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(Abstract)

The goal of this investigation is to provide answers to the following three questions:

1. For the two year college student affairs professional, what are the interpersonal relationship conditions leading to trust of their performance evaluators?

2. How are certain organizational power/status variables, such as professional status differences or demographic characteristics (e.g., gender or ethnicity), related to those trust conditions.

3. Do conditions leading to interpersonal trust differ based on differences in any of these power/status variables?

A questionnaire, which includes the Conditions of Trust Inventory (Butler, 1992) and rating measurements for the power/status variables, was administered on site. The sample was derived from a cross section of student affairs
professionals employed at every community college in a mid-
Atlantic state. A total of 204 subjects responded.

All 10 trust condition subscales from the survey
instrument were highly intercorrelated. A factor analysis
yielded a single factor solution which failed to effectively
differentiate, in any meaningful way, differences in either
the original 10 variables or to produce any useful factor
structure.

One-way and two-way ANOVAs were used to compare
subjects in rating their evaluators on measures of overall
trust on the basis of the power/status categorical
variables. The only significant power/status variable (p
<.05) was the "positional status level difference." Pearson
correlations were used to examine relationships between
power/status continuous variables (time duration) and
"overall trust." No significant correlations resulted.

Last, a regression analysis examined any possible
effects the "positional status level difference" variable
had on subject ratings of their evaluators on measures of
overall trust. In this case, "positional status level
difference" was not found to be significant.

The findings of this study suggest the following
implications for further investigation:

1. A need to examine the relationship of certain
organizational culture artifacts, unique to the two year
college environment, to measures of trust between student affairs practitioners and their evaluators.

2. A need to develop an effective assessment instrument which is built upon behavioral rather than attitudinal assessments.

3. A need to investigate the phenomenon of interpersonal trust development through a substantive qualitative analysis.

4. The need to examine the relationship of several contextual variables in this study to subordinate motivation and performance.

5. The need to examine certain institutional characteristics (enrollment size, funding structures, governance structures, etc.) as they may relate to varying measures of interpersonal trust between student affairs professionals and their evaluators.

6. The need to consider, for practice, positional status level difference as it relates to span of control management issues.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

American higher education has experienced several major thrusts within the realm of institutional accountability over the course of the past decade. Examples include management by objectives, outcomes assessment initiatives, institutional effectiveness strategies, and a recent proclivity toward the total quality management movement.

Leading authorities in the total quality movement such as Deming (1986), Juran (1988), Crosby (1979), and Feigenbaum (1983) provided a theoretical context intended for corporate management which recently began to inspire significant interest in higher education. Certain scholars and educational leaders such as Spanbauer (1992), Rinehart (1993), Sherr and Lozier (1991), Seymour (1991), and Cross (1993) have extended many of these total quality principles into the arena of higher education. Recent bold initiatives, influenced by this total quality movement, have attempted to transform entire organizational cultures within higher education.
Through these major initiatives, an emphasis on new priorities such as client satisfaction, continuous improvement, shared purposes, teamwork, and personnel empowerment began to emerge. As this emphasis in accountability grew, so did the need for effective tools in carrying out the assessment of organizational effectiveness along with individual job performance. Accompanying many of these new priorities are changes in management attitudes and beliefs regarding the relationship between the individual and the organization as well as the nature of interpersonal relationships within the organization.

One indication of these changing attitudes is in the nature of how individual, departmental, and organizational performance is evaluated. The necessity of determining specific areas of individual performance, from the perspective of traditional task evaluation, remains constant. However, new interest in organizational dynamics has brought to light the significance of understanding certain characteristics of interpersonal relationships and communication processes as driving forces influencing performance appraisal.

Another attitudinal shift is based on the notion that the establishment of meaningful standards alone in
a performance appraisal process only partially addresses the accountability requirements of an effective institution. In the conventional sense, performance standards typically address the "what" questions of personnel evaluation. Of equal, or perhaps, greater significance are the "how" questions. How does the nature of organizational and departmental relationships allow for performance appraisal to be a valid measure of employee professional development? Additionally, how do obstacles, within the realm of interpersonal relationships, impede honest and genuine dialogue between supervisor and subordinate. A more meaningful understanding of how certain conditions, when present within the interpersonal relationships of subordinates and their performance evaluators, may be related to the development of trust, would be of some value in addressing some these "how" questions. It is, thus, the intent of this study to examine this phenomena.

Background

The notion of an effective performance appraisal process at first might appear to be a somewhat simple and innocuous concept. After all, what can possibly be
so complex about designing a process which periodically measures the extent to which a practitioner achieves certain stated performance objectives? In almost every professional endeavor, some means of evaluation exists to inform the practitioner of the evaluator's view of his/her performance.

However, researchers such as Cavender (1990) point out that this most basic notion has been troubling higher education over the past several decades. Simply stated, she notes that there is little evidence reported within the literature that describes effective performance appraisal systems found in higher education. In their extensive review of the literature regarding performance appraisal in higher education, Blackburn and Pitney (1988) have drawn much the same conclusions as Cavender (1990) but offer the following insights as to why this has been a persistent problem:

1. Most systems of performance appraisal in higher education do not lead to improved employee performance. Further, many performance appraisal processes actually lead to reduced productivity and enhanced morale problems.

2. The existing body of theory and scientific evidence, associated with performance appraisal systems
in higher education, remains largely ignored in practice.

3. A substantial amount of theory and research indicates that motivation contributes significantly to quality of performance. However, the interactive relationships between these two phenomena are complex and unique to each individual. This concept mitigates against performance appraisal as being a standardized process throughout a department or organizational division.

4. The importance of employee participation in the development and implementation of the performance appraisal process often is ignored.

5. Performance appraisal processes are often ambiguous regarding their developmental and administrative purposes.

6. Evaluator training is often neglected as a means of improving the performance appraisal process.

In addition to these historic performance appraisal failings found within the realm of higher education in general, further inadequacies have been noted in the two year college sector in particular and in the student affairs components of that sector more specifically. Creamer (1986) has proposed that one plausible explanation for the failings of performance
appraisal within this domain may well be a result of the apparent absence of any well defined, institutionally-based objectives as the anchor for measuring performance effectiveness.

An understanding of factors associated with organizational and interpersonal conditions leading to levels of trust may provide useful guidance in attempting to affect useful performance appraisal processes within higher education, and, in particular, the two year college student affairs sector.

A philosophy which may undergird this notion can be found in Likert’s "Principle of Supportive Relationships" (1989) in which he states the following:

The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and in all relationships within the organization, each member, in the light of his background, values, desires and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance. (p. 25)

Sinetar (1989) emphasizes that the notion of trustworthiness must be understood as something much more substantive than mere technique. Feelings of
personal safety, acceptance, and affirmation are much more essential to measures of interpersonal trust than might be the quality of handshakes or eye contact.

Argyris (1989) addresses how the deterioration of basic trust between the individual and the institution can be related to the employee’s feelings of diminished control over positional status, working conditions, and limited opportunities to practice one’s talents.

Last, there has been some reported exploratory research which attempts to examine how certain power/status relationship characteristics may affect measured levels of trust and performance appraisal processes.


**Statement of the Problem**

There have been a number of themes that have been indicated in the literature (Blackburn & Pitney, 1988;
Cavender, 1990) which point to inadequacies associated with performance appraisal processes found in higher education in general. Other themes in the literature (Creamer, 1986), along with 17 years of professional experience in the two year college student affairs field, have pointed to my awareness of performance appraisal inadequacies in this particular sector of higher education.

There is additional evidence within the literature (Meyer, 1975; Meyer, Kay, & French, 1965; Pearce & Porter, 1986; Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgin, 1984) which suggests that certain performance appraisal processes are not only ineffective, but may have a profound adverse effect on overall employee motivation and productivity.

The extent of empirical evidence or theory which describes some relationship between the power/status relationship qualities of gender, ethnicity, length of professional association, professional classification status, tenure status and positional status level differences with organizational conditions of interpersonal trust, found in a performance appraisal context, is lacking. This void is evident in all organizational settings including those found in higher education. At best, the minimal amount of research in
this realm, which has been conducted in higher education, has either been on an exploratory level or simply inadequate to date.

There is empirical evidence that the level of interpersonal trust between practitioner and evaluator has a more profound effect on subordinate perceptions of fairness in performance appraisal practices than any number of other factors (Fulk, Brief, & Barr, 1985).

Thus, the problem which undergirds the need for this investigation is focused on the following issues:

1. Deficiencies continue to persist within the performance appraisal practices found in higher education in general and in the two year college student affairs sector in particular.

2. The current emphasis on institutional effectiveness and performance accountability necessitates a satisfactory level of scholarly inquiry leading to an expanded knowledge base and useful insights appropriate for improving performance appraisal within the two year college student affairs sector.

3. Previous empirical findings (Fulk, Brief, & Barr, 1985) have pointed to the significance of interpersonal trust on subordinate perceptions of fairness found in performance appraisal practices.
However, these findings have been largely ignored as potential salient predictors of effective performance appraisal processes.

4. An existing body of theoretical and empirical evidence has heretofore identified several useful trust constructs (Butler, 1991; Gabarro, 1978; Jennings, 1971). These constructs have been largely neglected in the realm of both scholarly inquiry and in practical applications for purposes of better understanding the dynamics of communication effectiveness between subordinates and evaluators.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study, therefore, was, to investigate certain phenomena related to organizational conditions of interpersonal trust found in performance appraisal processes conducted in two year college student affairs units by answering the following questions.

1. For two year college student affairs practitioners, what are the conditions leading to trust of their performance appraisal evaluators?

2. The power/status differences between these practitioners and their evaluators may be examined by
considering the following variables: (a) time duration of their professional association; (b) the defined level of positional status difference between them; (c) their gender differences (or similarity); (d) their ethnic differences (or similarities); (e) their professional status differences; (f) their tenure status differences. How are these variables related to conditions of trust as reported by ratees regarding their evaluators?

3. Do conditions leading to interpersonal trust differ depending on differences in any of these power/status variables?

Need for the Study

The findings of this study are intended to provide the following:

1. Guidance for further research, including theory development, by expanding the knowledge base regarding the effects of certain definable organizational conditions leading to levels of interpersonal trust.

2. Guidance for further research, including theory development, by expanding the knowledge base regarding the relationship of certain organizational
power/status qualities to these conditions of interpersonal trust.

3. Guidance to institutional leaders by increasing their understanding of these phenomena as they may pertain to the design of effective performance appraisal processes to be used in two year college student affairs units.

As the demand for greater institutional, departmental, and individual performance accountability appears to be an irreversible trend within higher education, better methods of evaluating performance are critically needed. Heretofore, most of the emphasis in the realm of performance appraisal found within higher education has addressed issues of technique and performance standards. However, little is revealed within the literature that addresses the effects of certain organizational relationship qualities on the underlying communication processes that occur between evaluators and practitioners. What does exist is primarily described as theory.

Accordingly, the intent of this study is to report empirical evidence that can describe how certain preexisting organizational conditions or interpersonal relationship qualities may be related to certain conditions of trust. Of particular interest are
student affairs organizational units found in two year colleges, a sector of the higher education community which has been largely ignored by any analysis of this type to date.

**Operational Definition**

For purposes of this study, the operational definition of *interpersonal trust* is offered as follows:

Interpersonal trust may be considered a perception held by one individual of another in which two general states of mind are indicated: (a) sense of overall confidence is attributable to the other individual; and (b) a sense of psychological safety is attributable to the relationship. Certain conditions, or perceptions of the other individual, must exist within this relationship to achieve a state of interpersonal trust. These conditions are enumerated as follows: (a) availability, (b) competence, (c) consistency, (d) discreetness, (e) fairness, (f) integrity, (g) loyalty, (h) openness, (i) promise fulfillment, and (j) receptivity (Butler, 1992).
Limitations

Certain limitations exist pertaining to this study. These are noted below.

1. Certain preexisting personality conflicts found between subordinates and their performance evaluators may be a source of measurement confound.

2. Differences among institutions in their performance appraisal methods may impact perceptions of trust conditions reported by subjects of their performance evaluators.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

There is a scarcity of literature which addresses the central purpose of this study. Quite simply, little, if any, literature could be found which concerned itself with the effects of these independent variables on measured levels of interpersonal trust found specifically within the context of performance appraisal processes conducted at two year college student affairs organizational units. For reasons that are likely to be obvious to the reader, this is a very narrowly focused question of interest that has heretofore eluded any comprehensive analysis in its own right.

Nevertheless, there does exist an ample body of literature found in three broad strands, each addressing a relevant component of this study. The first of these concerns what has been reported in the realm of performance appraisal in higher education. Some references are made to two year college student affairs units, subunits, or student affairs units in general. The second strand addresses what has been described in the broader context of organizational
literature as having to do with measures and dimensions of various trust constructs. The third of these literature groupings has to do with the effects of each of the power/status variables on performance or trust.

The literature review that follows will, accordingly, be organized along those three themes. Nevertheless, there will be instances where a confluence of themes will be evident.

**Performance Appraisal in Higher Education**

As noted above, there is a relative scarcity of literature which addresses performance appraisal in higher education. Nevertheless, Blackburn and Pitney (1988) note that related literature and research may expand almost a century of academic interest. These related areas of inquiry have been addressed within several disciplines including psychology, sociology, and organizational behavior.

In general, the body of scholarly inquiry into the realm of performance appraisal in higher education has addressed three broad domains: (a) the relationship to motivational theory; (b) methods of performance appraisal; and (c) their outcome effects on performance behaviors.
Relationship to Motivational Theory

Those motivational theories which have been most frequently addressed within the performance appraisal literature fall within two broad categories: (a) those which address the arousal of basic human needs such as with basic psychological safety, self-esteem, or freedom from want (Alderfer, 1969; Atkinson, 1964; Bandura, 1982; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1961; McGregor, 1967; Murray, 1938) and (b) those which address behaviors that go beyond the arousal of basic needs and are more concerned with the sustaining of repeated behaviors (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Goodman, 1977; Locke, 1968; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Skinner, 1971; Vroom, 1964).

Another way of describing these phenomena is through an understanding of significant internal and external variables that influence motivation. Porter and Miles (1974) provide such an understanding by their categorization of factors as follows: (a) individual employee characteristics, (b) definable work environment characteristics, (c) definable job characteristics, and (d) definable traits of the external environment.
**Individual Employee Characteristics**

The first of these four factors has been largely the concern of the behavioral literature and research noted above. However, interest in the other three variables has been the concern of more recent scholarly inquiry within the realm of organizational literature.

**Work Environment Characteristics**

These variables are generally addressed within the organizational development literature. Issues such as peer interactions, supervisor-subordinate interpersonal dynamics, reward practices, organizational communication and feedback systems are of key interest to scholars such as Argyris and Schon (1974). Some of the central questions related to the present study are largely influenced within this particular variable context.

**Definable Job Characteristics**

These factors found within the literature address issues of job content. That is, the definable duties, responsibilities, and activities associated with particular jobs as they are related to the ways in which individuals internalize these experiences as either a means of enhancing or discouraging their levels of motivation. Issues related to intrinsic motivation, job enrichment, personal autonomy and level
of responsibility are central concerns found within this body of literature (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Steers & Porter, 1974).

Definable Traits of the External Environment

These traits are concerned with the influences of organizational climate variables on employee motivation. Issues such as the cultural norms; expressed or implied attitudes or beliefs; political context and demographic influences all have had some relationship to levels of motivation (Perry & Porter, 1982). This, too, is a domain that will be of central interest within the current study.

Methods of Performance Appraisal

Organizational Context

To consider this issue, it is essential that key distinctions are noted between the environments of higher education institutions as contrasted with organizational characteristics found in business settings.

Blackburn and Pitney (1988) offer the following contrasts between academic and business settings relative to performance appraisal:
First, unlike traditional business organizations, academic managers (department chairs) are in their administrative role for a set period of time, fully expecting to return to an instructional status. Thus, this academic supervisor, who will conduct the performance appraisal of "subordinates," is not at all in an analogous role with business organization counterparts. Further, the role of the academic department chair is viewed more as being a representative of the faculty constituency as opposed to being an agent of senior management. Unlike line administrators who have attributed the major source of their job stress to be their supervisors, faculty have identified lack of time to accomplish tasks as being their stress. Simply stated, the perception among many faculty, regarding the notion of their department chairs as a source of stress, is generally viewed as a nonissue (Blackburn, Horowitz, Edington, & Klos, 1986).

Second, unlike business environments, the path toward career mobility into higher status positions of authority is not nearly as evident in academic settings. Instead, career advancement comes in the form of academic rank and tenure.

Third, the notion of a rigid job description, where fixed duties and responsibilities are assigned,
is treated with much greater latitude in academic environments than what may be found in more conventional business organizations.

Fourth, although considered employees of the institution, academicians often tend to perceive themselves more as "independent professionals" (Blackburn & Pitney, 1988, p. 24) somewhat immune from the notion of supervision. "Professionals--be they faculty, doctors, or lawyers--earn a reputation for the quality of their work, not from a number on a rating form. Quantitative rating forms are anathema to most professionals" (Blackburn & Pitney, 1988, p. 24).

Fifth, the notion of peer review takes on much greater significance in academic environments than in business settings. Academicians often contend that the best judges of their performance are colleagues with similar expertise. Accordingly, the performance evaluations of line supervisors are viewed with less confidence than the assessments offered by colleagues.

*Performance Appraisal Processes in Higher Education*

Blackburn and Pitney (1988) propose the following for consideration:

1. Performance appraisal processes need to be first and foremost a means used to advance the professional development of each affected professional
while serving the goals of the institution. This is in contrast to other purposes such as a tool to calculate merit pay or some other form of extrinsic reward.

2. It is essential that performance appraisal processes are individualized to take into account the vast range in the backgrounds of each practitioner as well as the variance presented in the professional goals to be achieved for each individual.

3. Measures of performance outcomes need to take into account the unique qualities of the particular type of institution. For example, innovative strategies which may contribute to the academic motivation and success of underprepared students may be a much more relevant quality to evaluate in a community college than would be the quantity of scholarly publications rendered within a specified time frame.

4. A greater emphasis on the importance of service needs to be built into performance appraisal measures. This is particularly important in those types of institutions which value service such as two year institutions. In doing this, essential student support functions, such as quality academic advisement, can be viewed by practitioners as a coveted professional objective instead of as an unwanted administrative burden.
5. An individualized portfolio appraisal process is the methodology of choice of these researchers in maintaining consistency with those assumptions described above. Further, such an approach has been found to reduce both gender and racial bias in performance appraisal ratings (Rossi, 1980). This particular issue will be covered more extensively later in this study.

6. Multiple information sources, including the affected professional and peers, need to be significantly involved in performance appraisal.

7. Portfolio performance appraisal processes need to be an ongoing experience throughout the career of each affected individual within the same institution. This is a process which needs to occur with predictable frequency. Progress toward goal attainment needs to be assessed from one appraisal interval to the next with prescriptive recommendations the outcome of each process.

8. Professional development plans that result from portfolio performance appraisal processes need to be met with resource support from the institution.

9. A reasonable balance needs to be achieved between the professional interests of the evaluated individual and the intended needs of the institution.
Performance Standards and Institutional Goals

Creamer (1986) has proposed that the basis of performance assessment for counseling staffs in two year colleges should be focused around the extent to which counseling effectiveness is directly related to the achievement of stated institutional purposes. Historically, the problem with this perspective has been based on the notion that two year college counseling personnel did not always view institutional goals as being consistent with their understanding of what might always be in the best educational interests of their student clientele. However, there is no reason assume that the very process of establishing institutional goals should not involve meaningful participation from student affairs personnel. As such, performance standards in two year college student affairs units can be clearly defined in such a way which intentionally takes into account institutional goals, student well-being, and professional ethics.

Effects of Performance Appraisal Processes

Most of the literature and research in this realm has addressed four basic areas of concern: (a) unintended confounds that contaminate rater
objectivity; (b) behavioral, motivational, and self-esteem effects on ratees; (c) nature and purposes of performance appraisal processes and (d) effects of rating instrument/format types on performance appraisal processes.

Confounds to Rater Objectivity

The first of these four categories is largely rooted in the social psychology literature on person perception. A recurring theme found within this body of literature has to do with ways in which perceivers (in this context - evaluators) assign ratees to stereotyped images based on certain types of attributes (gender, ethnicity, geographic background, professional background, etc.). The evaluator's assumptions regarding these stereotyped categories may significantly compromise his ability to concentrate exclusively on performance issues.

In this context, a corollary to person perception theories is found in the body of literature which addresses attribution theory. Essentially, where performance appears to be discrepant with the perceived category fit, a phenomenon described by attribution theory becomes the basis for explaining the observed behavior (Feldman, 1981). Rather than associating behavior with a category context, the evaluator will
attribute this to some causal description that is derived from her repertoire of human nature explanations (e.g., the ratees pattern of defensiveness may be attributable to low self-esteem). Previous research has revealed that in achievement-related contexts, such as in performance appraisal, causal explanations are attributed to factors such as ability, effort, task difficulty, or luck (Weiner, 1972).

Two related confounds to evaluator objectivity are systematic distortions and halo effects. Halo effects refer to an evaluator biases resulting from a consistently inflated perception of a subordinate’s overall behavior and personality. Systematic distortions refer to evaluation biases that result from memory-based ratings in lieu of conscious attention and recognition of actual performance behaviors (Borman, 1983). Interestingly, there is some evidence which indicates that neither of these two phenomena may have any appreciable effects on measures of performance appraisal accuracy (Bernardin & Pence, 1980; Borman, 1979).

Another source of confounds, associated with rater objectivity, can be found in social cognition research. Hamilton, Katz, and Leirer (1980) concluded that the perceived purposes in which evaluators believe
performance information may be eventually used will bias the way in which this knowledge is collected, organized, and recalled. Evidence exists which suggests that early impressions made by evaluators of their subordinates may significantly bias how they respond to performance behaviors (Balzer, 1986).

There is additional evidence that discrepancies found by evaluators between actual observed performance compared to expected performance resulted in lower ratings on subsequent evaluations even when performance was up to standards. It did not matter whether these discrepancies resulted from lower than expected or higher than expected performance. Thus, the essential conclusion was that evaluators were more concerned about making incorrect initial assessments than in carrying out an objective evaluation (Hogan, 1987).

Some amount of interest has been noted in the literature with regard to the effects of gender, race, and age as sources of evaluator bias in performance appraisal. Although aspects of this issue will be covered more extensively later in this study, several general research findings are of more immediate interest to the topic.

In a study conducted by Schmitt and Lappin (1980), subjects demonstrated a greater tendency to rate others
within their own racial group with greater confidence, but not so for individuals of the same gender. In a previous study, Deaux and Emswiller (1974) found that when identical performances were rendered by both males and females alike, male performance was considered to be attributed to competency factors where female performance was deemed to be caused more by luck or chance. In a somewhat related study, Rose (1978) found that subjects rated their managers with greater confidence if they represented a different gender than their own regardless of comparable performance evidence. Further, there is evidence that women were rated either equivalent to or higher than men on measures of strong performance but were rated lower than men on measures of inadequate performance (Abramson, Goldberg, Greenberg, & Abramson, 1978).

Other variables which were found to have biased performance appraisal include appearance (Heilman & Stoppeck, 1985) and age (Cleveland & Landy, 1981; Rosen, Jerdee, & Lunn, 1981; Schwab & Heneman, 1978).

Behavioral, Motivational, and Self-Esteem Effects on Ratees

There is some consistency within the literature that performance appraisal processes may, indeed, have an adverse effect on employee motivation, self-esteem,
and productivity. Taylor, Fisher, and Ilgen (1984) have concluded that even when performance appraisal systems are deemed to be fairly administered, types of negative communications may result in employee disaffection associated with defiant behavior directed at supervisors. These findings are consistent with conclusions reached in a previous study conducted by Meyer (1975).

Several substantive conclusions were reached in a seminal study regarding motivational effects of performance appraisal on ratees (Meyer, Kay, & French, 1965) which persist into present assumptions regarding this process:

1. Day to day performance coaching has a much greater effect on employee motivation than does the comprehensive, annual review. In the course of annual reviews, praise is often perceived as insincere, having little or no effect on motivation. Criticism invariably results in defensiveness.

2. Goal setting and planning serves as a much more productive source of motivation than does criticism or flattery.

3. There is a clear need to differentiate the purposes of performance appraisal between those intended for professional development versus those
intended for salary action. In so doing, the conflicted role of the evaluator as being both counselor/mentor and power figure needs to be addressed.

A study conducted by Pearce and Porter (1986) found that when performance appraisal feedback is in the form of more neutral language (i.e., "satisfactory" or "meets standards"), ratees often interpret this as negative or as being evaluated for poor performance. A central thesis of this research is based on the notion that ranking one employee in a competitive status against peers will necessarily yield self-esteem loss for those who are not ranked in the upper tiers of the distribution. What is indicated here is that organizations take into account the profound effects that performance appraisal processes may have on the attitudes and performance of their consistently reliable personnel.

Dorfman, Stephan, and Loveland (1986) discovered that a strong developmental perspective taken by evaluators was related to employee feelings of increased motivation. However, what they also discovered in the same study was that many of those same performance appraisal behaviors had little to do with any measured gains in job performance. Findings
from previous studies reaffirmed these conclusions that developmental performance appraisal counseling interviews resulted in little impact on actual job performance gains (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984).

A related line of research, which is of particular relevance to the present study, has to do with the effects of preexisting biases on the performance appraisal process itself. In a study conducted by Landy, Barnes-Farrell, and Cleveland (1980), the issue of whether previous performance ratings would affect perceptions of fairness among ratees was examined. The conclusions reached in this study indicated that factors other than previous ratings influenced perceptions of fairness. These included: (a) the elements of the evaluation process itself; (b) the frequency of communication between supervisor and subordinate; (c) opportunities for subordinates to effectively express feedback during evaluation; and (d) viable development plans related to performance deficiencies. This same study was replicated several years later (Fulk, Brief, & Barr, 1985). This time, the critical factor which weighed heavily on subordinate perceptions of fairness was reported to be levels of trust in the ongoing supervisor-subordinate
relationship as opposed to qualities of the performance appraisal process itself.

Central to this line of research is the question of subordinate perceptions of accuracy associated with performance appraisal feedback. Presumably, if ratees are persuaded that performance appraisal feedback is more a reflection of the supervisor's bias than it is of an accurate assessment of performance, the likelihood of seriously addressing noted deficiencies would become greatly compromised. This notion was tested by Stone and Stone (1984). Their findings were that the favorability of performance appraisal feedback was closely related to employee perceptions of accuracy.

Certain research has also found that subordinates are likely to positively view performance appraisal where the opportunity exists to: (a) provide meaningful feedback in stating their case, (b) feel as if they are being evaluated on relevant job responsibilities, and (c) have the opportunity to establish a purposeful plan for professional development (Dipboye & dePontbriand, 1981). A follow up study conducted by Shields (1984) found that the three variables studied by Dipboye and dePontbriand did, indeed, provide for a performance
appraisal process that was characteristically trusted and accepted by ratees.

Another factor which contributes to positive employee perceptions of performance appraisal has to do with both the quality and frequency of communication between supervisors and subordinates. Regarding the issue of communication quality, Mount (1983) found that subordinates considered both the quality of the appraisal discussion as well as the ways in which the rating forms facilitated dialogue to be significant variables. Managers, on the other hand, were more concerned that the performance appraisal process would be used more as an effective communication tool to heighten employee awareness of management's performance concerns. Regarding the issue of communication frequency, Ilgen, Peterson, Martin, and Boeschen (1981) reported that subordinates are unlikely to view performance appraisal as an isolated and distinct process - detached from the overall work experience. Thus, their findings indicate that subordinates respond more effectively to performance feedback when it is provided in consistent and regular intervals as opposed to only once a year.
Nature and Purposes of Performance Appraisal

At the heart of this issue in academic settings is whether performance appraisal is to be viewed primarily as serving administrative intentions or as serving purposes of professional development for affected employees. Related to this is the ambivalent role the supervisor must play between being in a helping, supportive role as opposed to being viewed as administrative enforcer. Although the basis of this argument is made primarily on theoretical grounds, some research findings indicate the perceived problem may not be as significant in actual practice while, at the same time, there is some conflicting evidence which contradicts this notion as well.

In two separate studies (Dorfman et al., 1986; Prince & Lawler, 1986), there were no negative effects found between salary discussions and developmental plans during performance appraisal processes. The theoretical argument, on the other hand, postulates that salary discussions, during the process of performance appraisal development coaching, can only cause defensiveness and mistrust. A study conducted by Deets and Tyler (1986) adds credibility to this argument. Their finding was that performance coaching
was typically unsuccessful when occurring at the same time as merit increase discussions. Similarly, Finn and Fontaine (1984) found in their study that a majority of their sampled midlevel state government workers clearly preferred to have goal setting discussions to be distinct from the performance appraisal itself.

**Effects of Rating Format on Performance Appraisal**

In general, those performance appraisal formats which have allowed for meaningful participation and feedback from affected subordinates have been found to be most closely associated with increased levels of worker motivation, high rates of satisfaction, and high productivity (Steel, 1985; Wexley, Singh, & Yukl, 1973).

A second area of concern noted in this body of literature has to do with the importance of providing for evaluator training as a condition of conducting performance appraisal. Feldman (1983) has pointed out that rater training should have the effect of enhancing evaluator sensitivity to situational distractions and the effects of personal biases. This research has suggested that evaluators trained in recognizing these
errors are much more likely to carry out accurate performance appraisal work.

Landy and Parr (1980) have concluded there may not be any one rating format that can assure performance appraisal accuracy. Pulakos (1984) has concluded that no single evaluator training approach can be reliably considered as a benchmark. Zammuto, London, and Rowland (1982) note that standardized formats can present significant problems by not taking into account the idiosyncratic features of each institutional culture.

Although formats that call for multiple rating sources have the advantage of neutralizing rater-bias, there is evidence which shows that self-appraisals consistently reflect inflated outcomes when compared to supervisor or peer ratings (Holzbach, 1978; Thornton, 1980). Peer ratings, on the other hand, have demonstrated higher levels of reliability, possibly resulting from day to day interactions among colleagues (Love, 1981). However, the problem with peer evaluations is that negative ratings frequently have an adverse effect on future group interactions, motivation, and self-esteem of the affected employee (De Nisi, Randolph, & Blencoe, 1983).
A subsequent study (Fuqua, Johnson, Newman, Anderson & Gade, 1984), however, found evidence that peer ratings, when conducted during early stages of counselor training, are significantly higher than both supervisor and self-ratings. These findings refute previously held assumptions that performance ratings across different sources would tend to be consistent. Among other concerns, this study raises the question as to whether differences in performance rating sources need to be examined during various career stages. Another question that is raised is whether the phenomenon of inflated peer ratings is evident in other professions beyond what Fuqua et al. discovered with counseling.

**Trust: Theory and Research**

In a recent study conducted by Butler (1991), an important theoretical distinction was made between the *conditions* leading to trust as compared to dimensions which describe the trust construct. Three of the key findings of this study were that: (a) the focus of analysis needs to be concerned with specific others as opposed to depersonalized environmental conditions; (b) measures of trust need to take into account a
multiconditional set of variables; and (c) conditions leading to trust, as well as conditions leading to distrust, are reciprocal between two individuals.

Earlier studies (Driscoll, 1978; Scott, 1980) were able to differentiate the effects of two trust subconstructs (global/affective versus situational specific/cognitive) organizational outcomes. Their findings indicated that only the situational specific trust subconstruct could predict any behavioral effects. Similarly, two related studies (Fisher, 1980; Heberlein & Black, 1976) found evidence that specific attitudes, not general ones, were related to specific behavioral outcomes. Accordingly, the following description of related literature will be presented in two broad categories: (a) those conditions that may be related to multi-conditional measures of trust focused on a specific person; and (b) conditions found in a macro social or organizational context.

**Trust/Distrust Reciprocity**

Butler (1991) proposed a theoretical framework in which trust between two individuals develops through a "... circular, mutually-reinforcing process that begins with one's expectations about another's
behavior" (p. 657). An expectation of trustworthiness with another individual is characterized by behaviors that reflect self-disclosure, acceptance of the other’s influence, and less defensiveness. Likewise, the recipient of these trusting behaviors redirects similar trusting behaviors back to the other individual. A process is created in which a pattern of such behaviors reinforces preliminary notions of trust to the extent a more enduring trusting relationship is developed.

Conversely, an opposite circular process is indicative of a reciprocal distrusting relationship. Expectations of untrustworthiness result from a withholding of information, rejection of the other’s influence, and greater controls within the interpersonal dynamics between both individuals. In turn, these same behaviors are reciprocated creating a dynamic which continually reinforces basic notions of mistrust. Upon establishing such a pattern of perceptions and behaviors, the overall interpersonal relationship can be characterized by high levels of distrust.

Prerequisite knowledge of how certain organizational and interpersonal conditions can lead to measures of overall trust can also be used as predictors of overall distrust in instances where such
conditions are not effectively achieved within the realm of interpersonal relationships.

**Dimensions of Trust: "Specific Person" Perspective**

Jennings (1971) was able to identify the following four, person-specific trust conditions in an extensive study involving interviews with executives: (a) loyalty, (b) accessibility (being mentally receptive to the ideas of others), (c) availability (being physically present), and (d) predictability.

Gabarro (1978) developed a research-based theory that proposed a four-stage developmental process as a means of explaining relationship building between two individuals. Stage 1 involves a process of mutual impression development. Stage 2 involves further learning and exploration of one another. Stage 3 is where the limits of trust and influence are tested. From this comes a semblance of boundaries and a mutual set of expectations. Stage 4 is where the relationship stabilizes. In this last stage, realistic expectations, mutual influence, and reciprocal trust become evident.

In addition to this relationship development stage theory, Gabarro (1978) has proposed the following nine
constructs which can be used as indicators of trust evident in an interpersonal relationship: (a) integrity, (b) motives, (c) consistency of behavior, (d) openness to other ideas, (e) maintaining confidences (discreetness), (f) evidence of competence, (g) interpersonal effectiveness, (h) organizational sense, and (i) good judgement.

Although much of this literature is generally theoretical in nature, some experimental research is evident. One such study (Butler & Cantrell, 1984) examined the effects of five of the trust conditions noted by Jennings (1971) and Gabarro (1978) in a decision-modeling experiment. The intent of this study was to produce a ranking of the relative importance of each of these trust conditions as viewed through two perspectives: (a) downward trust of managers in their subordinates; and (b) upward trust of subordinates in their managers. Interestingly, the same ranking occurred in both directions in the following order: (a) evidence of competence; (b) integrity; (c) consistency; (d) loyalty; and (e) openness.

From the perspective of understanding the effects of certain politically-oriented organizational dynamics on specific measures of interpersonal trust, Kumar and Ghadially (1989) found evidence that the specific
political strategies of cooption, threat, and structure change indeed had a negative effect on interpersonal trust. In the context of their study, notions of trust assumed past experiences and prior interactions between two affected individuals. Further, dimensions of trust included the following: (a) reliability, (b) dependability, (c) expressed concern, and (d) feelings of confidence and security between the two affected individuals (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985).

**Conditions of Trust: Macro-Social and Organizational Perspectives**

An entirely different theoretical perspective on trust dynamics comes out of the field of industrial sociology. Roche (1991) describes the phenomenon of "low discretion syndrome" (p. 101) in which management intentionally creates labor conditions where dependence on their workforce is intentionally minimized. To do this, employees are placed into "low discretion work roles" (p. 100) in which they are provided minimum opportunity to exercise judgement or initiative and are essentially prescribed work in the form of mindless routines. Additionally, pronounced differences in all levels of status such as salary, positional status, and
levels of responsibility are also indicated. Individuals who occupy these low discretion roles attribute low levels of trust to management in general and to immediate levels of supervision in particular. This is often manifested in the form of negating the credibility of supervisors in their ability to adequately assess employee performance. A key theoretical construct is described as "reciprocal distrust" (p. 101) which suggests that people who feel as if they are distrusted redirect those feelings by distrusting those who they believe are at the source of this problem.

The effects of this syndrome are theorized to be evident by the following organizational symptoms: (a) micromanagement; (b) untold assumptions regarding generic qualities of poor work ethic behaviors among employees; (c) disagreements handled through formal means such as collective bargaining or litigation instead of through dialogue and (d) consistent use of threats and sanctions as a means of influencing performance behaviors.

Another dimension of low discretion/trust syndrome is in the nature of interpersonal relations. The two competing constructs which emerge from this theoretical base are described as "economic exchange" and "social
exchange" (Roche, 1991, p. 101). Accordingly, low-trust behaviors and perceptions are more likely to be related to an economic exchange type of interpersonal environment whereas high-trust behaviors and perceptions are more likely to be related to a social exchange type of organizational environment.

In the economic exchange environment, labor-management relationships are spelled out in the form of both formal and informal contracts. Essentially, what is involved is a quid pro quo tradeoff between services rendered and highly specified extrinsic rewards in the form of remuneration and company benefits. The methods of establishing conditions of employment are based on bargaining and pressure tactics. Relationships between labor and management are kept in a divisive status where no sense of mutual respect or obligation is expected. Further, these relationships are typically instrumental in nature and are generally predicated upon how other individuals can be used to serve momentary wants and needs.

On the other hand, the social exchange construct may be found in a high discretion/trust syndrome with the following characteristics: (a) evidence of organizational behavior which reflects a sense of personal obligation individuals feel toward one
another; (b) an eagerness among individuals to provide spontaneous support to others; (c) the use of honest and genuine dialogue in place of formal bargaining and sanctions; and (d) confidence in the competencies and ethics of others within the organization.

Another construct found within the organizational psychology literature is the "TORI (Trust Level)" theory developed by Gibb (1978, p. 18). An underlying assumption which provided the basis of this theory is based on the notion of trust and fear as being antithetical constructs. Within this framework, Gibb suggests that as certain measures of trust increase, so will other dimensions as well. However, the same would hold for increased measures of fear having an effect on exacerbating other dimensions of that affect.

Gibb's (1978) theory is based on four measurable dimensions which vary in their emphasis between self-knowledge and interpersonal dynamics. The first of these is, indeed, centered on a level of self-awareness and self-acceptance. When realized, a level of self-trust is theoretically achieved. The second dimension is focused on the degree to which an individual can effectively open himself up to others in a climate of personal safety while, at the same time, provide a trusting environment for specific others to open up as
well. The third dimension is based on the individual feeling both a level of self-trust and interpersonal acceptance allowing for an environment, free from fear, which encourages creativity and productivity. The last dimension is measured by achieving a level of trusting interdependence between the individual and one or more specific others.

This theory (Gibb, 1978) proposes that when all four of these dimensions are effectively reached, the following outcomes are likely to occur within each affected individual: (a) increased levels of motivation; (b) enhanced consciousness; (c) heightened perceptions; (d) greater emotionality or passion; (e) greater cognitive effectiveness; (f) action-oriented behaviors; and (g) synergistic behavior. Conversely, when the four basic dimensions of this theory reflect greater levels of fear these seven effects are hypothesized to be negatively impacted.

In a more recent analysis of this trust-fear dichotomy, Ryan and Oestreich (1991) reported that the salient variable most frequently associated with why employees do not "speak up" is "fear of repercussions" (p. 51). When this fear was further dissected into various employee fear factors, "loss of credibility or reputation" was ranked significantly higher than other
fear variables such as "lack of career or financial advancement," "possible damage to relationship with boss." or even "loss of employment" (Ryan & Oestreich, p. 43). The meaning that these researchers attached to the "loss of credibility" variable indicated a perception of an individual associated with this label as someone who might tend to frequently exercise poor judgement, act unprofessionally, or function against the interests of the organization. These authors note that such a labeling process often creates unshakable biases held about an individual among many, often influential, leaders within the organization.

Labels are signals of disfavor that quietly operate in the minds of managers and supervisors. People often believe that over time these psychological sorting bins control the ultimate success or failure of people in the organization. Once a loss of credibility has occurred, other incremental repercussions begin to accumulate. (Ryan & Oestreich, p. 44)

Last, these authors hypothesize that the reason the "loss of credibility" variable was ranked as the salient fear among their sample may well have been attributed to the ego and self-esteem meaning that
employees perceive of that status as compared to performance measures alone.

In an earlier study intended to discern definable traits which could differentiate "effective" managers from "weak" managers, from the perspective of subordinates, White (1977) was able to identify that some measure of interpersonal trust between manager and subordinate was a highly coveted priority (fifth ranked out of 33 priority indicators of "effective managers") noted in a national sample of midlevel government agency employees.

Cangemi, Rice, and Kowalski (1989) have offered a useful framework for describing symptomatic indicators of a trusting versus a distrusting organizational climate. Of the former, they note that merely providing for subordinate input may not go far enough. Such a process can only enhance trust levels when this input is seriously listened to, given consideration, and acted upon when it is viewed as sensible. When such input is not, organizational leaders must be careful not to punish or ridicule individuals who initiated the ideas.

When leaders behave in ways that suggest they are fair, concerned with the needs of employees, are honest, open and considerate of employees -
treating them as a valuable asset - then we can be sure that a relationship of trust . . . can be developed. (Cangemi et al., p. 3)

Conversely, Cangemi et al. (1989) indicate that the following symptoms may be present as indicators that organizational trust levels are in decline:

- Threats and punishment with little praise.
- Much, little, or no appreciation for work done.
- "Tearing down" behavior - self-esteem deflating.
- Public criticism.
- Consistent creation of fear.
- No interest in input from employees.
- The leadership is always right.
- Favoritism.
- Indiscriminate terminations.
- Downward communication/none upward.
- Constant rejection of ideas.
- Treatment of subordinates as unintelligent or dumb.
- Little respect for employees.
- Employees are looked upon as pawns or objects.

(p. 4)

Another aspect of this same analysis (Cangemi et al., 1989) points to certain predicted organizational
behavior outcomes, as evidenced by disaffected employees, that are likely to ensue once a climate of distrust is evident throughout. Thus, examples of such behaviors are noted below from this analysis:

- Product quality deteriorates.
- Scrap rate is high.
- Absenteeism is high.
- Tardiness is excessive.
- Considerable viral-related sickness/much low back pain is experienced.
- Many capable/marketable people leave.
- Deadlines are rarely met on time.
- Employees feel they work for the union, not the organization.
- Careless use of machinery and equipment is seen.
- Employees spend too much time on breaks, lunch, etc., and abuse company time.
- Employees cannot accept blame for what they do - they seek scapegoats. There is little personal accountability.
- Employees stop learning/reliance is almost totally on old experience, old values, old traditions.
- There is much short term thinking.
- There is little or no proactive thinking, only reactionary thinking.
- There is little or no creativity.
- The cost to make the product escalates because the employees think the product belongs to the company, not to them.
- In general, lots of bad habits develop.
- The company is seen as the enemy. (p. 5)

It is interesting to note how consistent the spirit of this analysis (Cangemi et al., 1989) is with several key underlying principles found within the total quality literature. In particular, the quality themes of empowerment and ridding the organization of fear are directly related to many of the points raised by these authors in their depiction of a high trust versus low trust organizational climate.

**Relationship of Power/Status Variables to Conditions of Trust**

Recent empirical research has been conducted which has some relationship to the core questions raised in this study. Accordingly, this research can be categorized into the following areas of analysis: (a) gender difference effects on performance ratings and
related organizational behaviors; (b) hierarchical/positional level difference effects on organizational leadership behaviors; and (c) length of association effects on level of supervisor attention to subordinates, performance appraisal ratings, and measures of interpersonal trust.

**Gender Difference Effects On Performance Ratings and Related Organizational Behaviors**

In a recent comparison study conducted by Wilson, Wilson, Booth, and Shipper (1992), office subordinates in both a large utility company and, later, in a state government agency rated their supervisors in a broad range of competencies and interpersonal attributes. Summary data were analyzed on the basis of gender (among other variables) in the context of organizational setting differences. Among the conclusions reached was that there were no viable similarities between the two organizational settings. In the state agency, male managers were rated higher than their female counterparts on certain measures while female managers rated higher than their male counterparts on the remaining items. More specifically, male managers were rated higher on items
such as "clarification of goals," "encouraging participation," "expertise," "work facilitation," and "delegation" whereas the female managers rated higher on items such as "time emphasis," "control of details," and "goal pressure" (Wilson et al., p. 354). The initial explanation, offered by these researchers, was based on some relationship between certain management attributes of the female managers to a more controlling management style. However, when the data from the utility company study phase were examined, no discernable differences in responses between the two gender groups (with only two exceptions) were noted. Thus, Wilson et al. were able to conclude that differences in management attributes may well be as much (perhaps even more) a function of differences in organizational cultures or the occupations themselves as opposed to differences based on gender alone.

Earlier studies (Mischel, 1974; Noel & Allen, 1976; Peck, 1978; Pheterson, Kiesler, & Goldberg, 1971) have noted a general antifemale bias in performance evaluations. However, when attempting to delineate whether these biases might be more evident within one gender category versus the other, research findings were contradictory. Some studies were able to identify evidence of antifemale bias in performance appraisal
conducted by subgroups of males (Cline, Holmes, & Werner, 1977; Etaugh & Rose, 1975). Other studies noted these biases among subgroups of female evaluators (Peck, 1978; Pheterson et al., 1971). Yet, other studies indicated these biases among subgroups of combined genders (Mischel, 1974; Noel & Allen, 1976).

On the other hand, some of these same studies could find no evidence of this bias using different subgroups of female subjects (Etaugh & Rose, 1975) and male subjects (Peck, 1978).

In an effort to address some of this ambiguity, Lenney, Mitchell, and Browning (1983) introduced an additional variable which they hypothesized might be interacting with gender biases in these performance appraisal measures. Specifically, they looked at whether the relative clarity (or ambiguity) of evaluation criteria might be related to differences in gender bias judgements of performance. After completing two comprehensive experiments (one evaluating intellectual performance and the other evaluating creative, artistic performance), Lenney et al. found that gender bias only existed within the female group and only when conditions of ambiguous evaluation criteria were present. This was evident in both experiments. Accordingly, evidence of sex bias
was absent for the male subgroups under both conditions of clear and ambiguous evaluation criteria. Further, evidence of sex bias was absent within the female subgroup under conditions of clear criteria only.

Lenney et al. (1983) conjecture that the reason that gender bias may be reduced among their female subjects when clear evaluation guidelines are present may be a result of directing the focus of evaluation to the activities associated with performance itself. "Such an increase in performance information may allow less cognitive 'room' for judgements to be affected by stereotypes" (Lenney et al., p. 326).

Further, these researchers suggest that a plausible explanation for why their female subjects demonstrated antifemale gender biases, under conditions of vague evaluation criteria, may be based on the notion that male subjects might feel some degree of social pressure which may inhibit open displays of antifemale judgements.

Hierarchal Status and Organizational Behavior

In a recent analysis conducted by Tallarigo and Rosebush (1992), hierarchal positional status was one of several independent variables examined relative to
the effects of leadership behavior on subordinate reactions among cadets at the Air Force Academy. In this study, cadets rated certain characteristics of leadership behaviors as perceived in their superiors. Three positional levels were addressed: (a) wing, group, and squadron commanders (highest level); (b) flight commanders (midlevel supervisors); and (c) element leaders (first line supervisors).

Two investigations were conducted. The first examined the effects of positional status on three specific leadership behaviors: (a) individualized consideration, (b) task orientation, and (c) leadership demeanor. The second analysis looked at the effects of positional status on the relationship between leader behaviors and performance outcome measures. In general, the data did not reveal any meaningful explanation of positional status as having an effect on leadership behavior across all three levels. However, a pattern was noted with two scales of the first analysis: (a) individualized consideration, and (b) task orientation. In this case, the trend pointed to greater effects as positional levels increased. Nevertheless, it must be noted that, even with regard to this trend, the effects of these two positional-level variables were still minimal.
Earlier research (Jago & Vroom, 1977) reported evidence of a relationship which existed between increased hierarchal levels and management styles that were characteristically participative, collaborative, and nonautocratic.

Length of Association Effects on Supervisory Attention, Performance Appraisal, and Measures of Trust

In a study conducted by Dion and Dion (1976), measures of interpersonal love and trust among couples were found to be more highly correlated for marital rather than premarital partners. However, they also found that individual measures of these two variables did not increase with time intervals.

A similar study was subsequently conducted (Larzelere & Huston, 1980) in which the marital subgroup was deliberately altered to include newlyweds as 50% of the sample. In doing this, the researchers were able to differentiate between longer married couples and the newlywed subgroup finding that trust measures were strongly related to measures of love and self-disclosure for couples beyond the newlywed stage.
From the perspective of organizational behavior, Markham, Murry, and Scott (1992) reported that individuals within a work unit that had the same supervisor for 3 or more years received higher levels of leadership attention as well as higher performance appraisal ratings than individuals with lesser lengths of association with their supervisors. Further, measures of these dependent variables were increasingly higher with each increment of time (1 year, 2 year, and 3 year intervals).

This same study (Markham et al., 1992) was also able to differentiate between length of association effects on leadership attention and performance appraisal from the perspective of supervisor relationship to organizational units versus supervisor relationship to individuals. The findings of this research indicate that supervisors provide leadership attention to subordinates regardless of their group membership. Additionally, individuals, regardless of group membership, receive higher performance ratings as the length of association increases between superior and subordinate.
Summary

Most of the literature which pertains to the central question of this study is found within three broad domains: (a) the status of performance appraisal within higher education; (b) measures and dimensions of various trust constructs found in organizational literature; and (c) the effects of either gender, length of association, or positional status on performance, organizational behavior, or trust measures. A summary of this literature review as it pertains to each of these three domains is described below.

Summary of Performance Appraisal Literature Review

Although intended to provide management with an accurate process to measure the effectiveness of employee performance, appraisal processes themselves have resulted in significant side effects which have had a profound impact on the motivation, self-esteem, and job behaviors of both supervisors and subordinates. Accordingly, the following points are summarized from the literature review which specifically address the
relationship of performance appraisal to motivation, self-esteem, job behavior, and organizational context.

1. The literature which has linked performance appraisal to motivational theory has addressed two broad domains: (a) relationship to basic arousal and behavioral constructs; and (b) relationship to organizational constructs. Within the organizational domain, recent theory and research has noted the significance of interpersonal relationships, organizational climate qualities, and communication processes to performance appraisal and related organizational behaviors. Further, unique qualities of academic environments, as they pertain to issues of performance appraisal, are addressed within the literature. As such, certain procedural strategies are considered as appropriate for those organizational settings.

2. Person-perception and attribution theories have been used to describe phenomena which may ostensibly be related to evaluation biases and confounds to rater objectivity. Research into systematic distortion, halo effects, social cognition and expected performance discrepancies suggest that biases, indeed, may exist beyond the context of job performance issues alone. Further, certain personal characteristics such as age,
race, and appearance were shown to have biased performance appraisal processes. Gender variables, on the other hand, have resulted in ambiguous findings regarding bias effects on performance appraisal.

3. Contrary to the intended goals of performance appraisal, evidence exists that the process itself may adversely affect employee motivation, self-esteem, and productivity. Further, there is additional evidence that, even in cases where performance appraisal results in increased measures of motivation, little or no gains in actual performance were noted. More recent research has focused on underlying factors that may be more readily associated with expressed confidence in performance appraisal. Certain recurring themes have emerged throughout several recent studies as having a significant impact on the effectiveness of the process. These include the following: (a) frequency of communication between supervisor and subordinate; (b) opportunities for subordinates to express meaningful feedback; (c) confidence that development plans are relevant to professional growth; (d) indicators of trust between supervisor and subordinate as being of critical importance; and (e) employee perceptions that the process is genuinely focused on performance
development rather than indicative of a supervisor bias.

4. A related line of inquiry has examined the effects of the rating format and strategies on the overall effectiveness of performance appraisal processes. From this, the following outcomes are noted: (a) processes that allow for meaningful subordinate participation have been most closely related to increased levels of motivation, satisfaction, and productivity; (b) processes that include a component of evaluator training resulted in more accurate appraisals; (c) individualized evaluation processes have been found to work more effectively than standardized ones due to the unique characteristics of each higher education environment; and (d) there is evidence that reliability problems may exist with both self and peer ratings in multiple rater systems.

**Summary of Trust Theory/Research Literature Review**

1. Some general findings from recent literature have noted the following: (a) specific dyadic relationships rather than impersonal environmental factors provide a greater understanding of trust constructs; (b) only situational-specific trust
constructs have been found to predict behavioral outcomes; (c) specific attitudes, not general ones, are found to be related to behavioral effects associated with trust measures; and (d) the study of trust theory needs to be understood from a multidimensional set of variables.

2. From the "specific person" perspective, the following trust condition constructs have been proposed within the literature: (a) loyalty, (b) accessibility (mentally receptive to the ideas of others), (c) availability (being physically present), (d) predictability, (e) integrity, (f) motives, (g) consistency of behavior, (h) maintaining confidences, (i) evidence of competence, (j) interpersonal effectiveness, (k) business/organizational sense, and (l) good judgement.

3. Some evidence exists to indicate a preference ranking of these constructs both in upward (subordinate perspectives of trust conditions to be evident among superiors) and in downward (supervisor's perspectives of trust conditions to be evident among subordinates) directions. Accordingly, the following ranking was reported: (a) evidence of competence; (b) integrity; (c) consistency; (d) loyalty; and (e) openness.
4. Theories regarding conditions of trust are also found in the literature from the field of industrial sociology. "Low discretion syndrome" describes a phenomenon where management intentionally creates labor conditions where dependence on their workforce is minimized. As such, employees are placed into roles where they are provided minimum opportunity to exercise judgement, initiative or creativity. Differences in all levels of status and responsibility are exaggerated. Individuals within these low level roles attribute low levels of trust to management in general and to immediate supervisors in particular. From this comes the notion of "reciprocal distrust" where people who feel they are distrusted by management redirect those feelings by distrusting those in authority.

5. Evidence of low discretion syndrome is often manifested by the following organizational symptoms: (a) micromanagement; (b) employees generally characterized by management as having poor work ethic qualities; (c) disagreements handled through formal means such as collective bargaining and litigation as opposed to dialogue; and (d) consistent use of threats and sanctions as a means of influencing performance behaviors. Further, interpersonal relationships are characterized more in the form of an "economic
exchange" rather than in the form of a "social exchange."

6. "Economic exchange" relationships are characterized more by formal contracts and a quid pro quo tradeoff between services rendered and highly specific extrinsic rewards related to remuneration. Such relationships are prone to be both instrumental and divisive. "Social exchange" relationships are characterized by interpersonal behaviors that: (a) reflect a sense of personal obligation; (b) demonstrate an eagerness among individuals to provide support to one another; (c) reveal honest and genuine dialogue; and (d) communicate confidence in the competencies and ethics of others within the organization.

7. Yet another body of theory found within the organizational literature posits that constructs of trust are theoretically antithetical to constructs of fear. Within this framework, a trust-fear developmental stage theory dichotomy has been proposed. This theory is based on the occurrence of four sequential processes: (a) the achievement of self-awareness, self-acceptance, and self-trust; (b) the existence of a psychologically safe climate between two specific individuals; (c) an interpersonal context that is characteristically free from fear; and (d) the
realization of trusting interdependence between the individual and others within the environment.

8. Once all four stages are achieved, trusting relationships are likely to be characterized by the following indicators: (a) increased levels of motivation; (b) enhanced consciousness; (c) heightened perceptions; (d) greater emotionality or passion; (e) greater cognitive effectiveness; (f) action oriented behaviors; and (g) synergistic behaviors. Conversely, when these four stages are affected more by fear than by trust, these seven effects are hypothesized to be adversely impacted.

9. A useful framework for identifying symptoms of declining trust within an organizational context has been noted within the literature. Indicators of this phenomenon might include the following: (a) threats and punishment with little praise; (b) much, little, or no appreciation for work done; (c) "tearing down" behavior - self-esteem deflating; (d) public criticism; (e) consistent creation of fear; (f) no interest in input from employees; (g) leadership must always be correct; (f) favoritism; (g) indiscriminate terminations; (h) downward communication/none upward; (i) constant rejection of ideas; (j) treatment of subordinates as
unintelligent; (k) little respect for employees; and (l) employees are looked upon as pawns or objects.

Summary of Literature Review Pertaining to Independent Variables of Interest to this Study

This body of literature can be categorized into three general areas: (a) gender difference effects on performance ratings and related organizational behaviors; (b) hierarchal/positional status level effects on organizational leadership behaviors and performance ratings; and (c) length of association effects on level of supervisor attention to subordinates, performance appraisal ratings, and measures of interpersonal trust.

Gender Difference Effects on Performance Ratings and Related Organizational Behaviors

1. There is evidence from a recent study that subordinate perceptions of management attributes may well be as much a function of differences in organizational cultures and occupational content as opposed to differences based on gender alone.

2. Earlier studies regarding gender bias in performance appraisal have reported findings that were often contradictory.
3. A later study added the variable of clarity (or ambiguity) of evaluation criteria relative to gender bias in performance appraisal. In this analysis, the researchers found some evidence that antifemale gender bias only existed within the female subgroup and only when conditions of ambiguous criteria were present. When clear evaluation criteria conditions were present, no evidence of gender bias was noted within the female subgroup. Evidence of gender bias was absent from the male subgroups under both conditions of clear and ambiguous criteria.

Positional Status Level Effects on Organizational Behavior and Performance Ratings

There is a scarce body of literature regarding the effects of positional status on performance appraisal and organizational behavior.

1. Recent evidence was reported that positional status had little effect on specific leadership behaviors (as perceived by subordinates) or on performance appraisal outcomes. However, a minor trend pattern was noted to indicate that as positional status increased, so did enhanced evidence of two leadership measures: (a) individualized consideration; and (b) task orientation.
2. An earlier study reported evidence of a relationship that exists between increased positional status and management styles that are characteristically participative, collaborative, and nonautocratic.

**Length of Association Effects on Organizational Behavior, Performance Appraisal, and Interpersonal Trust**

Within the realm of length of association effects on interpersonal trust, two studies cited the following:

1. Evidence was reported in an earlier study that married couples scored higher on measures of love and trust than did premarital partners. However, the same study reported that when the unit of analysis was each individual, instead of a joint couple response, measures of the same dependent variables did not differ significantly between individuals in married couples as compared to individuals in premarital relationships.

2. A follow up study conducted several years later differentiated the marital subgroup to include newlyweds as 50% of the sample. Evidence from this analysis indicates that trust measures were strongly related to measures of love and self-disclosure for couples beyond the newlywed stage.
3. Evidence exists within the organizational literature that individuals within a work unit who had the same supervisor for 3 or more years received higher levels of leadership attention as well as higher performance appraisal ratings than did individuals with lesser lengths of association with their supervisors. Further, measures of these dependent variables increased with each increment of time (1 year, 2 year, and 3 year intervals). This same study also reported that these increased levels of supervisor attention and performance ratings, associated with length of association, occurred with individuals irrespective of group membership.

Conclusions from Literature Review

Although this literature review has been presented through three distinct thematic strands, it is essential that certain overarching relationships are identified as essential to our understanding of the phenomena under study in this analysis.

Thus, we may wish to consider that the outcomes of this study may have a twofold purpose as they relate to how a more sophisticated understanding of enhanced trust levels might allow for more effective performance
appraisal processes. First, and more obviously, these findings may provide guidance to both scholars and practitioners in their efforts to establish a more effective performance appraisal process within two year college student affairs units. Second, and possibly not as obvious, these findings may provide guidance to both scholars and practitioners in attempting to neutralize the profound negative side effects that performance appraisal has been demonstrated to have on motivation, self-esteem, and overall productivity.

Further, the existing body of literature has already informed us that performance appraisal processes are not conducted in a vacuum, free from the context of organizational climate factors. To understand relationships between trust, performance appraisal, and individual motivation, we must also become informed of the profound effects that organizational dynamics have in the overall process. This is particularly exacerbated within the idiosyncratic environments of higher education settings.

We are also informed, within the existing body of literature, that certain preexisting biases indeed exist which may provide major confounds to evaluator objectivity in conducting performance appraisal.
However, the scope of existing knowledge within this realm is limited. Heretofore, the evidence regarding the effects of gender bias is ambiguous and findings regarding the effects of positional status and length of association are somewhat exploratory.

Evidence from recent studies has reinforced the general rationale behind this study by pointing to certain highly valued factors within performance appraisal as expressed by subordinates. These include: (a) frequency of communication between supervisor and subordinate; (b) opportunities for subordinates to voice meaningful feedback; (c) confidence that development plans are relevant to professional growth; and (d) indicators of trust between supervisor. There is further evidence within the literature that evaluator training may be closely linked to reducing preexisting evaluator biases. An area of subsequent inquiry may be to examine how evaluator training may be related to the specific independent variables that are being addressed in the present study.

Last, within the realm of performance appraisal, certain outcome differences have been theorized regarding standardized versus individualized processes as well as outcome differences between conventional supervisor/subordinate processes versus multiple rater
systems. Comparisons between these processes may be of considerable value as objectives for future research concerned with examining interpersonal trust, employee motivation and self-esteem.

From the domain of literature associated with trust theory and research, we are guided into conducting an analysis which examines a multidimensional set of variables in a performance appraisal context on measures of interpersonal trust which are person-specific, situational-specific, and attitude specific. Within this context, we are provided with a workable framework of both stage theory as well as a set of grounded trust-theory constructs which are measurable in organizational settings. There is empirical evidence within the literature which provides an understanding of how certain types of these constructs may be of greater significance than other types of measures. Other trust theories have enabled us to understand how low trust syndromes have had profound adverse effects on overall organizational effectiveness and employee motivation. This research is further guided by an understanding of the conflicting interactive dynamics between levels of trust versus levels of fear. Given the emphasis on deemphasizing fear, which has emanated from the total quality
movement, knowledge of this trust-fear relationship has taken on significant interest within the context of organizational accountability and effectiveness. Certainly, this is a critical area of interest for the performance-appraisal context of this study.

Although research findings related to the power/status variables of interest are either conflicting or exploratory, we are made aware that certain organizational relationship qualities indeed may exist which may indicate a significant effect associated with either gender difference, positional status level, or length of association. For example, there is some evidence to indicate that female evaluators may be less inclined to demonstrate antifemale gender bias in performance appraisals when evaluation criteria are unambiguous. There are indications within the literature review that organizational climate factors may have greater significance than gender differences on subordinate perceptions of manager attributes. This may provide some guidance in understanding the effect of organizational climate as a possible intervening factor influencing the analysis of gender difference effects.

To date, little has been identified regarding the effects of positional status on measures of trust.
However, there is some rudimentary evidence that as hierarchal level increases, greater levels of management attention and task orientation are afforded to subordinates. Moreover, there is evidence that as hierarchal level increases, so do indications of a more collaborative and participative management style. These findings may also be taken into account as related or intervening variables as we examine the effects of positional status levels on measures of trust.

Although some exploratory research has indicated evidence that length of association has resulted in increased measures of trust, higher performance ratings and greater management attention, it is unclear how this variable may interact with the other two under consideration. Further, it is unclear how length of association may affect measures of trust in organizational settings in general and in two year college student affairs units in particular. Thus, the effects of this variable will still need to be understood with greater precision as it relates to the central question of this study.

Last, we find that areas of primary interest for the present study have been addressed in the literature from the perspective of organizational psychology.
performance appraisal, industrial sociology, behavioral psychology, gender psychology, trust theory, organizational management, and in higher education. What has been absent is any viable literature base which addresses issues of interpersonal trust, performance appraisal and the specific environment of two year college student affairs units. Accordingly, it is the intent of the present study to center its analysis in that specific organizational setting.
CHAPTER THREE

Design of the Study

The intent for this study was to examine how certain interpersonal relationship and organizational power/status conditions may be related to levels of trust indicated by two year college student affairs professionals of their performance appraisal evaluators.

Specifically, 10 interpersonal trust conditions were examined. These trust condition variables have been hypothesized to lead to subordinate perceptions of overall trust in their performance evaluators. These variables, derived from a content-based theory (Butler, 1991), are as follows: (a) fairness, (b) loyalty, (c) receptivity, (d) promise fulfillment, (e) openness, (f) competence, (g) consistency, (h) integrity, (i) discreetness, and (j) availability.

Further, the relationship of the following organizational power/status variables to trust conditions was investigated as well: (a) gender differences (or similarities) among subjects (b) gender differences (or similarities) between subjects and
evaluators, (c) ethnic differences (or similarities) among subjects, (d) ethnic differences (or similarities) between subordinates and evaluators, (e) time duration of professional association between subordinates and evaluators, (f) positional status level differences between subordinates and evaluators, (g) current professional status classifications, (h) tenure status classifications (i) time duration at current institution for subordinates (j) time duration within current position for subordinates, and (k) time duration within the student affairs profession for subordinates.

A survey questionnaire was used as the means of collecting data on all variables. All 10 scales included in the Conditions of Trust Inventory (Butler, 1992) was used as the basis for collecting data on the conditions of trust variables. A more detailed discussion of the psychometric properties of this instrument is addressed later in this chapter.

Data used for the organizational power/status variables were collected from subject responses to the survey questionnaire.

The consolidated questionnaire was thus comprised of three components: (a) The Conditions of Trust Inventory (Butler, 1992); (b) institutional data; and
(c) personal/demographic data. A specimen copy of the
principle survey instrument is located in Appendix A.

All variables are described in the following
subsection.

Description of Variables

Three categories of variables were examined within
this investigation. The first grouping includes the
contextual variables (perceived relevance of
performance appraisal to subject's actual duties;
purposes of performance appraisal at respective
institution; performance appraisal rating form
effectiveness at respective institution; frequency of
communication between subordinate and evaluator; and
collective bargaining status of respective
institution). The second grouping includes the
organizational power/status variables: (gender,
etnicity, length of association, positional status
level differences, professional status categories, and
tenure status categories). The third grouping includes
the 11 variables associated with organizational
conditions of trust found in the measurement
instrument.
Below is a complete listing of variables used in this investigation. A description of the measurement methods for each is included.

**Contextual Variables**

**Subject Perceptions of Performance Appraisal Feedback as Being Taken Seriously by Evaluator**

This variable measures the subject’s perception of how the performance appraisal process, practiced at the respective institution, reflects an actual two way dialogue in which subordinate feedback is given satisfactory attention and is well understood by the evaluator. A Likert-type rating format was used for this item using scores of 1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Disagree; 4 = Strongly disagree; and 5 = Don’t know. **Note that lower rating scores indicated stronger responses (e.g. 1 = Strongly agree).**

**Relevance of Performance Appraisal to Actual Job Responsibilities**

This variable measures the subject’s perception of how the performance appraisal process, practiced at the respective institution, can be suited to the specific job duties and responsibilities being evaluated. A Likert-type rating format was used for this item using scores of 1 =
Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Disagree; 4 = Strongly disagree; and 5 = Don’t know. **Note that lower rating scores indicated stronger responses (e.g. 1 = Strongly agree).**

**Purposes of Performance Appraisal at Respective Institution**

This variable measures subject perceptions of how performance appraisal practices are intended to be used, at the respective institution, relative to three areas of consideration: (a) used to enhance professional development; (b) used to determine salary issues; and (c) used to determine job promotion issues. A Likert-type rating format was used for this item using scores of 1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Disagree; 4 = Strongly disagree; and 5 = Don’t know. **Note that lower rating scores indicated stronger responses (e.g. 1 = Strongly agree).**

**Performance Appraisal Rating Form Effectiveness at Respective Institution**

This variable measures subject perceptions of how well the performance appraisal rating form, at the respective institution, is utilized regarding six areas of consideration: (a) used as an effective tool overall; (b) intended mainly to serve administrative purposes; (c) intended mainly to enhance professional development; (d) allows evaluator opportunity to provide relevant professional feedback; (e) actually serves administrative (more so than professional development) purposes; and (f)
actually serves professional development purposes. A Likert-type rating format was used for this item using scores of 1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Disagree; 4 = Strongly disagree; and 5 = Don’t know. Note that lower rating scores indicated stronger responses (e.g. 1 = Strongly agree).

Frequency of Communication between Subject and Evaluator

This variable measures subject perceptions of how often dialogue occurs between the evaluator and him/herself. A Likert-type rating format was used for this item using scores of 1 = Ongoing and regularly (daily or weekly); 2 = Periodically (monthly); 3 = Infrequently (two to four times per year); 4 = Only during performance review.

Collective Bargaining Status of Institution

This variable measures subject perceptions of approximate percentage of union membership, among student affairs colleagues present at respective institution. A Likert-type rating format was used for this item using scores of 1 = 100% membership (agency shop); 2 = More than 90% membership; 3 = Majority membership; and 4 = No representation at all (nonunion institution).
Power/Status Organizational Variables

Gender

This is a categorical variable in which males receive a code of one and females receive a code of two. Information was obtained from data reported by respondents on the survey questionnaire. Subjects responded to two "gender" items on the questionnaire: one pertaining to themselves and the other pertaining to the gender of their evaluators.

Ethnicity

This is a categorical variable in which Caucasians (non-Hispanic) receive a code of one, African-Americans (non-Hispanic) receive a code of two, Hispanics receive a code of three, and "other" receives a code of four. Information was obtained from data reported by respondents on the survey questionnaire. Subjects responded to two "ethnicity" items on the questionnaire: one pertaining to themselves and the other pertaining to the ethnicity of their evaluators.

Length of Association

This variable measures the specified time duration in which the respondent reports to have had a professional association, or relationship, with his identified performance appraisal evaluator. "Length of association" was used as a continuous variable in correlation studies.
Positional Status Level Differences

This variable measures the precise status level difference, within the reported organizational unit, between the respondent and performance evaluator. "Positional Status Level Difference" was reported as a categorical variable with the following coding classification: (a) zero for no status differences (i.e., peer evaluations); (b) one for a one status level difference (i.e., counseling director evaluating a counselor); (c) two for a two status level difference (i.e., associate dean evaluating a counselor, with a counseling director or coordinator in a nonevaluative role); and (d) three for a three status level difference (i.e., a dean evaluating a counselor, with an associate dean and counseling coordinator in a nonevaluative role). Data were obtained from information reported by the respondent on the survey questionnaire.

Professional Status Classification

This is a categorical variable designating four possible personnel classifications for subjects: 1 = faculty status; 2 = midlevel management status; 3 = professional staff status (e.g., counselor); and 4 = "other." Further, subjects responded to a second related variable regarding the personnel classification status of their performance evaluators: ï =
senior/executive level; 2 = midlevel management status; 3 = faculty status; and 4 = other.

**Tenure Status Classification**

This is a categorical variable coded with a score of one for a yes response and a score of two for a no response regarding the tenure status of subjects.

**Conditions of Trust**

Organizational conditions associated with levels of interpersonal trust were measured by the 11 variable subscales of the *Conditions of Trust Inventory* (Butler, 1992). Each subscale contains four items, each of which is rated on a five point Likert-type scale: 1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Moderately agree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Moderately disagree; and 5 = Strongly disagree. **Note that the lower numerical ratings signified stronger trust measures whereas higher numerical ratings signified weaker trust measures.**

Ten of these subscales measured the subordinate’s perception of his/her evaluator as it related to each of the trust condition variables. One additional subscale was used as a measure of the subordinate’s perception of his/her evaluator as it related to overall trust in that specific individual when compared
to general conditions of trust. The 10 trust condition
variables are described below:

**Availability**

The performance evaluator's tendency to become
physically present when needed.

**Competence**

The perceived job skills and knowledge of the
performance evaluator.

**Consistency**

The degree to which the subordinate views the
performance evaluator as being reliable and
predictable.

**Openness**

The performance evaluator's ability and
inclination to level and express ideas freely.

**Promise Fulfillment**

A perception of the performance evaluator's
ability to follow through on stated commitments.

**Receptivity**

The performance evaluator's inclination to listen
and understand ideas, problems and issues of others.

**Discreetness**

The ability of the performance evaluator to
consistently keep and maintain confidences.
Fairness
The performance evaluator’s inclination to treat his staff equitably.

Integrity
The performance evaluator’s level of honesty and moral character.

Loyalty
A measure of the performance evaluator’s inclination to be consistently protective.

Instrumentation

As noted above, the measurement instrument used to survey subject perceptions of organizational conditions of trust was the Conditions of Trust Inventory (Butler, 1992).

The 10 conditions of trust variable subscales used on this instrument are derived from a content theory developed by Butler (1991) which, in turn, is based on two previous studies (Gabarro, 1978; Jennings, 1971) and 84 extensive interviews with managers. A content analysis from these interviews was developed to establish those constructs identified as the 10 trust conditions.
Three independent raters were able to identify identical content-based categories which formed the basis of the 10 trust condition constructs. The coefficients of interrater consistency for all three raters were .78, .83, and .85 (Butler, 1991).

Additionally, the 10 identified scales were evaluated and selected after an iterative series of confirmatory analyses which used Jackson’s four principles of scale construction and validation (1984) as the basis for analysis: (a) a theoretically based definition; (b) reliability and homogeneity; (c) suppression of response bias; and (d) convergent and discriminant validity (Jackson).

A confirmatory factor test for content validity indicated strong evidence of factor homogeneity and separation for all CTI scales. In this factor test, 10 a priori factors tapped into nine different conditions of trust. Almost every item loaded with its respective conceptual scale pairing. Of the total variance indicated in item scores, 73.5% is attributable to the nine trust condition constructs. Further, these a priori factors had high alphas and test-retest reliabilities.

Results of the factor test had validated conditions found by the 84 interviews and previous
studies. Nine of these 10 a priori factors had a small range of eigenvalues (from 20.8 to 10.0) in a post rotation analysis, confirming the hypothesized 10 conditions of trust.

Convergent validity was measured by having 129 of the 380 management students (used for the factor analysis) complete three different trust level inventories, including the CTI. Correlations between the CTI and a second inventory (SITS) resulted in a .88 on the "Overall Trust" factor. The "Reliableness" factor on the SITS correlated .73 with the "Promise Fulfillment" factor on the CTI. Also, a sampled group of machine operators in a manufacturing plant had a .74 correlation on the "Receptivity" factor of the CTI with the Communications Responsiveness Scale total score (Hawkins, Penley, & Peterson, 1981).

Discriminant validity was determined by demonstrating weak correlations between the CTI trust condition scores and qualities of trust constructs that have previously been demonstrated to be theoretically and empirically weakly or negatively related. Weak positive correlations of trust with the following six variables have been noted in previous research (Butler, 1983, 1986; Frost, Stimpson & Maughan, 1978; Heretick, 1984; Rotter, 1966, 1967; Wrightsman, 1964): (a) self-
esteem; (b) social desirability; (c) expressed affection; (d) wanted affection; (e) expressed inclusion; and (f) wanted inclusion. Further, these same studies noted negative correlations between trust constructs and the following three variables: (a) external locus of control; (b) expressed control; and (c) wanted control. Last, strong negative correlations between trust constructs and variables described as "Machiavellianism" and "Dogmatism" were noted in these studies as well.

Correlation studies which measured construct validity were all significant at the .001 alpha level when CTI scores were correlated with observer ratings of trust between pairs of individuals when either high trust or low-trust conditions were encouraged prior to a trust-dependent problem-solving exercise involving these individuals. Further, correlations between CTI scores and observer ratings of disclosure behavior with the same pairs of individuals in the same role playing exercise were significant at the .05 alpha level. Using t tests to compare CTI mean scores of the high and low trust condition exercises, results were significant at the .0001 level.

Last, 10 trust condition scores of 166 sampled managers were correlated with corresponding scores of
paired subordinates were all significant at the .05 alpha level (with the exception of "availability" - .06).

Sample for the Study

The sample for this study was derived from a cross section of student affairs professionals employed at each of the 19 public community colleges in a mid-Atlantic state. The diverse nature of these institutions effectively represents demographic environments similar to those found in the larger society as a whole.

Sampling selection of student affairs professionals employed at these institutions was conducted as follows:

1. In those professional assignments where only one position was indicated, the incumbent individual was surveyed within each respective institution. Examples of such positions include: Financial Aid Director, Admissions Director, Enrollment Services Director (or Registrar), Counseling Director, Activities Director, Special Population Program Director, Advisement Center Director, and Athletic Director.
2. In those professional assignments that are occupied by multiple incumbents, individuals were identified randomly in the following way: (a) three institutional counselors per institution; (b) three academic advisors per institution; (c) two special program counselors per institution; (d) two financial aid advisors per institution; and (e) five staff members who might represent any one or combination of offices representative of intercollegiate athletics, student activities, admissions, and enrollment services.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission

Formal written approval to use the CTI (Butler, 1992) was granted by its author, Dr. John K. Butler Jr. A copy of Dr. Butler's authorization letter can be found in Appendix B.
Data Collection

Information pertaining to respondent personal data, as well as responses to variable items, were reported on the survey questionnaire (Appendix A).

A cover letter (Appendix C) and specimen copy of the survey instrument (Appendix A) was sent to each chief student affairs officer in each of the targeted two year institutions. Additionally, a formal presentation to the each of the two year college Dean of Students was made to follow up on the written request letter to administer the survey to the identified subjects. A written assurance of confidentiality was attached to the cover letter (Appendix D). Visitations to each targeted site was scheduled through the chief student affairs officers of each of those institutions. Surveys were administered to the selected group of subjects on site. Explicit step by step directions (Appendix E) were read from a script at each survey site for the purpose of creating consistency in survey conditions among target sites. Additionally, assurances of confidentiality were read to all subjects from a prepared text.

Last, documentation from the University "Institutional Review Board" was distributed to each
subject and chief student affairs officer for purposes of providing full assurance that all ethical standards, protocol, and confidentiality would be rigorously maintained (Appendix F).

Methods of Analysis

All data elements were coded for computer analysis using the Number Cruncher Statistical System, Version 5.03 (Hintze, 1990) and Number Cruncher Statistical System, Version 5.3 - Advanced Statistics (Hintze, 1992). All statistical analysis were conducted on an IBM compatible 386 personal computer. An alpha level of .05 was used in all statistical analyses throughout the study.

Contextual Data

Certain data were collected for purposes of providing a contextual understanding of the organizational environments under study. These data were reported, in text, in the form of frequency percentages. These variables are listed as follows: (a) "Subject perceptions of performance appraisal practices at their institutions;" (b) "Subject
perceptions of performance appraisal purposes at their institutions;" (c) "Subject perceptions of performance appraisal rating form effectiveness at their institutions;" (d) "Frequency of communication between subjects and evaluators;" and (e) "Collective bargaining status of institutions." Commentary regarding the relevance of these data to the overall findings of this study are discussed in Chapter Five.

Demographic Data

Descriptive data were reported regarding the following variables: (a) demographic variables of gender and ethnicity (subjects and their evaluators); (b) time duration variables (years in position, years with institution, years in student affairs, and years associated with evaluators); and (c) certain institutional power/status variables (tenure track status, and professional status of subjects and their evaluators). Numbers and percentages of subjects for each response category associated with all of these categorical variables were reported both in text and on data tables. Data for the time duration continuous variables were reported in the form of means, standard deviations, minimums and maximums.
Conditions of Trust

Descriptive Data and Correlations

Average scores and standard deviations for each of the 11 trust condition subscales (including "overall trust") were reported in both in text as well as in a data table. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to describe statistical relationships between all 11 trust condition variables. These were also presented both in text and in a data table correlation matrix.

Factor Analysis

A factor analysis, using a Varimax rotation, was used with the 10 trust condition variables (excluding "overall trust"). The purpose of utilizing factor analysis was threefold: (a) to address potential multicollinearity with independent variables; (b) to discern how independent variables may differ (in accordance with central question of investigation); and (c) to discern potential underlying factor themes from original independent variables.

Retained factors from Factor Analysis were to be used as predictor variables on the "overall trust" dependent variable. The purpose of this analysis was to determine the extent to which the "overall trust"
dependent variable was accounted for by any one, or combination, of trust condition factors.

Unfortunately, the 10 subscales produced a single factor solution so that subsequent analyses were no longer feasible.

**Relationship of Power/Status**

**Variables to Conditions of Trust**

**Analysis of Variance**

One way ANOVAs were conducted with the following categorical independent variables using "overall trust" as the dependent in all cases: (a) Positional Status Level Differences; (b) Tenure Status Differences; (c) Professional Status Differences (of subjects) and (d) Professional Status Differences (subjects reporting status of their evaluators). Subjects were compared on each category for each of these variables. These data are presented both in text and in data tables. Additional descriptive data were offered for those independent variables, within this grouping, found to be significant. As such, number of respondents, mean scores and standard error, for significant ANOVA variables, on the "overall trust" subscale, were reported. Further, "effect" measures were reported for
those independent variables, within this grouping, found to be significant as well.

Two two-way ANOVAs examined gender and ethnic differences both among subjects themselves and among subjects based on their evaluators' gender or ethnic status using "overall trust" as the dependent measure. In both of these ANOVAs, interactions between subjects' own gender (or ethnicity) and those of their evaluators were examined as well, again using "overall trust" as the dependent variable.

**Correlation Analysis**

Four continuous variables, within this area of the investigation, were examined using Pearson correlation coefficients. Each of these four variables were examined relative to one another and in relation to the "overall trust" variable. Accordingly, these time duration variables were as follows: (a) length of professional association with evaluator; (b) time duration within current position; (c) time duration within current institution; and (d) time duration within student affairs profession. Data were reported within text and in data table using a correlation matrix.
Differences in Trust Conditions

Based on Differences in Power/Status Variables

Power/status variables found to be significant, on measures of "overall trust," were examined using regression analysis with "overall trust" as the dependent variable again. A simple linear regression was used to examine the extent to which "overall trust" was attributable to each significant power/status variable.
CHAPTER FOUR

Findings

The findings reported in this chapter address the three central concerns related to the purposes of this study:

1. The identification of specified interpersonal factors which two year college student affairs professionals associate with perceptions of trust pertaining to their performance evaluators.

2. How certain organizational power/status variables may be related to these trust conditions.

3. How certain trust conditions may differ depending on differences found in any of these power/status variables.

Subject responses were obtained entirely from data reported on the survey questionnaire (Appendix A). Two categories of variables were examined therein: (a) 10 subscales related to "Conditions of Trust" and one subscale measuring "overall trust" (Butler, 1992) and (b) variables pertaining to specific power/status conditions found within the subordinate-evaluator relationship.
Current Sample

Questionnaires were administered on site at 17 of the 19 community colleges in a mid-Atlantic state. Subjects at the two other institutions received and returned their questionnaires through the mail. In all cases, every effort was made to avoid the involvement of internal institutional personnel in the distribution and collection of questionnaires so as to address any perceptions of potential bias or confidentiality exposure.

In all, 355 student affairs professionals, affiliated with these 19 institutions during the Spring 1995 term, were targeted as subjects. Of these, 204 (57%) were returned as the usable questionnaires for this study. Of the 151 nonrespondents (43%), most had experienced some type of schedule conflict or absence during the time the questionnaire was administered. Two individuals exercised their prerogative to decline taking the questionnaire.

Demographic Characteristics

Of the 204 respondents, the majority were Caucasian (65%), almost one-fourth were African-American (23%), nearly 10% were Hispanic, and the remaining 2.5% were comprised of individuals identifying themselves in the "other" ethnic
category. As shown on Table 1, reported ethnicity of subjects and evaluators was fairly comparable.

Almost two-thirds of the respondents were females (62%) whereas the gender majority of their evaluators was identified as male (55%). Three subjects declined to respond to the gender self-identification item. Four declined to respond to the gender evaluator-identification item. Both ethnic and gender data are presented in Table 1.

Institutional and Professional Characteristics

The average time durations reported by subjects as being affiliated with their current positions, institutions, profession and their evaluators are as follows: (a) 7.5 years in current position; (b) nearly 10.5 years employed at current institution; (c) nearly 12 years in the student affairs profession; and (d) approximately 6.5 years association with current evaluator. Nearly 85% of subjects were in a non-tenure track position.

The professional status held by subjects were reported as follows: (a) faculty (17%); (b) mid-level administrator (33%); (c) professional status such as counselors (43%); and "other" (7%). The professional status held by their evaluators were reported as follows: (a) senior or executive administration (46%); (b) mid-level administration (49%); faculty (4%); "other" (1%). Professional and institutional status categories are noted in Table 2.
Table 1

Number of Subjects and their Evaluators Classified by Ethnicity, Gender and Professional Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th></th>
<th>Their Evaluators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-Am.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Level</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Exec</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Numbers for Subjects Classified by Professional and Institutional Status Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Duration: Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Position</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Institution</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Student Affairs</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluator</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure Track Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contextual Data

Performance Appraisal Practices

Over three quarters of the respondents (78%) indicated that performance appraisal feedback of subjects was taken seriously by evaluators. Another strong frequency of responses (68%) indicated that the performance appraisal processes practiced at surveyed institutions were "highly relevant" to actual job duties.

Performance Appraisal Purposes

About two-thirds of the subjects considered performance appraisal purposes, at their respective institutions, to be mainly used for the enhancement of professional development (64%). A relative minority indicated that performance appraisal purposes at their institutions were intended for either: (a) salary (21%) or (b) job promotion considerations (36%).

Performance Appraisal Rating Form Effectiveness

Performance appraisal rating forms were seen as: (a) mainly designed to serve administrative purposes (82%), (b) allowing evaluator to provide effective feedback (72%), and (c) effectively serving administrative purposes (74%). Additionally, less than half the respondents saw them as being: (a) an effective tool overall (46%); (b) designed to
promote professional development (42%); and (c) effectively serving professional development purposes (45%).

Frequency of Communication Between Subjects and Evaluators

A vast majority of subjects reported that the frequency of communication with their evaluators occurs "ongoing and regularly" - i.e., daily or weekly (88%).

Collective Bargaining Status of Institutions

Last, it is abundantly clear that most subjects were likely to work in a unionized environment. Ninety-one percent work in environments in which at least 50% of all student affairs professionals are members of collective bargaining organizations. Sixty-seven percent work in institutions in which at least 90% of all student affairs professionals are members of a collective bargaining organizations. This is a particularly interesting statistic when considering that 34% of student affairs subjects in this study identified themselves as being midlevel management.

Conditions of Trust

Scores in all 11 subscales from the CTI were mainly found in the upper end of the distribution (i.e., those scores indicating a highly favorable perception of performance evaluators along all variables). For example,
on the "availability" subscale, 62% of all subjects (n=204) responded with "strongly agree" and 26% responded with "moderately agree" scores. Similar response rates were noted for the other ten subscales as well, including the "overall trust" variable. For example, on the "competence" subscale, 56% of all subjects (n=204) responded with "strongly agree" and 25.5% responded with "moderately agree."

Further, the distribution of scores varied among subscales on both the "strongly agree" and "moderately agree" responses. Four of the eleven subscales indicated "strongly agree" frequencies in excess of 50%: "availability" (61%); "competence" (56%); "fairness" (53%); and "receptivity" (53%). Five other subscales had "strongly agree" frequencies between 40% and 50%: "overall trust" (48%); "discreetness" (47%); "promise fulfillment" (45%); "integrity" (43%); and "consistency" (41%). The remaining two subscales indicate "strongly agree" frequencies below 40%: "loyalty" (39%) and "openness" (33%).

Table 3 contains a comparison of means, standard deviations, and correlations for each of these eleven subscales. As noted, all subscales consistently reflect positive scores with the "availability" subscale indicating the highest mean score (1.73) and the "consistency" subscale reflecting the lowest (2.41). Consistently, the magnitude
Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations, by Subscale, for the Conditions of Trust Inventory

(N = 204)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Availability</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Competence</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consistency</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discreetness</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fairness</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Integrity</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Loyalty</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Openness</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promise Fulfil</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Receptivity</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Overall Trust</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: From 1 = SA to 5 = SD, where a lower score indicates greater trust.
of the correlation coefficients were strong. With the exception of the "availability" subscale (r=.57), the nine other subscales were highly correlated with the "overall trust" subscale with coefficients ranging from .76 ("discreetness") on the lower end to .87 ("integrity") on the upper end. Further, all 11 subscales were highly correlated with one another.

The three subscales with the highest coefficients related to the "overall trust" variable were "integrity" (r=.87), "loyalty" (r=.84), and "fairness" (r=.83).

Common Factors in 10 Conditions of Trust

Data presented in Table 3 indicate high correlations across all 10 trust condition variables. The existence of these significant correlations presents three issues which would support the use of a factor analysis:

1. The likely presence of multivariate linearity, where information from original independent variables may be redundant with one another, would make a regression analysis of these variables suspect.

2. A central question in this study deals with the issue of whether conditions leading to interpersonal trust differ depending on institutional, demographic, or personal
relationship qualities. Given the high correlations of the
10 trust condition variables, an alternative means of
reconfiguring independent variables becomes essential so
that an examination of how they may differ becomes possible.

3. Through the use of factor analysis, several
underlying factor themes can be identified from the original
independent variables. This may lead to a richer
understanding of the phenomena being investigated.

Unfortunately, a factor analysis procedure, using
principal components extraction and Varimax rotation,
produced a one factor solution. This one factor accounted
for 71% of total variance for the original 10 trust
conditions.

**Relationship of Power/Status Variables**

**to Overall Trust**

One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) were computed on
the following categorical variables: (a) positional level
differences; (b) tenure status differences; and (c)
professional status differences. These data are presented
in Table 4.

Significant differences were found among positional
status levels relative to subject ratings of "overall
trust," (F = 3.00, p < .05). This was the only comparison
Table 4

One-Way Analysis of Variance Results for Institutional and Demographic Categorical Variables on Ratings of "Overall Trust"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS Bet</th>
<th>MS Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position Level Differences:Subjects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status:Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Status:Subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects Compared by Their Evaluators' Professional Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS Bet</th>
<th>MS Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Bold/underlined notation for significance

2. Comparison categories for each variable:
   a. Status level differences (0,1,2, and 3 level differences)
   b. Tenure status (yes/no)
   c. Professional status/subjects (faculty, midlevel, professional)*
   d. Professional status/evaluators (senior/exec, midlevel)**

* Inadequate sample size resulted in omission of "other" category

** Inadequate sample size resulted in omission of "faculty" and "other" categories
in this section found to be significant. Table 5 shows that higher ratings of average "overall trust" were indicated by subjects who were separated by only one positional level (2.04) from their evaluators than those who were separated by two levels (2.65). However, the small number of respondents found in the two extreme categories (0 and 3 status level differences) can create sample size discrepancies which can cast doubt about conclusions drawn from these ANOVA data.

Thus, a t-test was conducted which compared subject ratings of their evaluators on measures of overall trust using the two categories of 1 and 2 positional level differences. Consistent with the ANOVA, results from this t-test were significant. These data are presented in Table 6.

Two-way ANOVAs were conducted on the ethnicity and gender variables. These data are presented in Table 7.

Correlation Between Overall Trust and Time Variables

Table 8 presents correlations for overall trust and four variables pertaining to various time durations affecting the professional experiences of subjects: (a) length of professional association with evaluator; (b) time
Table 5

**Positional Status Difference Variable: Means, Standard Error and Effects for Each Response Category Using Subjects' Ratings of Overall Trust Regarding Their Evaluators - ANOVA Significant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positional Status Difference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Level</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Levels</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Levels</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: From 1 = SA to 5 = SD, where a lower score indicates greater trust.
Table 6

 t-Test Results for "Positional Status Difference" Variable Comparing Subjects Separated by One or Two Levels from Their Supervisors on Overall Trust Ratings of Their Evaluators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positional Status Difference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Level Difference</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Level Difference</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 185

T Value = 2.81

P = .005
Table 7

Two-Way ANOVA Results by Gender and Ethnicity on Ratings of Overall Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS Bet</th>
<th>MS Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of Subjects (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Subjects Using Evaluator Ethnicity (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Subjects Own Ethnicity X Subjects Identified by Evaluator Ethnicity (A X B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Subjects (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Subjects Using Evaluator Gender (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: Subjects Own Gender X Subjects Identified by Evaluator Gender (A X B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Correlation Coefficients for Time Duration Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall Trust</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>~ .07</td>
<td>- .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Length of Association with Evaluator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time in Current Position</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time at Current Institution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time in Student Affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant coefficients (p < .01) are underlined and in bold type.
duration within current position; (c) time duration at current institution; and (d) time duration within the student affairs profession.

These four variables were moderately related to each other (r’s = .49 to .67), but none was related to overall trust.

This indicated that the time spans in which student affairs professionals have been (a) associated with their evaluators, (b) within their current positions, (c) within their current institutions, and (d) within the field of college student affairs work, are related to one another. These data further suggested that there is little or no relationship between any of these professional experience time indicators and the overall trust felt for evaluators.

Differences in Trust Conditions Based on Differences in Power/Status Variables

The only institutional variable found to be significant, relative to ratings of "overall trust," was "positional status level difference" when using both an ANOVA and a t-Test. Both revealed that subjects who were only one positional level removed from their evaluators (e.g., counselors and counseling directors) had a tendency to rate their performance evaluators higher on average.
levels of "overall trust" than did individuals who were two levels removed (e.g. counselors and deans).

On the basis of this one significant finding, a simple regression was conducted to discern the predictive effects, if any, the "positional status level difference" variable might have on subject ratings on the "overall trust" variable. The effects of the "positional status difference" variable on subject ratings of "overall trust" were not significant (p > .05). Only 1% of the total variance noted in the "overall trust" variable was attributable to the presence of the "positional status level difference" independent variable (Adjusted R-sqr = .01). Results of this analysis are presented in Table 9.

Summary of Relevant Findings

A listing of relevant findings resulting from this investigation is cited below.

1. The majority of student affairs professionals were female (62%) whereas the majority of their evaluators were male (55%).

2. All ten "trust condition" variables were highly correlated with one another and with the "overall trust" variable. A Factor analysis, using a Varimax rotation, yielded high communality measures for all ten trust
Table 9

Regression Analysis for the Relationship Between Positional Status Level Differences and Overall Trust

N = 204

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>R-Sqr</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positional Status Level Differences</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Sqr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = Standardized Regression Coefficients
condition variables (nine were above .66 and one was above .50). One factor accounted for more than 71% of total variance of the original 10 "trust condition" variables.

3. Subjects were compared on ratings of their evaluators average "overall trust" on the basis of certain power/status variables. Only the "positional status level difference" variable was found to be significant in both an ANOVA and t-Test. In this case, higher ratings of average "overall trust" were indicated by subjects who were separated by only one positional level from their evaluators than those who were separated by two levels.

4. Differences among trust conditions, based on differences among power/status variables, could not be determined based on the absence of significance found among all but one of the latter. In the case of the one significant power/status variable (positional status level differences), a simple regression analysis did not yield evidence of any predictive effects on subject ratings of their evaluators on measures of overall trust.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary

A review of the literature has yielded four arguments which serve as the driving forces behind the need for this investigation:

1. Performance appraisal practices in higher education, in general, and in the two year college student affairs sector in particular, have historically failed to achieve their objectives (Cavender, 1990; Blackburn & Pitney, 1988; Creamer, 1986).

2. Many conventional performance appraisal practices not only are ineffective, but may actually create adverse consequences to employee motivation and productivity (Meyer, 1975; Meyer, Kay, and French, 1965; Pearce & Porter, 1986; Taylor, Fisher & Ilgin, 1984).

3. There is empirical evidence that, "level of interpersonal trust," between practitioner and evaluator, has a more profound effect on subordinate perceptions of fairness in performance appraisal practices than any number of other factors (Fulk, Brief, & Barr, 1985).

4. A body of both theoretical and empirical evidence has heretofore identified several useful trust constructs which could serve as valid predictor variables for the

Thus, the logic to be followed in this investigation was built on the following assumptions:

1. Specific trust factors, reported by two year college student affairs professionals of their evaluators, can be empirically identified. These can be associated with the interpersonal relationship qualities or certain power/status influences (e.g. time duration associated with evaluators, positional status level differences, gender, ethnicity, etc.).

2. Evidence of such findings can lead both scholars and practitioners toward the development of more effective performance appraisal strategies, within the two year college student affairs sector, which, heretofore, has largely eluded this population.

3. The current emphasis on both institutional effectiveness and professional accountability makes such an initiative increasingly important.

Hence, the intent of this investigation was to answer three questions:

1. For the two year college student affairs professional, what are the organizational conditions which lead them to trust their performance evaluators?
2. Power differences between these practitioners and their evaluators may be examined by considering the following variables: (a) time duration of their professional association; (b) the defined level of positional status levels between them; (c) their gender differences (or similarities); (d) their ethnic differences (or similarities); (e) their current professional status; (f) their current tenure (or lack of) status; and (g) time duration at the current institution, within current position, and within the student affairs profession. How are these variables related to conditions of trust as reported by subordinates regarding their evaluators?

3. Do conditions leading to interpersonal trust differ based on differences in any of the variables in question two?

The sample for this investigation was derived from a cross section of student affairs professionals employed at each of the 19 public community colleges in a Mid-Atlantic state. The highly diverse nature of these institutions effectively represent demographic environments similar to those found in the larger society as a whole.

Subject data were obtained using a survey questionnaire administered on site by the investigator. Three broad categories of data, reported by subjects of their evaluators, were obtained: (a) interpersonal relationship
trust conditions (between subject and evaluator) using the 11 subscales of the *Conditions of Trust Inventory* (Butler, 1992); (b) institutional variables pertaining to subjects' job status and relationship to evaluator; and (c) personal demographic status of subjects and their evaluators.

Preliminary frequency demographic data were obtained from the questionnaire instrument for the purpose of examining numbers and percentages of subjects, and their evaluators, on the basis of their gender and ethnic identities. Similar frequency data were obtained from questionnaires for the purpose of examining institutional professional status of subjects, and their evaluators, on the basis of tenure and job classification. The time duration variables, found both within the "Institutional" and the "Demographic" sections of the questionnaire, were first examined on the basis of descriptive data in the form of means and standard deviations.

Subject ratings of their evaluators on the 11 "Conditions of Trust" subscales (Butler, 1991) were first examined on the basis of descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) as well as with the use of a Pearson Correlation Coefficient matrix.

High correlation coefficients among all 10 trust condition variables had the potential of presenting problems of multicollinearity. To be able to address the research
question having to do with how conditions leading to interpersonal trust differ depending on differences in any of the institutional/demographic variables, it was first necessary to consider how trust conditions might differ simply among themselves. High correlation coefficients among all 10 of these variables would have precluded an the ability to address this question. This problem, coupled with the multicollinearity issue, led to the use of a factor analysis used on the 10 "trust condition" variables.

Unfortunately, the factor analysis yielded a single factor solution in which one factor accounted for 71% of the total variance found in all 10 trust conditions. This finding precluded any further analysis which would have been based on any distinctive meaning attributable to a set of trust condition factors.

To then examine the relationship of these power/status variables to overall trust, a set of one-way ANOVAs and a set of two-way ANOVAs were analyzed which examined how groups of subjects, identified by either institutional job status characteristics or by personal demographic variables, differed from one another based on ratings of their evaluators on measures of "overall trust." The set of one-way ANOVAs compared different groups of subjects on this dependent variable using the following four categorical independent variables: (a) tenure status (yes/no), (b) job
classification for themselves, (c) job classifications of
their evaluators, and (d) positional status level
differences between themselves and their evaluators. The
set of two way ANOVAs compared different groups of subjects
on this dependent variable using the following categorical
demographic variables: (a) subject ethnicity; (b) subjects
compared by evaluator ethnicity; (c) interaction of subjects
ethnicity with subjects compared by evaluator ethnicity; (d)
subject gender; (e) subjects compared by evaluator gender;
(f) interaction of subjects gender with subjects compared by
evaluator gender. Among these sets of both one-way and two
way ANOVAs, only the comparison of subjects on the basis of
positional status differences was significant \(p < .05\).

Relationships of demographic continuous variables were
examined, both with one another and with the "overall trust"
variable, using Pearson Correlation Coefficients. These
were the time duration variables which examined: (a) length
of professional association with performance evaluator; (b)
time within current institution; (c) time in current
position; and (d) time within student affairs profession.
Although some significance was found among some of the time
duration variables with one another, extremely low
correlations were found between each time duration variable
and the "overall trust" variable.
As the only power/status variable found to be significant in an ANOVA, the "positional status level difference" variable was further examined through the use of a t-Test and then a simple regression. This variable had almost no effect whatsoever in accounting for the total variance of the overall trust dependent variable.

**Contexts of the Study**

The student affairs professionals who were the subjects of this study were employed at every public two year college within this mid-Atlantic state. This particular state was selected for two reasons: (a) convenience to the investigator for purposes of conducting onsite survey administration; and (b) the diverse nature of all 19 institutions allowing for satisfactory generalization to the national sector of public two year colleges. Thus, subjects in this study were representative of institutions found in inner-city urban areas, remote rural areas, high density suburban areas, and a few prominent resort areas. As such, it is understood that perceptions reported by these subjects were, to an extent, influenced by specific artifacts of the organizational culture within their respective institutions. The contextual variables that were of interest to this study were the following: (a) perceptions of subjects regarding
how seriously their feedback in performance appraisal was considered by their evaluators; (b) perceptions of subjects regarding the relevance of performance appraisal practiced at their respective institution; (c) subject perceptions of performance appraisal purposes as practiced at their respective institutions; (d) subject perceptions of the performance appraisal rating form effectiveness practiced at their respective institutions; (e) subject perceptions of communication frequency, between their evaluators and themselves, as practiced at their respective institutions; and (f) collective bargaining status at subjects' respective institutions.

As indicated in Chapter Four, a large majority of subjects considered the performance appraisal practices of their respective institutions to allow for satisfactory opportunities for providing meaningful feedback to their evaluators. Further, subjects, on the whole, considered the performance appraisal practices at their respective institutions to be relevant to their actual job responsibilities. A majority of these subjects also reported that they considered the purposes of performance appraisal at their institutions to be used primarily to enhance their professional development. However, given the overwhelmingly high proportion of subjects, at every surveyed institution, working in unionized environments,
most did not consider that performance appraisal could have much of an effect on either job promotion or salary considerations. Further, most subjects considered the rating forms, at their respective institutions, to serve only administrative purposes or to allow for effective evaluator feedback.

The extremely high proportion of subjects (88%) indicating an "ongoing or regular" frequency of communication between their evaluators and themselves (i.e. daily or weekly) may indicate a greater reliance on informal, regular interactions with their evaluators as a source of performance feedback than those processes associated with the more formal performance appraisal practiced at these institutions.

Last, given the high level of skepticism indicated by subjects regarding the relationship of performance appraisal to both salary and job promotion considerations, coupled with the strong presence of a collective bargaining environment present within this particular state, two contextual assumptions need to be made clear:

1. Subject perceptions of performance appraisal as serving both intrinsic, as well as extrinsic, purposes need to be questioned within the context of this particular state. High levels of confidence were indicated by subjects regarding performance appraisal as being of value for
professional development as well as being relevant to their actual job responsibilities. Thus, one might conclude that the "payoff" perceived by many subjects may come more in the form of intrinsic value than in extrinsic. Certainly, one must assume that, in this environment, the motivation to achieve success within the performance appraisal process is more likely driven by a need to feel competent more so than a need to achieve a higher job status or to realize gain in remuneration.

2. Although the diverse nature of the 19 institutions used in this study can be generalized to comparable institutions throughout the country, it is imperative that the presence (or absence) of the collective bargaining status be taken into account. Questions regarding how subjects in nonunion institutions might perceive the purposes and relevance of performance appraisal would need to be given very careful consideration. It would be of considerable interest to examine the effects of extrinsic motivators (salary and promotion) in environments where those factors may be considered to be associated with the performance appraisal process.
Conclusions

Assessment Instrument

The highly intercorrelated nature of the 10 trust conditions, coupled with the resulting single factor solution for the factor analysis, raises considerable doubt regarding the efficacy of the assessment instrument in this type of an organizational environment. The inability of this instrument to differentiate, in any meaningful way, differences in either the original 10 trust conditions, or to yield any useful factor structure, suggests several issues which might, ostensibly, form the basis for future investigation.

1. There are certain salient characteristics, distinctive to higher education organizational cultures, which substantially differentiates such environments from those of business and industry. Much of the literature cited in Chapter Two, regarding the unique qualities of higher education environments, would support this notion. Two such environmental differences might include the effects of tenure and the effects of a unionized environment. Would the existence of such conditions render the usefulness of this trust instrument as suspect? That is, would a climate of relative perceived safety, in comparison to that of business
and industry, contribute to a halo effect response pattern on such an instrument?

2. Attitudinal measures, as those indicated on this inventory, may be considerably less effective in discerning any distinctive or meaningful factor structure, than those which effectively assess behavioral responses.

3. The dynamics of interpersonal trust development, found between two individuals, may need to be understood as a function of a highly complex sequence of personal interactions and repeated behaviors which may elude the measurement of a simple attitudinal scale.

4. The 10 trust condition variables, used in this inventory, may be more effective as dependent measures, or symptoms of a trusting relationship, once the existence of interpersonal trust can be determined through a more substantive assessment.

**Power/Status Variables**

"Positional status level difference" was the only power/status variable found to be significant (p < .05) in an ANOVA and subsequent t-test. In this case, practitioners who were separated by only one positional status level from their evaluators had a tendency to rate their evaluators
more favorably on measures of overall trust than those who were separated by two levels.

**Recommendations**

**Implications for Further Study**

One of the essential premises of this investigation is based on the notion that barriers to interpersonal trust directly impedes performance appraisal effectiveness. An inference drawn from this notion is that knowledge of factors which obstruct interpersonal trust would provide useful insight in attempting to enhance the effectiveness of this process. Further, knowledge of specific organizational and interpersonal conditions leading to interpersonal trust can contribute substantially to other related areas of two year college student affairs administration. These would include applications for supervision, team building, training, and coaching.

Thus, the continued pursuit of this line of research is strongly recommended for the purpose of addressing these issues noted above. However, in view of the findings associated with the present investigation, the following strategies are recommended for future study.
1. Investigate the relationship of certain organizational culture artifacts, unique to higher education (specifically the two-year college sector), to measures of trust between the student affairs practitioner and evaluator. Examples may include tenure, collective bargaining status, or institutional status of student affairs units.

2. Develop an assessment instrument which is built upon behavioral assessments as opposed to attitudinal ones. Subordinate perceptions of psychological safety, regarding the relationship with the evaluator, may be of particular interest.

3. Consider a comprehensive qualitative analysis which seeks to measure the interpersonal dynamics, between subordinates and evaluators, over time. Constructs which might emerge may provide the basis for theory development.

4. Consider a study which satisfies certain a priori trust indicators and then makes use of some, or all, of these 10 trust conditions as dependent measures of preexisting trusting relationships.

5. Some of the contextual variables, used in the present investigation, might be of value for such additional analysis. For example, differences in trust measures might be compared in unionized versus nonunionized environments. Or, variables pertaining to practitioner ratings of
performance appraisal practices as being relevant to their job duties, or their feedback being taken seriously by evaluators, might characterize certain types of institutional environments more so than others. Moreover, some dependent measure related to ratings of practitioner motivation and productivity would need to be included in assessing performance appraisal effectiveness.

6. An examination of what differences, if any, might exist in trust measures when comparing two year college student affairs units on the basis of institutional enrollment sizes, funding structures, governance structures, organizational structures or regional setting. In particular, differences in the organizational placement of the student affairs unit might provide an interesting comparison of trust measures. That is, might there be differences in trust ratings when the chief student affairs officer reports directly to the institutional president as opposed to units where there is an intermediary between these two officers?

**Implications for Practice**

As an institutional variable associated with overall trust, "positional status level differences" should be considered as part of any overall attempt intended to
enhance performance appraisal through the development of trust building strategies.

Recent trends toward "flattening" out the organization have increased the span of control of higher level student affairs officers to the degree where they are now responsible to evaluate subordinates who may have previously been two levels removed. To this extent, it would be incumbent upon student affairs units to examine their staffing patterns and determine if span of control problems are evident by having a disproportionate level of subordinates more than one level removed from their evaluators.

The findings of this investigation can provide usefulness for student affairs leaders and scholars. From a practical perspective, findings from this analysis can be put to use at present for purposes of enhancing performance appraisal processes and supervision strategies. From a more long term perspective, findings from this study can provide a foundation for the development for further inquiry into this body of knowledge. It is anticipated that such initiatives will follow.
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Appendix C

Cover Letter to Deans of Students

Dear

The need to develop effective performance appraisal processes has been a long standing goal within the two year college student affairs sector. The literature suggests some link between levels of interpersonal trust and performance appraisal effectiveness. However, our current knowledge of those organizational conditions leading to interpersonal trust between student affairs professionals and their performance evaluators is still limited. Accordingly, I am engaged in an academic investigation intended to examine these phenomena.

To gain the essential data needed to conduct this analysis, I am seeking your approval to administer the attached questionnaire, which includes the Conditions of Trust Inventory, to selected members of your staff. A listing of those specific positions is attached. I would like to administer this instrument on site at a scheduled time convenient to you and your staff. The entire process should take no longer than thirty minutes. In keeping with all ethical standards, full confidentiality will be rigorously maintained for all participants within the study. All data will be reported in the aggregate (a full copy of the approved Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board Informed Consent Protocol is attached).

I very much wish to thank you in advance for your willingness to cooperate. One clear intention of this study is to provide further guidance to two year college student affairs leaders, such as yourself, in your efforts to establish effective performance appraisal systems within your organizational division. I hope to speak with you very shortly to plan the arrangements.

Regards,

Art Wexler,
Ed.D. Candidate, Virginia Tech;
Director of Atlantic Community College Cape May County Center

Enclosures
Appendix C

Attachment to Cover Letter

Recommended Staff Members
for Survey Subjects

1. Financial Aid Director
2. Admissions Director
3. Enrollment Services Director (Registrar)
4. Counseling Director
5. Activities Director
6. Special Population Program Director (EOF or SSS)
7. Advisement Program Director
8. Athletic Director
9. Three (3) institutional counselors*
10. Three (3) academic advisors*
11. Two (2) special program counselors*
12. Two (2) financial aid advisors*
13. Five (5) staff members representing any one or combination of the following offices: athletics, student activities, admissions, enrollment services (registrar), and financial aid

* - Items # 9-12, please identify subjects on the basis of randomly selecting individuals based on alternating first names in alphabetical order. Please use the full first name of each individual.
Appendix D

Statement of Confidentiality

In keeping with the highest of ethical standards associated with academic research, as well as those within the Student Affairs profession, all data reported by study subjects will be maintained with the full confidentiality. All data associated with this study will be reported only in the aggregate. Survey respondents will not be asked to identify themselves by name. Full assurance is provided that no individual survey data will be made known to the public, the employing institution of the respondent, any individual associated with the employing institution of the respondent, or simply anyone other than researcher and the research committee members associated with the sponsoring graduate school.
Appendix E

Verbal Instructions for the Conditions of Trust Inventory

1. You are being asked to respond to 44 items regarding how you might feel about your performance appraisal evaluator. Please keep this individual in mind as you respond to these items. All of your responses should refer to the same individual.

2. Please circle the letter at the right of each statement to show how you respond to that statement using this key:

   1 = Strongly agree
   2 = Moderately agree
   3 = Neither agree nor disagree
   4 = Moderately disagree
   5 = Strongly disagree

3. Please return your response form to the survey administrator upon completion.
Vita

Arthur Wexler

Address: 17 Gray Birch Court
Turnersville, NJ 08012

Personal Information
Born: October 16, 1945
Married, three daughters

Educational Background

1995 Doctorate of Education, Community
College Education, Virginia Polytechnic
Institute and State University, Blacksburg,
Virginia

1977 Master of Arts (M.A.), Clinical
Psychology, Antioch University, Yellow
Springs, Ohio (Columbia, Maryland Center)

1970 Master of Education (M.Ed.), Disadvantaged
Populations, South Carolina State College,
Orangeburg, South Carolina

1967 Bachelor of Science (B.S.), Business
Administration, Bryant College, Smithfield
(formerly Providence), Rhode Island

Recent Professional Experience

Present - Director, Cape May County Extension Center,
Atlantic Community College, New Jersey

1985 - Associate Dean of Student Development,
Atlantic Community College, New Jersey