon seniority within the hospital as well as the trainers' personal preference, were selected to participate. The pilot group and the control group were also selected by the trainers at each hospital, on the basis of the trainers' opinions regarding the subjects' likelihood to respond to the questionnaires, as well as availability.
The Training Program

The training program under investigation was entitled "Interpersonal Skills Training" and consisted of eight units of instruction. This program, designed by Zenger Miller, Inc., is currently used by a set of eight Veterans Administration Hospital Centers to teach communication skills to hospital supervisors. Evaluation of training for this research focused upon twenty-seven communication skills (see Appendix A for a list of these behaviors) taught at the two participating hospitals over a 3-1/2 week period. Training occurred in half-day sessions during scheduled working hours.

Preliminary Investigation

According to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), the first step to utilizing their model is to determine the modal salient beliefs of the group(s) under investigation. This required asking open-ended questions regarding supervisors' salient beliefs about performing each of the key behaviors outlined in the training program. It also involved questions which identify those people whom supervisors consider to be salient referents for each behavior (see Appendix B for the questionnaires used in the preliminary study).
Also in the interest of keeping the survey brief enough in order that hospital supervisors could complete it during their busy work hours, the preliminary questionnaires deviated from the specifications for determining the salient referents as outlined by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980). It seemed unlikely that asking for three salient referent dimensions (who approves/disapproves/is associated with) for each of the 27 behaviors would generate a wide range of responses. This was because there were less than 90 supervisors at the Wilmington hospital where this pilot study was conducted. In addition, each department had a maximum of only two or three levels of management (supervisor, assistant chief, chief). As a result, the most categorically descriptive interpersonal skill was selected from each of the eight units. The questionnaire then sought the dimensional aspects of these eight behaviors in terms of salient referents.

Given the broad range of open-ended responses, any response that occurred two or more times was coded as a potentially salient belief. Then, with this list of the most frequent responses as a guide, those responses which occurred three or more times were used as salient modal beliefs to create the scaled questionnaires. In addition,
after discussing with one of the trainers their applicability to the supervisors who were to be trained, those responses which occurred only two times were either eliminated, included "as is," or considered in relation to other pairs of responses so that they could be combined to form more generalizable beliefs. Eighty beliefs (b) regarding the consequences of performing the training behaviors and fifty-one evaluations (e) of those consequences were ultimately selected for inclusion in the pre-training and post-training evaluation questionnaires (see Appendix B).

The Training Evaluation Questionnaire(s)

Assessing Trainees' Intentions

According to Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) specifications for applying the theory of reasoned action, a training evaluation questionnaire was designed from the survey of supervisors' modal salient beliefs about performing the training-specific behaviors. Three areas central to the theory were included for measurement: behavioral intention, attitudes, and subjective norms. Semantic differential scales (from 1 to 7) were used to
obtain measurements for each of the twenty-seven training behaviors (see Appendix C for the pre-/post-training questionnaire developed).

As suggested by the theory of reasoned action, the components of behavioral intention were trainees' attitudes toward performing the training behaviors and their beliefs regarding social norms in the workplace which would influence their performance of the behaviors.

It is important to recall that this study deviated from Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) condition that the subjective norm component (SN) of the model be equated with subjects' normative beliefs (nb) times their motivation to comply (mc). Instead, (nb)(mc) was combined into one set of questions. For example, the question "My immediate supervisor thinks I should/should not give recognition to employees . . . " (nb) and the question "Generally speaking, I want to do what my immediate supervisor thinks I should do" were combined to form the questionnaire item "It is likely/unlikely that my immediate supervisor will influence my giving recognition to employees" (see Appendix C).

Combining component questions in this way eliminated the redundancy of asking essentially the same
question in two different ways, whereas permitting both sets of questions for each of the training behaviors would have added seven pages to the twenty-two page questionnaire. Ultimately, the decision to deviate from Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) formula was made in the interest of keeping the pre-/post-training questionnaire at a length which trainees could complete in thirty minutes.

The questionnaire developed for pre- and post-training assessment asked "Do you intend to . . ." perform each behavior. It also sought information regarding participants' evaluations of possible consequences of their performing the behaviors recommended in the training program. Finally, the questionnaire asked participants to indicate their motivation to comply with significant others in their workplace who would influence their acting in such a manner. As such, the questionnaire developed for this study consisted of 27 items concerning intentions to perform the training behaviors, 27 items assessing attitudes toward performing them, 80 items regarding subjects' beliefs associated with their performing the training behaviors, 51 items about their evaluations of
those beliefs, and 216 items (8 referents for each of the 27 behaviors) concerning the amended motivation to comply component.

The purpose of this questionnaire was to determine the relationships between trainees' attitudes, subjective norms, their motivation to comply with significant members of their workgroups, and their behavioral intentions. This information, in turn, was used to formulate a prediction concerning the probability that trainees would perform each of the twenty-seven behaviors.

Procedure

Phase I: Predicting Trainees' Behavioral Intentions

In Phase I of this research, the independent variable was the "Interpersonal Skills Training" program and the dependent variable was the intention of each trainee to perform each training behavior.

On the first day of training at each of the two hospitals involved in this study, the questionnaire designed to measure trainees' intentions regarding each of the training behaviors was administered. Three and one-half weeks later, at the end of the last day of training,
Trainees were again asked to complete the same version of this questionnaire. Meanwhile, over the same three and one-half week period of time, members of the control group were asked to complete the pre- and post-training questionnaire, although this group did not participate in any training program during this time.

Based upon the relationships between each of the components of Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) model, a prediction was made regarding the likelihood that each of the trainees as well as each of the control group participants would perform each of the twenty-seven training behaviors.

Phase II: Assessing the Behavioral Impact of Training

At the end of Phase I of this research, the predictions regarding the performance of each training behavior by members of the experimental group and the control group were made based upon each participant's intentions. In Phase II, these predictions served as the independent research variable, while the actual performance of the training behaviors represented the dependent variable.

In order to assess behavioral performances, the trainees were asked to complete a self-report of their use
of the training behaviors (see Appendix D for this follow-up questionnaire). As recommended by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), this questionnaire asked for the number of times respondents had the opportunity to perform each of the twenty-seven interpersonal behaviors learned in training, in addition to the number of times they actually performed each behavior. Members of the control group were also asked to complete this self-rating questionnaire at end of a matched time period.

To test the prediction regarding trainees' versus control participants' performance over a longer period of time, Phase II of this research was repeated three months after Phase I for each group of respondents.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

For the purpose of analysis in this study, data collected from the trainees at the Wilmington hospital was combined with that of the Perry Point location to form the experimental group. As explained in the previous chapter, the control group consisted of eleven supervisors at the Perry Point hospital who did not participate in training. In order to ascertain the correlation between subjects' beliefs times their evaluation of the beliefs (the "b x e" component of the model) and their attitudes (A) toward performing each of the twenty-seven training behaviors, two regression analyses were performed with A as the dependent variable and b and e as independent variables. One analysis was performed on data collected from each of the two groups prior to training, and the second was performed upon data collected from each of the groups after the training period. These analyses provided some insight into the reliability of the salient modal beliefs used in the design of the questionnaires. Results of these regressions generally indicated that the
beliefs of the control group were slightly more strongly correlated with their attitudes than were the beliefs of the experimental group, as can be seen in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X = .29</td>
<td>X = .38</td>
<td>X = .24</td>
<td>X = .31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6724</td>
<td>.4305</td>
<td>.8212</td>
<td>.4368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0276</td>
<td>.1696</td>
<td>.1147</td>
<td>.1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2531</td>
<td>.1845</td>
<td>.1985</td>
<td>.2861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5366</td>
<td>.5242</td>
<td>.0552</td>
<td>.1497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2602</td>
<td>.6808</td>
<td>.0614</td>
<td>.0677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1519</td>
<td>.4520</td>
<td>.1281</td>
<td>.1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1690</td>
<td>.2581</td>
<td>.0349</td>
<td>.1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1859</td>
<td>.0079</td>
<td>.4018</td>
<td>.4379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1654</td>
<td>.3615</td>
<td>.0084</td>
<td>.5907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1760</td>
<td>.0436</td>
<td>.0756</td>
<td>.0604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2694</td>
<td>.3096</td>
<td>.0081</td>
<td>.1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2406</td>
<td>.8155</td>
<td>.2344</td>
<td>.1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5529</td>
<td>.2875</td>
<td>.2755</td>
<td>.0457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3347</td>
<td>.8159</td>
<td>.6409</td>
<td>.5732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6633</td>
<td>.5701</td>
<td>.6169</td>
<td>.7359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5515</td>
<td>.4280</td>
<td>.1788</td>
<td>.6149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2688</td>
<td>.1696</td>
<td>.2405</td>
<td>.4940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1402</td>
<td>.5394</td>
<td>.1012</td>
<td>.5715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5787</td>
<td>.3276</td>
<td>.3101</td>
<td>.5707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.5610</td>
<td>.0265</td>
<td>.0811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1182</td>
<td>.3298</td>
<td>.2997</td>
<td>.2181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0614</td>
<td>.2014</td>
<td>.4299</td>
<td>.4458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0239</td>
<td>.3883</td>
<td>.1323</td>
<td>.4328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4542</td>
<td>.2787</td>
<td>.4521</td>
<td>.1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1993</td>
<td>.6791</td>
<td>.0612</td>
<td>.2224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4890</td>
<td>.3457</td>
<td>.4863</td>
<td>.2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1831</td>
<td>.0394</td>
<td>.0396</td>
<td>.1583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The components of the reasoned action model discussed in the previous chapter, beliefs regarding consequences and evaluations of those consequences (be) and subjects' motivation to comply (mc) with others in their workgroup, were regressed upon intentions, I, to produce the multiple correlations between beliefs and intentions. These regressions were performed using the results of the time one questionnaires ("pre-training") and then again for the responses obtained at time two ("post-training"). The results of these regressions are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Multiple Correlations Between Subjects' Beliefs and Intentions. Regressions of (b)(e) and mc on I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = .49</td>
<td>X = .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8739</td>
<td>.7084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1963</td>
<td>.8578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6347</td>
<td>.4333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6175</td>
<td>.4190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2177</td>
<td>.7791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7691</td>
<td>.4325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2479</td>
<td>.2709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2593</td>
<td>.1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7854</td>
<td>.7427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6552</td>
<td>.5807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2370</td>
<td>.4936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0616</td>
<td>.1648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3613</td>
<td>.3269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1493</td>
<td>.3567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6415</td>
<td>.8589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5456</td>
<td>.6424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3092</td>
<td>.5771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The multiple correlations shown in Table 4 above are in many cases much lower than those often obtained by Ajzen and Fisbein (1980). One explanation for this concerns the number of salient beliefs associated with each behavior in the questionnaire used. Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) usually include eight to ten beliefs per behavior in their questionnaires, which allows for potential statistical inflation of the multiple correlations due to the chance of intercorrelation among the items. Based upon the preliminary investigation used to construct the pre- and post-training questionnaires, this study used only two to five salient beliefs for each of the twenty-seven behaviors.

Since "the results of statistical procedures can be used as data points and subjected to further statistical test" (Pavitt & Haight, 1986), and given the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control (cont.)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental (cont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>X = .49</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>X = .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>X = .49</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>X = .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4860</td>
<td>.4879</td>
<td>.4183</td>
<td>.4074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7937</td>
<td>.8045</td>
<td>.3887</td>
<td>.4254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5078</td>
<td>.5655</td>
<td>.2910</td>
<td>.3822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5397</td>
<td>.0193</td>
<td>.2639</td>
<td>.1268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3459</td>
<td>.1604</td>
<td>.3012</td>
<td>.4363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7937</td>
<td>.4419</td>
<td>.2734</td>
<td>.4658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6619</td>
<td>.1432</td>
<td>.4235</td>
<td>.1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6741</td>
<td>.4066</td>
<td>.5008</td>
<td>.6100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3089</td>
<td>.9501</td>
<td>.4840</td>
<td>.4622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5635</td>
<td>.2027</td>
<td>.3514</td>
<td>.1951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
large number of behaviors tested, as well as the need to examine the difference between the two small groups, the multiple correlation figures for subjects' intentions to perform the training behaviors were translated into their respective z-scores. This procedure transformed the multiple correlations into a normal distribution that could be analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance.

A 2 X 2 repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance was computed to examine the effects of condition (experimental versus control) and time using the computed z-scores at time one and at time two. No interaction effects were detected. As examination of the means in Table 3 reveals, the transformed multiple correlations of the experimental group were significantly lower than those of the control group at time one \( (F(1,52)=8.96, p<.004) \), and again at time two \( (F(1,52)=7.74, p<.007) \).

**Table 3. Comparison of the Experimental and Control Group over Time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>.361(.203)</td>
<td>.590(.341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-Score</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.359(.160)</td>
<td>.604(.428)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What the above results indicate is that the Control Group's intentions (I) to perform the behaviors
(B) were stronger than the intentions of Experimental Group of trainees both at time one prior to training and at time two after training. In other words, the results of Phase One of this study are not consistent with the hypothesis that trainees' intentions to perform the training behaviors would be significantly stronger than those of the control group. These results were unexpected according to Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) work with the theory of reasoned action, as well as the work of other proponents of the theory (see Davidson and Ja`ccard, 1975 and Vinokur-Kaplan, 1978).

Due to the low response rate to questionnaires administered one month and three months after training, correlations between intentions and behaviors for both the trainees and the members of the control group could not be determined. In order to compare changes between the "post-training" behaviors of the control group versus the behaviors of the experimental group, means were computed for subjects' responses to the one month and to the three month follow-up questionnaires (see Appendix D) regarding the number of times they perceived the opportunity to perform each of the 27 training behaviors, the number of times they reported to have performed the behaviors, and the proportion of perceived opportunities to reported
performances. Each set of means was then used to compute an analysis of variance with condition (experimental versus control) as the dependent variable for the one month assessment and for the three months assessment. No significant results were obtained from these analyses, as can be seen in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Results of One Month and Three Months Analyses of Variance. Cell means and significance of F reported for each treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perceived Opportunity</th>
<th>Reported Performance</th>
<th>Opportunity/Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1 Time 2</td>
<td>Time 1 Time 2</td>
<td>Time 1 Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper</td>
<td>2.270 5.870</td>
<td>2.170 5.710</td>
<td>0.970 0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.610 4.090</td>
<td>3.310 3.610</td>
<td>0.960 0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S of F</td>
<td>0.396 0.603</td>
<td>0.429 0.487</td>
<td>0.873 0.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of significance in the comparison between the experimental group and the control group in their perceptions of opportunities to perform the training behaviors, their actual reported performance of the behaviors, and the ratio of opportunities to performances is inconsistent with the second hypothesis of this study. Apparently, the members of the experimental group did not perform the training behaviors more often than the members of the control group. This set of results, though disappointing, is hardly surprising given the small sample
size and the poor rate of return for the questionnaires. These and other considerations regarding the overall results of this investigation are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary of the Investigation

Building upon the assumption that the evaluation of training and development programs should follow from models grounded in communication theory, this investigation approached interpersonal skills training as a communicative process of persuasion that occurs within the context of an organizational system. From this perspective, Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action offered a generalizable, empirically-based framework for investigating training. The established predictive value of the theory of reasoned action allowed for the generation of the two hypotheses upon which this research was based: That the members of the experimental (trained) group will have significantly stronger intentions to perform the training behaviors than will the members of the control (untrained) group at time two, and that those trained will both recognize more opportunities
to perform the training behaviors in the workplace, and will therefore perform the training behaviors more often than those who were not trained.

Questionnaires designed to assess the beliefs, attitudes, and intentions of study participants were administered immediately before and immediately after the training period in order to make predictions regarding subjects' intentions to perform each of the 27 training behaviors. Contrary to the first hypothesis for this study, results from this phase of the investigation indicated that the intentions of members of the experimental (trained) group did not change from pre-training to post-training; nor did the intentions of the control (untrained) group. In other words, training did not seem to affect trainees' intentions to perform each of the 27 training behaviors.

One month after the training period, self-report questionnaires which measured the number of times subjects in each group perceived the opportunity to perform the training behaviors as well as the number of times they reported to have actually performed the behaviors were administered. This questionnaire was again administered three months after the training period. In both cases, the number of properly completed questionnaires returned
by subjects for analysis was insufficient for the purpose of computing the correlation between intentions and behaviors. Analysis of variance between the experimental group and the control group generally indicated that the experimental group did not perceive any more opportunities to perform any of the 27 training behaviors than did the control group; nor did the experimental group report any significantly greater performance of the training behaviors. However, these results are far from conclusive given the number of cases included.

Limitations of the Investigation

In addition to logistical limitations embedded in the overall investigation, there were certain limitations particular to the accuracy of the prediction of subjects' intentions, as well as limitations specific to the assessment of subjects' performance of the training behaviors.

The combination of a small sample size with the relatively large number of not-necessarily-related training behaviors (27) made this investigation difficult. However, as this study was not performed in a controlled laboratory environment, and given that the administration of questionnaires spanned a four month period, each participant's contribution to each phase of the research
was not consistent. Added to this is the complexity of the training program, i.e., the fact that it attempted to influence the performance of 27 behaviors, as opposed to just one or two. These behaviors were identified by the designers of the training program, were not evaluated in terms of their relationship to each other within the training program, and they were not evaluated in terms of their "performability" within the hospital setting. In other words, the training program and the number of available participants in the study were "fixed entities," and perhaps not ideal for the purposes of this pilot study.

One important problem that resulted from the requirements for applying the theory of reasoned action to a supervisory training program was the necessity of investigating each component of the model for each of the 27 training behaviors. In other words, the pre-training and post-training questionnaires, despite the abridgements discussed in Chapter 2 of this document, were extremely lengthy. It seems likely that the factor of fatigue influenced the concentration and accuracy of responses for members of both the experimental and the control group.

It is possible that the predictive value of assessing subjects' intentions was weakened because the
normative beliefs and the social norm components were excluded from this investigation. However, this does not seem likely given that the overall relative weights of the subjective norm component have rarely been found to be greater than those of the attitudinal component of the model (see Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

The most limited aspect of this research was the inability to compute a correlation between subjects' intentions and their behaviors. As already explained, the low response rate for the follow-up to the training program was detrimental to the predictive value of this application of the theory of reasoned action. However, there is another key criticism of this phase of the investigation, and that is the method by which the performance of the training behaviors were to be assessed.

As suggested in Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), this investigation attempted to ascertain the number of times subjects perceived the opportunity to perform the training behaviors, and it relied upon their self-reports with regard to the number of times they actually performed the behaviors. However, given the difficulties involved in collecting follow-up information regarding broadly-defined interpersonal behaviors within an organizational context as dynamic and as time-conscious as a hospital,
this approach to data-collection may not have been appropriate. Although for the purposes of a pilot study, the use of self-reports as recommended seemed adequate, it is plausible that the supervisors involved in this research had difficulties in remembering how many times they used a particular communication style/behavior in the course of the time periods examined. At the very least, this limitation stems from the lack of coordination between the design of the training program itself and the intention to assess the program impact one and three months later. While a training evaluation model should be flexible enough to be incorporated into a variety of training approaches, this study probably suffered from its failure to plan for exactly how this incorporation should be managed.

Discussion of Investigation Results

The results obtained in this investigation were not expected given the precedent set by other studies which utilized the theory of reasoned action. While the limitations described above may account for some of the logistical problems embedded in this study, there are broader areas of discussion which may explain the outcome of this research.
At first glance, the results obtained in this study suggest that "training didn't work," i.e., that the training program did not alter the attitudinal or the normative components of the trainees' intentions to perform the training behaviors. This is possible. However, given the limitations regarding the small sample size and the poor return rate for questionnaires, such an assertion is far from conclusive. In addition, the fact that this is the first investigation in which a persuasion model was used to evaluate training makes the "training failed" conclusion an overly harsh one. Further applications of the model on this comparable types of training programs are necessary.

The findings that the control group had comparatively stronger intentions than the experimental group both before and after the training period may stem from a variety of circumstances. One reason may be that the control group had only half as many members as the experimental group. That is, two independent variables were examined in association with eleven participants in the control group, and twenty-three participants in the experimental group. Because of the smaller ratio between the number of independent variables and the number of
participants, the difference between the control group and the experimental group may simply be a statistical artifact.

Participation in other communication training programs may also account for the disparity between the two groups. Although the number of subjects in the control group equalled only half of the number in the experimental group, proportionately 60 percent of the control group had been trained prior to this study, as compared to only 40 percent of the experimental group. However, in addition to the fact that this conclusion is very speculative given the sample size comparisons, it is important to recall that the training program evaluated in this study had not been presented at the hospitals involved prior to this research.

Given that the pre- and post-training assessments were administered to trainees while they were gathered together for the training program, the circumstances under which they completed the questionnaires differed from those of the control group, who received the questionnaires via intra-hospital mail and who could complete them on their own time. The trainees may have considered the items on the questionnaires more carefully,
and also more critically since they were the first set of supervisors who were expected to perform the training behaviors.

It is also possible that the trainees had negative attitudes toward being in the training program. Subjects' beliefs about interpersonal skills training in general were not assessed in this investigation. Future research in this area may want to make comparisons between subjects' beliefs about training in general and their intentions to perform the behaviors.

Another plausible explanation for the results of this study is that this application of Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) model failed to assess the appropriate changes in intentions from time one to time two. First of all, it is possible that the modal salient beliefs vital to the design of the pre- and post-training questionnaires were not adequately tapped by the preliminary survey. In fact, a wide variety of beliefs for each behavior were found, and many were eliminated. This seems likely given that subjects' beliefs regarding the outcomes of the behaviors as well as their evaluations of those beliefs were not strongly correlated for the experimental group. Future research could limit the development of the assessment instruments to one location.
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Related to problems regarding the use of modal salient beliefs in questionnaire development is the possibility that the modal salient beliefs upon which the pre- and post-training instruments were based changed in the course of training. This may be an important shortcoming of Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) model as applied to training evaluation, and as such warrants further investigation.

A final thought regarding the applicability of Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action to training evaluation is that training simply does not influence intentions. If interpersonal skills training has no effect upon intentions, then we cannot assess the impact of training upon behavior using this model.

At the base of this research is the assumption that training is a process of persuasion. Persuasion, as introduced in Chapter 1, was defined very broadly as an attempt to influence behavior. This study examined the impact of training upon some very specific behaviors using a highly structured measurement approach. Although the results of this approach seem discouraging, it is possible that persuasion occurred on a much more global level than this investigation allowed. For example, the number of functions which training serves in an organization may
indirectly affect behavior in ways which go beyond Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) model. In essence, the necessity of exploring generalizable, theoretically-grounded ways to investigate and to evaluate the process of training in organizations has not changed. Thus, future research can seek clearer definitions of the indirect as well as the direct functions of training in order to examine their relationships to the organizational impact of the programs.

The rationale behind this research was to open up a relatively new area to communication research. Has the theory of reasoned action failed? Can it be revised to better fit the complex circumstances of assessing the impact of training and development? What other ways of investigating persuasive phenomenon exist? The conclusion of this research endeavor, then, is that the questions regarding training evaluation have been raised, a pattern for scholarly research in this area for the communication field has been established, and that the bugs in the system of investigation must be found before they can be minimized.
APPENDIX A

List of Training Behaviors

1. Ask employees to support changes in the work environment

2. Seek the opinions of each of my subordinates concerning his or her overall performance since the employee’s last performance appraisal

3. Set up a problem-solving meeting with each employee with whom I encounter performance problems

4. Explain to employees the tasks of each of their jobs and how each job relates to overall group performance

5. Calmly identify an employee’s problem behavior, explain to him or her why the behavior concerns me, and then express my desire for change

6. Maintain constructive supervisor-employee relationships

7. Recognize and acknowledge the feelings of an employee when he or she expresses a complaint to me

8. Give recognition to my employees by expressing my personal appreciation to them

9. Specify one or two areas where an employee’s performance might be improved, and then ask him or her for confirmation and suggestions concerning this matter

10. Set and communicate job priorities to my employees
11. State my own position calmly when confronted with an employee's complaint

12. Request and listen carefully to a full description of any of my employees' complaints

13. Ask my employees for their reactions concerning changes in the workplace

14. Describe the rationale behind a given change in the workplace

15. Explicitly state the specific changes required by each of my employees

16. Establish and discuss specific job standards with the employees I supervise

17. Maintain the self-confidence of my employees

18. Focus on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of the person

19. Offer to help make my employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging

20. Offer my help in solving employee's problem behavior when faced with such behavior

21. Seek out and listen to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior (when dealing with problem behavior).

22. Avoid responding in a hostile or defensive way when handling employee complaints

23. Conclude performance appraisals with an encouraging remark

24. Set a date for an early/informal progress review with employees under my supervision

25. Provide detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition
26. Arrange a friendly problem-solving discussion to actively seek and listen to my employees' ideas.

27. Agree upon specific actions that the employee and myself will take to alter performance problems.
APPENDIX B

Preliminary Investigation Questionnaire: Version A

The following survey is mainly concerned with supervisors' views toward performing specific interpersonal skills. Your responses are greatly appreciated, and they will be recorded on an anonymous basis.

While at first glance this questionnaire may appear somewhat overwhelming, every three consecutive items follow a similar pattern. It should not require more than 10 minutes of your time to complete. The idea is for you to write down the first 2 to 4 responses that come to your mind for each question. Note that each question refers to how you would feel if you were to perform the behaviors indicated. Please answer as carefully and as succinctly as possible.

1) Are there any groups or people who would approve of your asking employees during scheduled working hours to support changes in the working environment over the next three months—even if some of them disagree?

2) Are there any groups or people who would disapprove of your asking employees during scheduled working hours to support changes in the working environment over the next three months—even if some of them disagree?
3) Are there any other groups or people who come to mind when you think about your asking employees during scheduled working hours to support changes in the working environment over the next three months— even if some of them disagree?

4) Are there any groups or people who would approve of your seeking the opinions of each of your employees during scheduled working hours over the next three months concerning his or her overall performance since each employee's last performance appraisal?

5) Are there any groups or people who would disapprove of your seeking the opinions of each of your employees during scheduled working hours over the next three months concerning his or her overall performance since each employee's last performance appraisal?

6) Are there any other groups or people who come to mind when you think about your seeking the opinions of each of your employees during scheduled working hours over the next three months concerning his or her overall performance since each employee's last performance appraisal?

7) Are there any groups or people who would approve of your setting up a problem-solving meeting during scheduled working hours in the course of the next three months with those employees with whom you encounter performance problems?

8) Are there any groups or people who would disapprove of your setting up a problem-solving meeting during scheduled working hours in the course of the next three months with those employees with whom you encounter performance problems?
9) Are there any other groups or people who come to mind when you think about your setting up a problem-solving meeting during scheduled working hours in the course of the next three months with those employees with whom you encounter performance problems?

10) Are there any groups or people who would approve of your explaining to employees at some time in the next three months during scheduled working hours the tasks of each of their jobs and how they relate to overall group performance?

11) Are there any groups or people who would disapprove of your explaining to employees at some time in the next three months during scheduled working hours the tasks of each of their jobs and how they relate to overall group performance?

12) Are there any other groups or people who come to mind when you think about your explaining to employees at some time in the next three months during scheduled working hours the tasks of each of their jobs and how they relate to overall group performance?

13) As a supervisor, what do you see as the advantages of your maintaining the self-confidence and basic self-esteem of the employee during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

14) As a supervisor, what do you see as the disadvantages of your maintaining the self-confidence and basic self-esteem of the employee during the next three months of scheduled working hours?
15) As a supervisor, is there anything else you associate with your maintaining the self-confidence and basic self-esteem of the employee during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

16) As a supervisor, what do you see as the advantages of your focusing on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of focusing on the person during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

17) As a supervisor, what do you see as the disadvantages of your focusing on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of focusing on the person during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

18) As a supervisor, is there anything else you associate with your focusing on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of focusing on the person during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

19) During the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the advantages of your offering to help make your employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging?

20) During the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the disadvantages of your offering to help make your employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging?
21) During the next three months of scheduled working hours, what else do you associate with offering to help make your employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging?

22) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the advantages of your calmly pointing out the problem to the employee involved, explaining to him or her why it concerns you, and expressing your desire for change?

23) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the disadvantages of your calmly pointing out the problem to the employee involved, explaining to him or her why it concerns you, and expressing your desire for change?

24) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what else do you associate with your calmly pointing out the problem to the employee involved, explaining to him or her why it concerns you, and expressing your desire for change?

25) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the advantages of your offering your help in solving the problem as the employee's supervisor?

26) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the disadvantages of your offering your help in solving the problem as the employee's supervisor?
27) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what else do you associate with your offering your help in solving the problem as the employee's supervisor?

28) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the advantages of your seeking out and listening to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior?

29) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the disadvantages of your seeking out and listening to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior?

30) In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what else do you associate with your seeking out and listening to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior?

31) In handling employee complaints during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what do you see as the advantages of your not responding in a hostile or defensive way?

32) In handling employee complaints during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what do you see as the disadvantages of your not responding in a hostile or defensive way?
33) In handling employee complaints during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what else do you associate with your not responding in a hostile or defensive way?

34) In the next performance appraisal you conduct during scheduled working hours at the hospital, what do you see as the advantages of your concluding with an encouraging remark?

35) In the next performance appraisal you conduct during scheduled working hours at the hospital, what do you see as the disadvantages of your concluding with an encouraging remark?

36) In the next performance appraisal you conduct during scheduled working hours at the hospital, what else do you associate with your concluding with an encouraging remark?

37) List the advantages of your setting a date within the next three months of scheduled working hours for an early/informal progress review with employees under your supervision.

38) List the disadvantages of your setting a date within the next three months of scheduled working hours for an early/informal progress review with employees under your supervision.
39) List any other things you associate with your setting a date within the next three months of scheduled working hours for an early/informal progress review with employees under your supervision.

40) What are the advantages of your giving recognition for good performance in the workplace during the next three months of scheduled working hours by expressing your personal appreciation?

41) What are the disadvantages of your giving recognition for good performance in the workplace during the next three months of scheduled working hours by expressing your personal appreciation?

42) What else do you associate with your giving recognition for good performance in the workplace during the next three months of scheduled working hours by expressing your personal appreciation?

43) What are the advantages of your providing detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition, to employees during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

44) What are the disadvantages of your providing detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition, to employees during the next three months of scheduled working hours?
45) What else do you associate with your providing detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition, to employees during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

46) What are the advantages of your remaining positive and friendly, actively seeking and listening to your employee’s ideas during a problem-solving discussion you arrange with the employee at some time during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

47) What are the disadvantages of your remaining positive and friendly, actively seeking and listening to your employee’s ideas during a problem-solving discussion you arrange with the employee at some time during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

48) What else do you associate with your remaining positive and friendly, actively seeking and listening to your employee’s ideas during a problem-solving discussion you arrange with the employee at some time during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

49) With the next three months of scheduled working hours in mind, what are the advantages of your agreeing upon specific actions that both you and each of the employees with whom you encounter performance problems will undertake to alter the situation?

50) With the next three months of scheduled working hours in mind, what are the disadvantages of your agreeing upon specific actions that both you and each of the employees with whom you encounter performance problems will undertake to alter the situation?
51) With the next three months of scheduled working hours in mind, what else do you associate with your agreeing upon specific actions that both you and each of the employees with whom you encounter performance problems will undertake to alter the situation?

52) With the next three months of scheduled working hours in mind, what do see as the advantages of your seeking the employee's opinion of his or her overall performance since the employee's last performance appraisal?

53) With the next three months of scheduled working hours in mind, what do see as the disadvantages of your seeking the employee's opinion of his or her overall performance since the employee's last performance appraisal?

54) With the next three months of scheduled working hours in mind, what else do you associate with your seeking the employee's opinion of his or her overall performance since the employee's last performance appraisal?

THANK YOU!
APPENDIX B

Preliminary Investigation Questionnaire: Version B

The following survey is mainly concerned with supervisors' views toward performing specific interpersonal skills. Your responses are greatly appreciated, and they will be recorded on an anonymous basis.

While at first glance this questionnaire may appear somewhat overwhelming, it should not require more than 10 minutes of your time to complete. The idea is for you to write down the first 2 to 4 responses that come to your mind for each question. Please do not omit any of them.

What are the advantages of your specifying one or are the advantages of your asking each of your employees to support the change—even if he or she disagrees?

What are the disadvantages of your setting up within the next three months of scheduled working hours a problem-solving meeting with each of the employees under your immediate supervision to discuss a performance problem that concerns you?

What do you see as the advantages of stating your own position calmly when confronted with an employee's complaint during the next three months of scheduled working hours?
What do you see as the advantages of your maintaining constructive supervisor-employee relationships during scheduled working hours over the next three months?

What are the disadvantages of your providing detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition, to employees during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what do you associate with your calmly pointing out the problem to the employee involved, explaining to him or her why it concerns you, and expressing your desire for change?

When dealing with resistance to change in the workplace during the next three months, what are the disadvantages of your describing the reasons why the change is required to your employees?

As a supervisor, what do you see as the disadvantages of your maintaining the self-confidence and basic self-esteem of the employee during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

In the next performance appraisal you conduct during scheduled working hours at the hospital, what do you associate with your concluding with an encouraging remark?
With the next three months of scheduled working hours in mind, what do you associate with your establishing and discussing specific job standards with employees?

During the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the disadvantages of your offering to help make your employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging?

When dealing with resistance to change in the workplace during the next three months, what are the advantages of your explicitly stating the specific changes that are required to your employees?

In the next performance appraisal you conduct during scheduled working hours at the hospital, what do you see as the advantages of your concluding with an encouraging remark?

What are the disadvantages of your remaining positive and friendly, actively seeking and listening to your employee's ideas during a problem-solving discussion you arrange with the employee at some time during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

When dealing with complaints during the next three months during scheduled working hours, what do you believe are the disadvantages of your recognizing and acknowledging the employee's feelings?

What are the advantages of your giving recognition for good performance in the workplace during the next three months of scheduled working hours by expressing your personal appreciation?
What do you see as the advantages of your requesting and listening carefully to a full description of an employee's complaint during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

What are the advantages of your setting up within the next three months of scheduled working hours a problem-solving meeting with each of the employees under your immediate supervision to discuss a performance problem that concerns you?

In handling employee complaints during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what do you see as the advantages of your not responding in a hostile or defensive way?

In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the disadvantages of your offering your help in solving the problem as the employee's supervisor?

What do you associate with your remaining positive and friendly, actively seeking and listening to your employee's ideas during a problem-solving discussion you arrange with the employee at some time during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

List the advantages of your setting a date within the next three months of scheduled working hours for an early/informal progress review with employees under your supervision.
What are the advantages of your remaining positive and friendly, actively seeking and listening to your employee's ideas during a problem-solving discussion you arrange with the employee at some time during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what do you associate with your seeking out and listening to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior?

What do you consider to be the disadvantages of your setting and communicating job priorities to employees during the next three months of scheduled working hours?

With the next three months of scheduled working hours in mind, what do you see as the advantages of your seeking the employee's opinion of his or her overall performance since the employee's last performance appraisal?

What do you see as the advantages of your explaining to employees at some time during the next three months of scheduled working hours the tasks of each job and how it relates to overall performance?

When dealing with change in the workplace during the next three months, what do you associate with your asking for employee reaction?

When dealing with complaints during the next three months during scheduled working hours, what do you believe are the advantages of your recognizing and acknowledging the employee's feelings?
When dealing with change in the workplace during the next three months, what are the disadvantages of your asking each of your employees to support the change—even if he or she disagrees?

In dealing with problem behavior during the next three months of scheduled working hours, what are the advantages of your seeking out and listening to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior?
APPENDIX C

Questionnaire Used to Assess Pre-Training and Post-Training Intentions

In the questionnaire you are about to fill out we ask questions which utilize rating scales made up of 7 numbers. You are to circle the number which best describes your opinion.

(1) Circle only one number per item.
(2) Be sure to answer all items—please do not omit any.
(3) Read each item carefully, but do not spend too much time on any one item.
(4) Be sure to fill in your responses to the background information requested on the last page of this questionnaire before returning it.

In this particular questionnaire, we are mainly concerned with supervisors’ views toward engaging in certain types of communication.

PLEASE NOTE: You are to interpret each and every item in terms of the next three months of scheduled working hours.

Do you have any questions?

For each of the following statements, circle the number that best indicates your intention to perform the behaviors listed within the next three months of scheduled working hours. The numbers correspond to the guide as indicated:

Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
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1. I intend to ask employees to support changes in the working environment that occur over the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

2. I intend to seek the opinions of each of my subordinates concerning his or her overall performance since the employee’s last performance appraisal.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

3. I intend to set up a problem-solving meeting with each employee with whom I encounter performance problems.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

4. I intend to explain to employees the tasks of each of their jobs and how each job relates to overall group performance.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

5. I intend to calmly identify an employee’s problem behavior, explain to him or her why the behavior concerns me, and then express my desire for change.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

6. I intend to maintain constructive supervisor-employee relationships in the course of the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

7. I intend to recognize and acknowledge the feelings of an employee when he or she expresses a complaint to me during the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

8. I intend to give recognition to my employees by expressing my personal appreciation to them.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

9. I intend to specify one or two areas where an employee’s performance might be improved, and then ask him or her for confirmation and suggestions concerning this matter.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
10. I intend to set and communicate job priorities to my employees during the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

11. I intend to state my own position calmly when confronted with an employee's complaint during the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

12. I intend to request and listen carefully to a full description of any of my employees' complaints.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

13. I intend to ask my employees for their reactions concerning changes in the workplace over the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

14. I intend to describe the rationale behind a given change in the workplace during the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

15. I intend to explicitly state the specific changes required by each of my employees over the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

16. I intend to establish and discuss specific job standards with the employees I supervise.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

17. I intend to maintain the self-confidence of my employees during the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

18. I intend to focus on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of the person.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

19. I intend to offer to help make my employees' work effective, rewarding, and challenging.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

20. I intend to offer my help in solving an employee's problem behavior when faced with such behavior.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
21. In dealing with problem behavior, I intend to seek out and listen to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

22. In handling employee complaints, I intend to avoid responding in a hostile or defensive way.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

23. I intend to conclude the next performance appraisal I conduct with an encouraging remark.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

24. I intend to set a date within the next three months for an early/informal progress review with employees under my supervision.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

25. I intend to provide detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition during the next three months.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

26. I intend to arrange a friendly problem-solving discussion to actively seek and listen to my employee's ideas.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

27. When I encounter performance problems with any given employee under my supervision, I intend to agree upon specific actions that the employee and myself will take to alter the situation.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

For each of the following statements, circle the number that best indicates your opinion as to whether or not your performing the behaviors within the next three months of scheduled working hours would be "good" or "bad." The numbers correspond to the guide as indicated:

**Good**
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Bad**

1. My asking employees to support changes in the working environment that occur over the next three months is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
2. My specifying one or two areas where an employee's performance might be improved, and then ask him or her for confirmation and suggestions concerning this matter is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

3. My explaining to employees the tasks of each of their jobs and how each job relates to overall group performance is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

4. My seeking the opinions of each of my subordinates concerning his or her overall performance since the employee's last performance appraisal is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

5. My calmly identifying an employee's problem behavior, explain to him or her why the behavior concerns me, and then express my desire for change is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

6. My recognizing and acknowledging the feelings of an employee when he or she expresses a complaint to me during the next three months is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

7. My giving recognition to my employees by expressing my personal appreciation to them is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

8. My maintaining constructive supervisor-employee relationships in the course of the next three months is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

9. My setting and communicating job priorities to my employees during the next three months is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

10. Stating my own position calmly when confronted with an employee's complaint during the next three months is
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

11. My requesting and listening carefully to a full description of any of my employees' complaints is
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 Bad

12. My asking my employees for their reactions concerning changes in the workplace over the next three months is
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

13. My describing the rationale behind a given change in the workplace during the next three months is
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

14. My explicitly stating the specific changes required by each of my employees over the next three months is
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
15. My establishing and discussing specific job standards with the employees I supervise is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
16. My maintaining the self-confidence of my employees during the next three months is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
17. My focusing on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of on the person is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
18. My offering to help make my employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
19. My offering my help in solving an employee’s problem behavior when faced with such behavior is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
20. In dealing with problem behavior, my seeking out and listening to the employee’s reasons for his or her behavior is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
21. In handling employee complaints, my avoiding responding in a hostile or defensive way is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
22. My concluding the next performance appraisal I conduct with an encouraging remark is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
23. My setting a date within the next three months for an early/informal progress review with employees under my supervision is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
24. My providing detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition during the next three months is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
25. My arranging a friendly problem-solving discussion to actively seek and listen to my employee’s ideas is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
26. When I encounter performance problems with any given employee under my supervision, my agreeing upon specific actions that the employee and myself will take to alter the situation is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
27. My setting up a problem-solving meeting with each employee with whom I encounter performance problems is
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
For each of the following statements, circle the number that best indicates the consequences of your performing the behaviors listed within the next three months of scheduled working hours. The numbers correspond to the guide as indicated:

**Likely**
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Unlikely**

1. My asking employees to support changes in the working environment that occur over the next three months would

create a sense of teamwork among employees.

**Likely** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Unlikely**

2. My seeking the opinions of each of my subordinates concerning his or her overall performance since the employee's last performance appraisal would:

provide me with information about the employee's performance I may have overlooked beforehand.

**Likely** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Unlikely**

cause disagreements between myself and the employee.

**Likely** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Unlikely**

offer the employee more control of his or her own performance rating.

**Likely** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Unlikely**

3. My specifying one or two areas where an employee's performance might be improved, and then asking him or her for confirmation and suggestions concerning this matter would:

establish clear understanding about how I feel about the employee's performance.

**Likely** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Unlikely**

indicate my interest in the employee to him or her.

**Likely** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Unlikely**

cause the employee to offer inadequate or inappropriate suggestions.

**Likely** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Unlikely**
4. My setting and communicating job priorities to my employees during the next three months would:

clarify my expectations of their job for my employees.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

generate resentment toward my doing so on the part of my employees.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

5. My setting up a problem-solving meeting with each employee with whom I encounter performance problems would:

allow me to identify problems before they become more serious.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

be time-consuming.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

6. My explaining to employees the tasks of each of their jobs and how each job relates to overall group performance would:

improve employees performance.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

help employees identify with their role in the organization.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

require some changes in the hospital’s present performance standards.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

7. My calmly identifying an employee's problem behavior, explaining to him or her why the behavior concerns me, and then expressing my desire for change would:

lead to more expedient resolution of the problem.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

improve the relationship I have with the employee.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

make the employee more aware of his or her unacceptable behavior.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

cause the employee to react unfavorably toward me.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
8. My maintaining constructive supervisor-employee relationships in the course of the next three months would:

- improve morale
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
- keep myself and my employees informed
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
- assist in the achievement of organizational goals
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

9. My recognizing and acknowledging the feelings of an employee when he or she expresses a complaint to me during the next three months would:

- improve my relationship with my employees
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
- let the employees know that I care about them
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
- allow employees to become emotional in the workplace.
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

10. My giving recognition to my employees by expressing my personal appreciation to them would:

- act as an incentive for them to do their job well
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
- boost their morale and motivation
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
- cause some employees to feel slighted if I do not recognize their work
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

11. Stating my own position calmly when confronted with an employee's complaint during the next three months would:

- help to resolve the issue.
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
- keep my relationship with the employee at a level where we can understand each other.
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
- cause the employee to respond defensively.
  Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
12. My requesting and listening carefully to a full description of any of my employees' complaints would:

allow the employee to vent his or her feelings.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
clarify the situation for me.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
take time.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
possibly avoid following formal grievance procedure.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

13. My asking my employees for their reactions concerning changes in the workplace over the next three months would:

make the transition to the change easier.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
elicit some negative responses.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

14. My describing the rationale behind a given change in the workplace during the next three months would:

provide them with better understanding about the change.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
allow the change process to occur more smoothly.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

15. My explicitly stating the specific changes required by each of my employees over the next three months would:

enhance employees' understanding of the situation.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

16. My establishing and discussing specific job standards with the employees I supervise would:

let my employees know exactly what I expect.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
17. My maintaining the self-confidence of my employees during the next three months would:

increase productivity.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
improve employee morale.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
create a satisfying work atmosphere.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
be difficult to do in light of hospital cutbacks.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

18. My focusing on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of the person would:

illustrate my fairness.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
aid problem resolution.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
be difficult, since some employees' personalities are the problem.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

19. My offering to help make my employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging would:

increase employees' productivity.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
improve the productivity of the whole service.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
motivate my employees.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
be difficult to do.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
be met with resistance on the part of some employees.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

20. My offering my help in solving an employee's problem behavior when faced with such behavior would:

show the employees my support and concern.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
help employees handle criticism better.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
make the employees more dependent upon me for help.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
be met with resistance.
   Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

21. In dealing with problem behavior, my seeking out and listening to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior would:

   provide me with better understanding of the employee's reasons for the behavior.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
   improve the employees evaluation of me as a supervisor.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
   generate resentment on the part of the employee.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
   possibly result in my getting too involved with the employee's personal problems.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
   take time.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

22. In handling employee complaints, my avoiding responding in a hostile or defensive way would:

   maintain a cooperative atmosphere.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
   builds the employee's trust.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
   reduce threat of union or EEO intervention.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

23. My concluding the next performance appraisal I conduct with an encouraging remark would:

   make the employee feel better about his or her job.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
   generate positive employee reactions.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
   improve employees' performance on the job.
      Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

24. My setting a date within the next three months for an early/informal progress review with employees under my supervision would:
let the employee know where he or she stands in terms of my assessment of their job performance.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

show employees my attention and concern.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
take time.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

25. My providing detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition during the next three months would:

provide an incentive for employees for good future performance.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
boost morale and motivation.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
make employees not recognized feel slighted.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

26. My arranging a friendly problem-solving discussion to actively seek and listen to my employee's ideas would:

improve employee morale.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
provide an incentive for employees to be more creative.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
set an example for all employees to follow.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
take time.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely

27. When I encounter performance problems with any given employee under my supervision, my agreeing upon specific actions that the employee and myself will take to alter the situation would:

improve my image as a supervisor.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
help to resolve the problem.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
result in my agreeing to things that later become inappropriate.
Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unlikely
Using the scale provided, evaluate the following activities in terms of your job as a supervisor during the next three months of scheduled working hours.

Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

1. Building teamwork with my employees
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

2. Obtaining information about my employees' actions that I may have overlooked before
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

3. Having employees disagree with me
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

4. Offering an employee more control over his or her own performance rating
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

5. Establishing an understanding with an employee about how I feel regarding his or her performance
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

6. Showing my interest in the employees I work with
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

7. Having employees respond to my communication inadequately or inappropriately
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

8. Clarifying my expectations concerning employees' work
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

9. Having my employees resent my words or actions
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

10. Identifying problems in the workplace before they escalate
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

11. Improving my relationship with employees
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

12. Engaging in time-consuming activities
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

13. Improving employee performance/productivity
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

14. Helping employees identify their role in the organization
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

15. Changing the hospital's present performance standards
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

16. Resolving problems more quickly
    Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
17. Making an employee more aware of his or her unacceptable behavior(s)
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
18. Improving morale
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
19. Motivating employees
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
20. Keeping employees informed
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
21. Helping to achieve organizational goals
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
22. Letting employees know I care about them
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
23. Dealing with employees who exhibit emotion
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
24. Providing incentives for doing the job well
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
25. Causing some employees to feel slighted by me when I do not recognize their good performance
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
26. Attempting to do something I know will be difficult under current circumstances
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
27. Maintaining a good relationship with my employees
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
28. Causing an employee to respond defensively toward me
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
29. Avoiding formal grievance procedure
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
30. Allowing employee to vent his or her feelings
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
31. Eliciting negative responses from employees
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
32. Making transitions to change easier
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
33. Creating a satisfying work atmosphere
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
34. Illustrating my fairness
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
35. Improving my image as a supervisor
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
36. Improving the productivity of entire service
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
37. Facing employee resistance on the job
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
38. Helping employees handle criticism better
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
39. Having employees depend upon me for help
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
40. Improving employees evaluation of me as their supervisor
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
41. Getting involved with employees personal problems
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
42. Maintaining a cooperative communication atmosphere
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
43. Building employees' trust
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
44. Reducing threat of Union intervention
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
45. Reducing threat of EEO intervention
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
46. Generating positive employee reactions
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
47. Providing incentives that encourage creativity
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
48. Offering examples for all employees to follow
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
49. Improving my image as a supervisor
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
50. Agreeing to things that may later become inappropriate
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
51. Making an employee aware of his or her unacceptable behavior
   Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

If you were to perform each of the following activities, how likely is it that your behavior would be influenced by the people or groups of people listed below?

The following guide is provided at the top of every page. Note that it is only a guide. Circle the appropriate number in the scale next to each item.

Likely Unlikely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

1. ask employees to support changes in the working environment that occur over the next three months

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. seek the opinions of each of my subordinates concerning his or her overall performance

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. set up a problem-solving meeting with each employee with whom I encounter performance problems

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. explain to employees the tasks of each of their jobs and how each job relates to overall group performance

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. calmly identify an employee’s problem behavior, explain to him or her why the behavior concerns me, and then express my desire for change.

- most people who are important to me
- my immediate supervisor
- employees involved
- chief of my department
- hospital director
- other supervisors at my level in hospital
- union steward
- personnel department

6. maintain constructive supervisor-employee relationships in the course of the next three months.

- most people who are important to me
- my immediate supervisor
- employees involved
- chief of my department
- hospital director
- other supervisors at my level in hospital
- union steward
- personnel department

7. recognize and acknowledge the feelings of an employee when he or she expresses a complaint to me during the next three months.

- most people who are important to me
- my immediate supervisor
- employees involved
- chief of my department
- hospital director
- other supervisors at my level in hospital
- union steward
- personnel department

8. give recognition to my employees by expressing my personal appreciation to them.

- most people who are important to me
- my immediate supervisor
- employees involved
- chief of my department
- hospital director
9. specify one or two areas where an employee's performance might be improved, and then ask him or her for confirmation and suggestions concerning this matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people who are important to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees involved</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of my department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital director</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other supervisors at my level in hospital</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union steward</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. set and communicate job priorities to my employees during the next three months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people who are important to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees involved</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of my department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital director</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other supervisors at my level in hospital</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union steward</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. state my own position calmly when confronted with an employee's complaint during the next three months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people who are important to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees involved</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of my department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital director</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other supervisors at my level in hospital</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union steward</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel department</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. request and listen carefully to a full description of any of my employees' complaints.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. ask my employees for their reactions concerning changes in the workplace over the next three months.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. describe the rationale behind a given change in the workplace during the next three months.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. explicitly state the specific changes required by each of my employees over the next three months.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. establish and discuss specific job standards with the employees I supervise.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. maintain the self-confidence of my employees during the next three months.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. focus on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of the person.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. offer to help make my employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. offer my help in solving an employee's problem behavior when faced with such behavior.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. seek out and listen to the employee's reasons for his or her actions in dealing with problem behavior.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. avoid responding in a hostile or defensive way when dealing with employee complaints.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. conclude the next performance appraisal I conduct with an encouraging remark.

most people who are important to me  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. set a date within the next three months for an early/informal progress review with employees under my supervision.

most people who are important to me  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. provide detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition, and why it deserves recognition during the next three months.

most people who are important to me  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. arrange a friendly problem-solving discussion to actively seek and listen to my employee’s ideas.

most people who are important to me  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. with the employee, agree upon specific actions that the employee and myself will take to alter performance problems.

most people who are important to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
my immediate supervisor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
employees involved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
chief of my department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
hospital director 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
other supervisors at my level in hospital 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
union steward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
personnel department 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Please fill in the information requested below by circling the appropriate item.

1. Sex: Male Female

2. Number of years you have been employed by your present organization:
   1 or less 2 3 4 5 other_____
   (please indicate)

3. Number of years you have been in a supervisory position:
   1 or less 2 3 4 5 other_____
   (please indicate)

4. Have you ever participated in an interpersonal skills training program, not including the one about to take place?
   yes  no

5. How many people do you supervise? _______ (please indicate)

6. Generally speaking, do you believe that interpersonal skills training programs are effective?
   yes  no

7. Do most people apply what they learn in interpersonal skills training to their job situation?
   yes  no
APPENDIX D

One Month and Three Month Behavioral Assessment

In the questionnaire that follows, write the number of times you performed the behaviors described below.

* Record actual numbers in the blanks provided. Estimate if necessary.

* To insure the confidentiality of your responses, when you have completed this questionnaire, seal it in the envelope provided.

Fill in the blanks which correspond to each item according to the following guide:

a. In the past month (3 months), how many times (1, 2, 5, 25, etc.) have you had the **opportunity** to perform each of the behaviors indicated? (opportunity to perform)

b. In the past month (3 months), how many times (1, 2, 5, 25, etc.) have you actually performed each of the behaviors indicated? (performed)

As you can see, the first blank indicates the number of times you had the opportunity to perform each of the behaviors, and the second blank the number of times you actually performed them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in the course of the past month (3 months), I have . . .</th>
<th>Opportunity to Perform</th>
<th>#times</th>
<th>Performed</th>
<th>#times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Asked employees to support changes in the working environment

Sought the opinions of each of my subordinates concerning his or her overall performance since the employee’s last performance appraisal

Set up a problem-solving meeting with each employee with whom I encounter performance problems

Explained to employees the tasks of each of their jobs and how each job relates to overall group performance

Calmly identified an employee’s problem behavior, explained to him or her why the behavior concerns me, and then expressed my desire for change

Maintained constructive supervisor-employee relationships

Acknowledged the feelings of an employee when he or she expressed a complaint to me

Gave recognition to my employees by expressing my personal appreciation to them

Specified one or two areas where an employee’s performance might be improved, and then asked him or her for confirmation and suggestions concerning this matter

Set and communicated job priorities to my employees

Stated my own position calmly when confronted with an employee’s complaint
Requested and listened carefully to full description of any of my employees' complaints

Asked my employees for their reactions concerning changes in the workplace

Described the rationale behind a given change in the workplace

Explicitly stated the specific changes required by each of my employees in light of organizational changes

Established and discussed specific job standards with the employees I supervise

Maintained the self-confidence of my employees.

Focused on the problem, issue, or behavior of a subordinate instead of the person

Offered to help make my employees work effective, rewarding, and challenging

Offered my help in solving and employee's problem behavior when faced with such behavior

Sought and listened to the employee's reasons for his or her behavior

Avoided responding in a hostile or defensive way when confronting employees

Concluded the last performance appraisal I conducted with an encouraging remark
Set a date for an early/informal progress review with employees under my supervision.

Provided detailed descriptions of performance that deserves recognition and why it deserves recognition.

Arranged a friendly problem-solving discussion in order to actively seek out and listen to my employee's ideas.

When I encountered a performance problem with a particular employee, I agreed to specific actions that both the employee and myself will take to alter the situation.
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