

FACTORS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES
FOLLOWING PARTICIPATION IN A
DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT CENTER
FOR MIDDLE MANAGERS

by

BILLIE E. NICHOLS

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Adult/Continuing Education

APPROVED:

Harold W. Stubblefield, Chairman

Neil E. Chalofsky

William C. Giegold

Marvin G. Cline

Samuel D. Morgan

December, 1985

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No one can write a dissertation alone. I wish to thank a few of the many people who have supported and sustained me throughout the process of bringing this research to completion. However, I can never thank them as fully as they deserve.

My committee members have made so many contributions to the development and completion of this study and to my professional development. I want to thank Drs. Neil Chalofsky, Marvin G. Cline, William C. Giegold, and Samuel D. Morgan for their unique contributions, interest, and support. Special thanks go to Dr. Harold Stubblefield, Chairman, who was always "on call" to provide guidance, encouragement, and direction.

I am much indebted to the manager of the Department of Management and Organization Development of Shemano Corporation and to his professional staff. Whether their assistance was granting approval for this study, providing internal coordination, providing information, and/or responding to the findings of the study, they were a critical part of conducting and completing this study. Thanks to the employees of the organization who gave their time and shared their experiences so that this project could be researched and written.

I am grateful to _____, who was kind enough to offer advice, comments, and information during the final stages of completing the dissertation. I have at times depended heavily on her expertise in editing to sustain my efforts.

Appreciation is due _____, who assisted in the typing. She, as well as _____, helped me meet the many deadlines throughout the project.

Finally, my family deserves a special note of appreciation. To my parents and children, I appreciate their love, encouragement, and confidence in my abilities. They helped me to survive the always challenging process in writing a research dissertation. To my husband, I would like to acknowledge with deep affection and gratitude his contributions of continued motivation and inspiration during this study. I could not have succeeded without his love, understanding, and assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	13
Objectives of the Study	15
Significance of the Study	16
Delimitations of the Study	17
Limitations of the Study	17
Definitions of Terms	18
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	19
Assessment Centers	19
AT&T Experiment	19
Research Literature	21
Prescriptive Literature	24
Critics of the Assessment Center Approach	25
Implementing Learning in a Corporate Setting.....	26
Theoretical Background for Self-Directed Learning and Learning Projects	27
Research in Self-Directed Learning.....	29
Relationship of Self-Directed Learning to Career Development	31
Transfer of Learning--The Linkage between Learning and Behavioral Change on the Job	34

3	METHODOLOGY	39
	Design of the Study	39
	Population and Sample	40
	Treatment	49
	Instrumentation	53
	Collection of Data	55
	Data Analysis	56
4	RESULTS: EXTENT OF DEVELOPMENT	59
	Evaluation of Participants' Management Abilities	59
	Assessor Evaluation	60
	Peer Evaluation and Self Evaluation	62
	Assessor Recommendations	65
	Implementation of Developmental Activities	67
	Recommended Developmental Areas/Activities Implemented	70
	Recommended Developmental Areas/Activities Not Implemented	75
	Self-Selected Developmental Activities Implemented...	77
	Participants' Perceptions of the Program Operation	83
	Pressure from Management to Attend	85
	Effectiveness of Program	86
	Immediacy of Feedback	87
	Clarity of Feedback Report	88
	Agreement with Report	89
	Confidentiality Preserved	90
	Sharing of Report with Supervisor	91
	Overall Satisfaction with Program	94

Judgment of Assessment Experience	96
Changes in Participants' Management Behavior	97
Learning from Program	97
Improvement in Management Skills	107
Confidence in Management Skills	111
Feedback from Others Concerning Changes in Management Behavior	111
Professional Outcomes	113
Job Satisfaction	113
Job Movement	117
Other Benefits from the Program	120
Participants' Recommendations for Improvement of the Program	120
5 RESULTS: FACTORS RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT.....	132
High Implementers	133
Moderate Implementers	140
Low Implementers	147
Implementers of Self-Selected Activities Only	154
Non-Implementers	162
Summary	166
6 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	168
Summary	168
Conclusions	173
Recommendations	176
Future Research Considerations	180
REFERENCES	182

APPENDICES	188
A. Memo with Survey Questionnaire: Participants and Assessors...	189
B. Memo to Participants in Sample	204
C. Interview Schedules	207
Form A	208
Form B	221
Form C	232
Form D	243
VITA	254
ABSTRACT	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Career Development Models	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Perceptions about MMDP	42
2 Developmental Activity of Participants after MMDP	43
3 Characteristics of MMDP Participants: Preliminary Survey	44
4 Characteristics of MMDP Participants: Adjusted Population	47
5 Characteristics of MMDP Participants: Interview Sample	48
6 Assessors' Evaluation of Management Abilities	61
7 Ranking of Participants' Management Abilities in Upper, Middle, and Lower Third of Class	63
8 Management Areas Recommended and Implemented	66
9 Recommended Developmental Areas/Activities	68
10 Activities Recommended by Assessors for Participants' Development	69
11 Activities Used in Implementation of Recommended Activities	72
12 Implementation of Recommended Activities: Length of Time to Start, Problems Experienced, Other Similar Activities	74
13 Reasons Why Recommended Activities Were Not Implemented	76
14 Self-Selected Development Areas/Activities Implemented	78
15 Activities Used in Implementation of Self-Selected Activities	80
16 Implementation of Self-Selected Activities: Length of Time to Start, Problems Experienced, Support, Substitution of Recommended Activity, Future Plans	82
17 Perceptions of Program Operation	84
18 Sharing of Report with Supervisor	92
19 Change in Participants' Management Behavior	98
20 Activities Which Influenced Learning	99

21	Activities Which Influenced Learning Most and Least	101
22	Assessment of Program's Self-Directed Learning Approach to Development	103
23	Source of Help Needed From Management	105
24	Management Skills Most and Least Improved	108
25	Reasons Why Management Skills Least Implemented	110
26	Reasons for Increased Confidence	112
27	Feedback from Others Concerning Changes in Management Behavior	114
28	Professional Outcomes	116
29	Expectation of Managerial Advancement	119
30	Other Benefits from Program Participation	121
31	Major Obstacles to Implementation of Developmental Activities	123
32	Recommendations to Improve Implementation of Developmental Activities	124
33	Recommendations to Improve Overall Effectiveness	127
34	Other Comments by Participants	130

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The assessment center is a contemporary approach to identifying managerial potential for purposes of selection, placement, promotion, or development (or some combination of these). The diagnostic or developmental assessment center, which is used solely for development of the individual, is the newest assessment innovation; however, little research has been done on whether or not participants implemented developmental activities and the subsequent effect upon their professional development. This study focused on the extent to which participants actually implemented developmental activities after assessment.

Background of the Problem

In the modern industrialized world, management is universal. Every organization "requires the making of decisions, the coordinating of activities, the handling of people, and the evaluation of performance directed toward group objectives" (Massie, 1979, p. 3). Management is becoming more important as the scale of business operations increases and labor becomes more specialized. The need for better trained managers, therefore, will increase with this development of more complex organizations. A higher quality of managers will be demanded by the rapid growth of knowledge useful to managers. Because of the increasing importance of management and the new challenges it faces, many researchers in various disciplines have concentrated their attention on the subject (Massie, 1979). More effort is being given to the selection and development of employees who can better perform managerial functions. If the well-being of an organization depends largely on the quality of its managers,

then no organizational activity is more important than that of choosing these managers.

Since the maturing of these men is a long process involving training, practice, and the creation of developmental opportunities, it is critical for the future of the enterprise to identify, if possible, these men at all levels in the organizational structure (Koontz & O'Donnell, 1974, p. 252).

The organization must be able to determine (a) who is performing well, (b) who has the capability to continue to perform well, and (c) what types of additional training and experience are required for each manager.

The assessment center has been developed to handle these problems (Slevin, 1972). It has become one of the most powerful techniques available for identifying management potential (Kraut, 1976). Under controlled conditions managers can observe promising employees in action and evaluate them objectively, both for general management ability and specific job capabilities. The assessment center has proven to be a better indicator of future success than any other tool management has yet devised, and it also brings many valuable fringe benefits to the organization that uses it (Byham, 1970). The success of assessment centers is dependent upon many factors. According to Byham (1980a, p. 27), organizations must conceptualize, position the center, analyze the target job(s), determine the dimensions to be taught, select and/or develop the assessment exercises, train the assessors, administer the program, feed back the results, use the results, and actually assess the individuals.

Assessment Center Origins

Henry Murray from Harvard University is credited with inventing the assessment center approach in the 1930s. The federal government adopted the concept during World War II; it was also used by the Germans and the British

(Moses, 1977). The technique was temporarily abandoned after the war and was revived and introduced to industry during the 1950s by Douglas Bray of American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T). The AT&T experiment first realized the merit of assessment as a selection and development instrument. Today, the technique "has proven to be a highly accurate means for evaluating executive potential and has been widely adopted by both industry and government" (Steiner, 1975, p. 236).

The increasing adoption of the assessment center approach, particularly during the 1970s, has not resulted in its unqualified support. Specifically, the majority of professionals in the area of employee selection remain divided in their support. Two experts in the field (Millard & Pinsky, 1980) indicate "this lack of full professional endorsement and support alone is sufficient cause for some concern about the increasing widespread adoption and use of the technique" (p. 86). The results, therefore, should not be used as the single criterion for making decisions. Parker (1980) warned against relying on any one method completely. When measuring employees, a diversified program should be used. Doing otherwise increases rather than reduces management problems.

Definition of the Assessment Center

The assessment center is a method, not a place. It is a multimethod, multitrait, and multimedia technique. Kraut (1976) defines an assessment center in this way:

. . . a series of individual and group exercises in which a number of candidates participate while being observed by several specially trained judges. The exercises are simulations of managerial tasks designed to test various managerial skills (p. 30).

The Task Force on Development of Assessment Center Standards (Kraut, 1976) recommended that a program be considered an assessment center only if it met certain minimum standards:

1. Multiple assessment techniques must be used, one of which must be a simulation.

2. Multiple assessors must be used and must receive training prior to participating in a center.

3. Judgments resulting in an outcome such as recommendation for promotion must be based on pooling information from assessors and techniques.

4. An overall evaluation of behavior must be made by assessors at a separate time from observation of behavior.

5. Simulation exercises are used to tap a variety of predetermined behaviors. The simulations have been pretested previously to ensure that reliable, objective, and relevant behavioral information will be provided.

6. The dimensions, attributes, characteristics, or qualities that are evaluated by the assessors are determined by an analysis of relevant job behaviors.

7. The techniques used in the center are designed to provide information that is used in evaluating the dimensions, attributes, or qualities previously determined.

Assessment centers differ greatly in content, cost, length, staffing, and administration depending on the objectives of the center, the dimensions to be assessed, and the employee population. They differ from other methods in the following ways: (a) A number of individuals are processed at the same time; (b) trained managers, who do not directly supervise the candidates, conduct and

evaluate the assessee; (c) multiple exercises are used to evaluate behavior (Byham, 1971, p. 10).

The assessment center provides a "broad band" approach to the evaluation of managerial potential. The assessee is observed in a variety of settings over a considerable period of time--usually two to three days. This overall assessment combining several predictors is the key to the assessment center concept (Slevin, 1972).

Purpose of the Assessment Center

The assessment center is multipurpose. First, it aids an organization in the critical selection process by objectively identifying and determining immediate managerial potential. Research findings show that assessment centers are highly valid in predicting managerial performance (Campbell & Bray, 1967; Jaffee, Bender, & Calvert, 1970).

Second, the assessment center serves as a way to identify and develop individual managerial improvement strategies. By focusing on characteristics and traits associated with managerial functions, the center can chart areas of strength and weakness, and a personalized career development plan can be proposed. However, most organizations do not use the assessment center results to purposely design a specific program for individual development (Olivas, 1980).

Third, the assessment center can be a training vehicle used by participants as a learning experience (Steiner, 1975; Teel & DuBois, 1983). The participant gets practice in leadership skills, makes hypothetical management decisions, makes oral presentations, and views videotapes of his or her own performance. The center provides the participant with an opportunity to scrutinize behavior in a manner not possible on the job and in a manner which

can lead to an understanding of behaviors that are most effective for managers. This is accomplished through a process of critical and intensive peer and self review that provides information on how to achieve positive change. (Slevin, 1972).

Fourth, it can have a positive influence on motivation, job expectations, and morale. The center is viewed as a means of objectively and fairly evaluating assessees' worth and ability to perform. "Politics" no longer clouds the appraisal process, and the selection interview procedures are no longer unstructured and indefensible (Steiner, 1975, p. 236).

Fifth, the assessment center can increase the accuracy of evaluating management development or other training programs. The procedure provides a means for measuring training output when both trained and untrained individuals participate in the center (Steiner, 1975).

Finally, individual self-development can be stimulated from the experience of participating in the assessment center itself and from assessors' feedback about problem areas and possible developmental actions (Byham, 1980b). More research needs to be focused in the area of management development, particularly the developmental strategies following feedback (Thornton & Byham, 1982).

How an Assessment Center Works

Assessment centers attempt to predict the behavior of individuals in management situations from their performance in a series of simulated exercises. An assessment center uses the following procedures:

1. Management decides the types or categories of jobs to be used in the exercises.

2. Management chooses a set of raters, and they are trained to develop assessing skills.

3. The management staff and assessment raters define the job/jobs to be assessed and the criteria for performance. The skills deemed important may include the following: Organization and planning, recognition and integration, decision making, group leadership, and oral and written communication.

4. Candidates are identified and selected--nomination by a superior or self-nomination.

5. Candidates perform assessment activities in group activities.

6. Candidates are given feedback on their assessment center performance --usually in less than two weeks--in written and verbal form (Szilagyi, 1981; Slevin, 1972).

7. Top management may receive a written report. Other information on the candidates' background and experience can then be combined with the assessment data in making management decisions (Wessman, 1975).

The above procedures apply to the three major kinds of assessment centers: (a) Selection, (b) early identification, and (c) diagnosis. An assessment center used for selection is probably the most common one in operation today. It selects personnel to fill immediate and specific job openings and, therefore, is distinguishable by its primary end product--the decision by management to select or not select each participant for a specific job opening (Jeswald, 1977).

Thornton and Byham (1982) reveal that the early identification program usually resembles selection programs closely.

They have the same ultimate goal (identification of success at the target level . . .), similar dimensions, and similar exercises. The principal difference is in when they are offered. Early identification programs are offered early in a person's career, years prior to a final selection decision. Selection programs are

offered later in the career, immediately prior to a selection decision (p. 325).

The objective of the early identification assessment center is to identify candidates for middle and top level management positions early enough to give them the developmental exposure necessary to successfully perform top management functions. It gives the individuals accurate and informed feedback early in their career concerning their chances of achievement of career goals. These individuals can then choose alternate routes to success within the company or outside the company.

A newer trend is the assessment center in which diagnosis and development takes precedence over the selection decision. Here the final overall decision is far less important, and in "pure" diagnostic assessment centers, no overall decision is made. These diagnostic centers are usually longer and more complex and are created by a number of structural characteristics that must be present if accurate diagnosis is to be achieved (Thornton & Byham, 1982, p. 337). According to Thornton and Byham (1982), several characteristics differentiate the diagnostic assessment center. They usually (a) have more dimensions, (b) use a larger number of exercises so that dimensions are seen in at least two or more exercises to ensure adequate measurement, and (c) need more variety in the exercises to provide increased developmental insight. Therefore, for a combination of reasons, diagnostic assessment centers last two to three days while centers aimed at making a decision are one day long. Also, in a "pure" diagnostic assessment center, top management usually receives no formal report since the diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses of managerial skills for improvement and recommendations are written solely for the purpose of the self-development of the individual.

The assessment center has two major benefits for participants' development as described by Slevin (1972):

First, the exercise of participating in a center is in itself a developmental experience. The individual gets practice in leadership skills, makes oral presentations, makes hypothetical management decisions and has them criticized . . . the whole process of the critical and intensive period of self insight that is experienced in a two or three day center is extremely constructive in providing the assessee with information on how to achieve positive change. He is provided with an opportunity to scrutinize his behavior in a critical manner not possible in on-the-job performance, and in a manner that might lead him to understand those behaviors that are most effective and least effective in his managerial capacity.

Second, the assessment center is an excellent place for the formulation of a developmental plan. Executives serving as assessors are currently operating at levels in the organization to which the assessee eventually aspires. They're in a position to evaluate the types of skills necessary to their jobs and the types of experiences and training the assessee needs to reach their level of attainment. At no other time in the assessee's experience with his organization will six upper management executives spend an intensive two or three hours discussing his strengths, weaknesses and developmental needs (pp. 258-259).

Most of the research has been conducted on the selection or the early identification assessment center. According to Fitz-enz, Hards, and Savage (1980), "what has not been as seriously considered is the use of the assessment center for management and/or trainee development" (p. 62). More emphasis has been placed on subsequent performance after assessment (validity of prediction) rather than developmental activities after assessment.

Rowland, London, Ferris, and Sherman (1980) reveal that evaluation research, especially of diagnostic programs, is badly needed. With the exception of the identification-type program of AT&T, evaluation of assessment center programs aimed toward serving developmental purposes is virtually nonexistent. Further, Thornton (cited in Rowland et al., 1980) states: "A new and virtually untouched area in research awaits the investigator, and it

is almost certain that this will become a major thrust of assessment center research in the 1980s" (p. 360).

The Experience of Shemano Corporation's Diagnostic Assessment Center

One company that has organized and conducted a middle-management development program is Shemano Corporation, which utilizes the Success, Inc., simulation. (Shemano Corporation and Success, Inc. are fictitious names to protect the identity of the organization and its assessment program.) Success, Inc. is the title to an unique approach designed to evaluate the management abilities of upper-middle and upper level managers with Shemano. Success, Inc. is unique because it is an assessment center that has been designed specifically for Shemano and is unlike few, if any, other centers in its content and style. In this simulation the abilities of current middle managers are compared against the standards required of higher management. Any discrepancies between where an individual currently stands and what a higher level position would require constitute developmental needs, which can be dealt with before or as the individual is being considered for a higher level job.

Shemano Corporation developed its Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP) in 1979, and as of July, 1984, had conducted eleven programs. Each program takes three days. One hundred twenty individuals have attended the program since its inception. Individuals who are classified as mid- to upper-level middle management as defined by Shemano Corporation's personnel grading system and who have performed successfully in their present positions can be nominated by senior management within the divisions they serve. The nominations are conveyed to the managers of Employee Relations Operations (ERO), who serve within the major divisions of the organization. The ERO

managers prepare a list of prospective participants and send the list to the MMDP Administrator. Although nomination is made by management, an individual may approach his/her division ERO manager to seek nomination to the program. The Program Administrator reviews the list of nominations and selects the participants for an upcoming program. The supervisor of the selected individual informs him/her of the nomination and selection. The decision to participate is completely voluntary.

The objective of this assessment center is to simulate a specific job, or set of job situations, at a higher level than the participant's present job level. Therefore, it assesses how well a person who is working at one level will be able to perform at a higher level. The procedure simulates "live" the basic situations with which an individual would be faced if he/she were in higher management positions. Through participation in the simulation, the participants receive evidence of their ability to function in higher management. The procedure also serves as a vehicle to provide formal and specific documentation of developmental needs which may not take place in the performance of day-to-day responsibilities.

The representatives from this organization believe that the developmental assessment center represents one approach to identifying and developing the management talent needed to effectively meet the challenges of the 1980s and beyond. Yet no formal research has determined whether participants implement recommended developmental activities and improve their managerial skills. However, in providing an objective standard against which individual management abilities are compared and documented, the developmental assessment center can result in an action plan for development which should be reviewed and followed up with the participant to ensure its effectiveness and

relevance. In essence, the organization believes that the Mid-Management Development Program can provide them with a pool of highly qualified middle managers who will be ready to assume significant responsibilities at the appropriate time.

The only evaluation of this program was a preliminary survey (Nichols, 1984) conducted of the 120 assesseees and 24 assessors who have participated in the program since its inception in 1979. The response rate was 85 percent from 102 out of 120 assesseees and 88 percent from 21 out of 24 assessors. The two questionnaires were designed to gather three kinds of information concerning assessee and assessor participation in MMDP: (a) Their satisfaction with the program, (b) whether they learned through the program, and (c) to what degree they applied the knowledge they acquired from the program. Overall, the program received a very favorable evaluation from both groups. Eighty-one (81) percent of participants and ninety (90) percent of assessors were satisfied with the program. Both participants (87%) and assessors (76%) indicated that as a result of MMDP they had learned more about what they could do to enhance their managerial skills. Most of the participant learning occurred during the program itself or the feedback meeting. Very little learning resulted from participant interactions with supervisors. Most of the assessors' learning occurred through observation and interaction with participants and through assessor training. Participants also indicated that their managerial skills were improved by MMDP (71%). Most improvement resulted from the program participation itself or the feedback session; less improvement resulted from subsequent developmental activities. Sixty-two (62) percent of assessors indicated their work-related behavior changed due to participation in MMDP; most improvement resulted in their ability to appraise subordinates, their

ability to evaluate subordinates' long-term potential, and their feelings about the worth of MMDP.

In addition, several items in the survey questionnaire asked participants to report on their development following assessment and feedback. Sixty-seven (67) percent reported that they had implemented one or more developmental activities (recommended and/or self-selected) as a result of having attended the assessment center program. To determine developmental progress, 88 percent of those who implemented developmental activities reported that one or more of the developmental activities undertaken were actually completed.

In this diagnostic assessment center, even though participants receive both an oral and a written report of their strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for developmental activities to improve certain areas, there has been no evaluation study to determine whether these individuals actually implement the recommendations and the conditions under which some are implemented and some are not. Actual developmental activities are the individuals' responsibility at Shemano Corporation. There is no formal organizational follow-up at any time.

Statement of the Problem

This study addressed the problem: To what extent did participants in a middle management development program implement recommended developmental activities, and what were the factors influencing implementation of developmental activities following the program? This research study was designed to address five major research questions:

1. To what extent did participants implement recommended developmental activities?

2. For those who implemented developmental activities (recommended and/or self-selected), what was the process by which the recommendations were implemented and completed?

a. What were the activities used to implement the developmental recommendations?

b. How long after the program did it take for participants to implement the developmental recommendations?

c. What were the problems experienced in implementing the developmental recommendations?

d. What support did participants receive from others?

3. To what extent did the program operation affect the participants' implementation of developmental activities?

a. To what extent did the participants perceive their decision to enter the program to be voluntary and free from pressure?

b. To what extent did the participants perceive the program to be effective in assessing their managerial skills?

c. To what extent did the participants perceive the time frame between program participation and the feedback interview to be of appropriate length?

d. To what extent did the participants perceive the feedback report to be clearly written?

e. To what extent did the participants perceive any discrepancies between the feedback report and their perceptions of their strengths and weaknesses?

- f. To what extent did the participants perceive the confidentiality of their performance preserved by those who participated in the program or by those who received the results from the participants?
 - g. To what extent did the participants share their feedback report with their supervisors?
 - h. To what extent were the participants satisfied with the program overall?
 - i. To what extent did the participants describe their assessment experience as a positive one?
4. What changes in management behavior resulted from participation in the program?
- a. Did the participants learn what they could do to enhance their managerial skills, and which activity influenced their learning the most and least?
 - b. Did the participants improve their managerial skills, and which ones did they improve the most and least?
 - c. Did the participants gain more confidence in their management abilities?
 - d. What feedback did the participants receive on whether their behavior had changed as a result of participation in the program?
5. What professional outcomes did the participants experience with respect to job satisfaction and job movement as a result of participation in the program?

Objectives of the Study

Although research studies have shown that assessment centers can be of tremendous value in identifying employees with above-average management

potential as well as in diagnosing the strengths and weaknesses of employees as the bases for tailor-made development programs (Teel & DuBois, 1983), it is questionable whether or not the assessment center is a valid educational predictor to move individuals through the center, give them feedback on their managerial abilities, make recommendations about ways to improve, and then withdraw all formal support and contact. Thus, the assumption is that through the assessment center process, the individuals were motivated to assume responsibility for their own learning and change their managerial behavior.

This study, therefore, examined this assumption about individuals' educative behavior and their ability to change after being given feedback from a three-day assessment program. The primary objective of this study, therefore, was (a) to determine the extent to which participants actually implemented development after assessment and (b) to examine the assumption that individuals are motivated to assume responsibility for their own learning and to change their management behavior as a result of participation in MMDP. Other objectives were (a) to identify the process by which the developmental activities were implemented, (b) to determine how the program operation affected implementation of participants' developmental activities, (c) to identify any changes in participants' management behavior after assessment, and (d) to identify participants' professional outcomes relating to job satisfaction and job movement after assessment.

Significance of the Study

As its business expanded, Shemano Corporation became increasingly concerned about the supply of high quality middle and upper managers for the 1980s and beyond. Its policy is to select and develop management talent from

within the organization whenever possible. In order to meet these challenges, Shemano, through its diagnostic assessment center, began to identify and develop high potential employees. Shemano is using its Mid-Management Development Program as a tool for management development even though no evidence exists that these individuals actually implemented developmental activities after assessment. This study revealed that they did. When individuals are notified about their program performance and are given accurate feedback and support, they generally take the responsibility and implement developmental activities and subsequently change their management behavior. Therefore, studying the participants' reactions to assessment and their subsequent behavior changes after assessment provided evidence for the assumption that individuals can be left on their own to develop and can determine the best course of action in the further development of their talents.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was not a study of how participants were selected to the program. It was not a study about how the program operates, or whether it is superior to another kind of assessment. It was, however, a study about implementation of developmental activities following a middle management development program.

Limitations of the Study

Data for this study were provided by 19 participants from Shemano Corporation's Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP). Findings refer only to the participants interviewed and cannot be generalized to any other

individuals because (a) too few subjects remained in several of the categories and (b) too little difference in the behavior of the subjects in the various categories occurred.

Definitions of Terms

Developmental activities. Specific, planned learning experiences (projects) designed to prepare employees for the future.

Manager. Refers to a person in a position of authority within an organization with subordinates over whom he/she exercises control; synonymous with administrator.

Middle management. Refers to professionals in the organizational hierarchy who have authority over a number of managers at a subordinate level and are responsible to managers at a higher level.

Motivation. Inner desire to achieve a predetermined goal. Can be intrinsic (stimulated by inherent nature of the activity or its natural consequences such as a person's inner drive to improve a skill) or extrinsic (stimulated by external reward and/or reinforcement such as a salary raise, promotion, psychological stroking).

Self-Development. Process in which the manager takes primary responsibility for his own learning and for choosing the means to achieve this learning.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The problem of this study was: To what extent did participants in a middle management development program implement development after assessment, and what factors influenced implementation of developmental activities following the program? Literature in the following categories were reviewed because they provided background information for the study: (a) Literature on the assessment center and its effectiveness, (b) literature related to implementing learning in a corporate setting, and (c) literature related to transfer of learning (training).

Assessment Centers

The growth of assessment centers during the past twenty years has been astonishing. Few personnel methods have stood the test of time as well as the assessment center concept due to the fact that extensive evaluation has been conducted on the assessment center method (Bray, 1976; Finkle, 1976; Huck, 1977; Jaffee & Cohen, 1980).

AT&T Experiment

The first industrial application of the assessment center technique in the United States, and still considered to be the most important study on assessment center validity, was a longitudinal study undertaken by American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T) in 1956 as part of its Management Progress Study (Bray, 1964; Bray & Grant, 1966; Bray, Campbell & Grant, 1974; Moses, 1977; Thornton & Byham, 1982). The purpose of this study was to

develop pertinent "career histories" of young business managers by investigating the factors which determine their career progress. The management abilities assessed were derived from a review of the literature and from discussions with the Bell System Companies' management, who had initially assessed personal characteristics important to an individual's success. A special research assessment center was developed for this study, which extended over a four-year span (1956-1960).

The subjects in the study were 422 men drawn from the Bell System Operating Companies. One third of the sample had been employed initially for non-management positions and early in their careers had advanced into management. The other two-thirds were management trainees, recruited after college graduation.

The subjects participated in a variety of techniques, which included leaderless group exercises, a specially developed in-basket, business games, in-depth interviews, projective tests, work samples, and paper and pencil tests. In groups of 12, they were evaluated by a team of psychologists and specially trained managers and executives for 3-1/2 days. The participants were rated on each of 25 management abilities and were given an overall evaluation for potential advancement in management. This overall rating was determined by consensus of all assessors. Afterward, each participant received a narrative summary of his/her performance.

The results of the Management Progress Study established the validity of the assessment center technique. Strong relationships existed between the predictions made and subsequent career progress. A unique feature of the Management Progress Study, as reported by Huck (1974) and Jeffrey-Smith (1981), is that information concerning the participants' performance was held

for research purposes only and was never communicated to management. Therefore, the results of the study were not contaminated in subsequent criterion data.

AT&T has continued its commitment to the assessment center technique. Relatively large numbers of employees participate in AT&T's assessment programs each year. In 1976, the company reported that over 19,000 had been evaluated. Of that number, 35 percent were rated as having management potential (Butteriss & Albrecht, 1979).

AT&T's efforts awakened a new interest in corporate assessment centers. In 1962 Standard Oil of Ohio developed an assessment center for its managers. Shortly, Sears, J. C. Penny, GE, and IBM initiated AT&T type assessment centers. By the end of 1980 over 3,000 firms had developed assessment centers for their employees (Soulder & Leksich, 1983). "On the basis of a single, but monumental study, the assessment center has made its reputation in American industry" (Cohen, 1974, p. 19).

Research Literature

Since the inception of the assessment center approach, extensive research has been conducted in order to monitor, evaluate, and improve the assessment process (Mcloskey, Slivinski, & Bourgeois, 1980). Most of the research literature on assessment center technology has been on whether or not it is valid in predicting job performance. By 1972 there were 22 published research studies that attempted to evaluate the overall validity of assessment center applications. Fifteen of those studies showed positive results. Six had such small samples that showed no results, and one small sample was negative (Byham, 1971).

Unfortunately, during the next ten years, little research was done. However, Byham (1980b) notes a number of new research studies. Importantly, the AT&T Management Progress Study has a twenty year follow-up data on assessees. That data indicate that the assessment center is a predictor of management success as high as four levels above entry-level management positions. The Caterpillar Tractor negative validity study that Byham reported in 1972 was found to be inaccurate after re-evaluation. Since then, Caterpillar has conducted several studies showing the accuracy of its assessment center.

Before 1972 there were few studies that explored the possible differential impact of sex or race on assessment center scores. Since then, there have been numerous studies that looked into those issues. In general, the assessment center has found to be equally fair for all races and for both sexes (Byham, 1980b).

Huck and Bray (1976) emphasize that the assessment center technique predicts job performance in an equally valid manner for members of different minority groups. With respect to the correlations between overall assessment performance and overall job performance criteria, there were no significant differences between blacks and whites. Subjects in the study, both black and white, who were rated high during assessment showed high potential for advancement and excellent job performance with about four times the frequency of the subjects who were rated low.

Also, AT&T completed an agreement with the federal government to use assessment centers as a way to judge management potential of women to facilitate their upgrading. Therefore, it seems that government officials have

approved the use of assessment centers as a tool of affirmative action (Kraut, 1976).

Moses (1973) compared ratings of different groups of assessees who participated in a one-day assessment center and later in a two-day assessment center. The assessees were male and female, black and white. The findings concluded that the one-day assessment was comparable to the two-day assessment for all groups, and there were no significant differences among the groups in overall assessment.

Mcloskey, Slivinski, and Bourgeois (1980) report an evaluation of the Career Assessment Program (CAP), which is sponsored by the Canadian federal public service. In following up the participants, efforts have been made to identify the link between performance in the assessment center and performance on the job. Overall, a number of statistically significant relationships have been established. For example, in one follow-up of 120 participants, a statistically significant correlation occurred when the average assessment center ratings for the 12 management abilities were correlated with the average supervisor's ratings obtained on the same abilities two to four years later.

Kraut (1972) emphasizes that research on assessment centers should be meaningful in order to provide hard data. "We should look beyond simple-minded questions of validity to examine the broader effects of assessment programs . . . to include peer judgments and the ratings of subordinates about the assessees' managerial practices . . . (and) look at the impact on participants' behaviors, self-concepts, and careers . . . our conduct of research should reflect the real world in which the techniques are being applied (p. 325).

Prescriptive Literature

Much of the literature on assessment centers is prescriptive. It contains information for developing and conducting successful assessment centers and describes on-going programs (Bender, 1973; Bray, 1971; Byham, 1980a; Fitz-enz, Hards, & Savage, 1980; Jaffee & Sefcik, 1980; Kraut, 1976; Schiffhauer, 1972; Souder & Leksich, 1983).

Souder and Leksich (1983) stress that in order to achieve full benefits from the assessment center five requirements must be met: (a) A system perspective in the design must be taken; (b) the center must have commitment from top management; (c) the participants must be selected carefully, according to pre-determined selection criteria which relate to the center's objectives; (d) the credibility of the center must be maintained by competent assessors, valid exercises, and honest feedback to participants; and (5) the center should be managed as an agency of change. They predict that within the next ten years nearly every organization will either have its own assessment center or be participating jointly in some "community" center (p. 87).

Kraut (1976), stresses the difference between what an assessment center is and what it is not by following the guidelines developed by the Third International Congress on the Assessment Center Method in 1975.

Bray (1971) describes how the assessment center can be used to open up greater opportunities for women by accurately identifying those with high potential for advancement.

This prescriptive literature presents valuable information to organizations who are planning to use the assessment center approach as

part of their selection-identification-development personnel practice for employees.

Critics of the Assessment Center Approach

Most of the assessment center literature stress positive results. However, the assessment procedure has its critics. These critics generally question, not that the method generates useful information, but that the results of the assessment center should not be used alone in making management decisions (Byham, 1980a; Cohen, 1980; Kraut, 1972; Wilson & Tatge, 1973). Some critics point out that many assessment centers fail to obtain validity because they are operating incorrectly or use the wrong exercises (Byham, 1978; Howard, 1974; Hinrichs & Haanpera, 1976; Klimoski & Strickland, 1977).

Thornton (1979) emphasizes some of the ethical, professional, and scientific issues surrounding the use of the assessment centers:

1. Assessment center technology, from job analysis to assessment procedures and assessor discussion, assumes a static model of job performance, tending to perpetuate the status quo. Therefore, alternate approaches and models should be checked out to determine the best technique for solving a given organizational problem.

2. Assessment centers are used for many purposes, thus setting up different assumptions for each application. Organizations must recognize and examine these assumptions, determine if they can meet them, and then design an appropriate assessment center.

3. Users of assessment centers should guard against unwarranted claims. Much of the evidence is either limited or has not been reported.

Thornton (1979) emphasizes, "It would be a real loss if faddish adoption and misuse led to disrepute and disuse of assessment centers as so often has happened with other practices in industrial/organizational psychology" (pp. 4-5).

Although survey results are encouraging, they do not suggest abandonment of all other human resource tools in favor of the assessment approach. Several researchers suggest an integrated approach by combining the best features of the assessment center with existing activities in the organization (Brush & Schoenfeldt, 1980; Byham, 1980a; Fitz-enz, Hards, & Savage, 1980; Nichols & Hudson, 1981).

In order to enhance the validity of the assessment tool, Millard and Pinsky (1980) recommended that all selection and promotion procedures "be carefully developed and documented, seperately, for each position under consideration. In addition frequent checks should be made to ensure that promotions standards and selection procedures are in fact in compliance with EEOC guidelines" (p. 88).

Implementing Learning in a Corporate Setting

The diagnostic assessment center technique, through the assessors' evaluation of the participants' management abilities and subsequent recommendations for improvement and the individuals' self-awareness of their management abilities from participation in the assessment center, identifies the participants' learning (knowledge, skills, and attitudes), diagnoses their learning deficiencies, and provides learning strategies for them to improve these deficiencies. After assessment, the participants assume responsibility,

in most organizations, for developing their own learning plans--which resources and strategies to pursue--to improve their management abilities.

Theoretical Background for Self-Directed Learning and Learning Projects

Considerable research has been done in the last 20 years on self-directed learning and adults' learning projects (Houle, 1961; Tough, 1979; Knowles, 1980).

Houle (1961) launched this research line in a study of 22 "continuing learners." The interviews identified three subgroups of learners: (a) Goal-oriented learners who use education as a means to accomplish clear-cut objectives; (b) activity-oriented learners who participate for the sake of the activity itself rather than the learning; (c) and learning-oriented learners who pursue knowledge for its own sake.

Allen Tough, a Houle student, furthered this kind of research by producing his findings in two reports, Learning Without a Teacher (1967) and The Adult's Learning Projects (1979). The findings showed that (a) most adults pursue from one to twenty major learning projects a year, (b) approximately 10 percent of the learning projects were completed in an educational institution environment, (c) adults who pursue learning on their own go through a similar sequence of steps, (d) most adults turn to somebody for help one or more times in the sequence, and (e) adults usually go to "helpers" who are not trained teachers.

Tough (1979) defines a learning project as a "major, highly deliberate effort to gain certain knowledge and skill (or to change in some other way)" (p. 1). He further notes that adults undertake learning projects to (a) improve their skill or performance, (b) change their attitudes or emotional reactions,

(c) gain new knowledge, and (d) change their overt behavior or to break a habit. From his research, Tough (1979) reports that adults learn in many different ways, such as (a) reading books, periodicals, and newspapers; (b) watching movies and television; (c) seeking advice and subject matter from relatives, friends, neighbors, and fellow workers; (d) consulting professionals on and off the job; and (e) enrolling in training programs/courses.

Knowles (1975, 1980) indicates that the body of theory and practice on which self-directed learning is based is "andragogy" and is defined as the art and science of helping adults learn. Self-directed learning is defined as a "process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, and evaluating learning outcomes (Knowles, 1975, p. 18). Self-directed learning usually is associated with various kinds of helpers, i.e., mentors, instructors, coaches, tutors, resource people, and peers. A great deal of mutuality exists among a group of self-directed learners on the andragogy approach: (a) Individuals grow in capacity (and need) to be self-directing as an essential component of maturing and this capacity should be nurtured to develop as rapidly as possible; (b) learners' experiences are increasingly rich resources for learning and should be exploited along with the resources of experts; (c) individuals have different patterns of readiness for learning as they become ready to learn what is required to perform their life tasks or to cope with their life problems; (d) individuals' natural orientation to learning is task or problem centered, not subject centered (therefore, their learning experiences must be organized as task-accomplishing or problem-solving learning projects; and (e) individuals are motivated to learn by internal incentives such as the desire

to achieve, the need for esteem, the urge to grow, the need to know something specific, the satisfaction of accomplishment and curiosity.

Self-directed learning starts when learners become aware of some need for learning, and the clearer that these needs are, the more efficiently individuals can plan their learning. It implies that individuals take the initiative in using their resources. "They know what they want to get from a resource, and they probe the resource until they get what they want. They are proactive rather than reactive learners" (Knowles, 1975, p. 105). Therefore, they need to formulate objectives for learning in order to determine the direction of self-development.

Mumford (1979) similarly defines development and self-development as "the process of improving effectiveness through a planned learning experience (and) . . . personal development, with the managers taking primary responsibility for their own learning and for choosing the means to achieve this" (pp. 13-14).

Research in Self-Directed Learning

According to Cross (1982) a number of conclusions can be drawn from Allen Tough's research on self-directed learners in the 1960s:

1. Most adult learners have more than one reason for pursuing learning.
2. Most adult learners are motivated by the pragmatic desire to apply or use the knowledge or skills learned.
3. Three patterns of starting learning projects can be identified as (a) starting learning projects with the awareness of wanting to do something or being assigned a task by others, (b) starting a learning project with curiosity

about a controversial or important issue, (c) starting a learning project with a decision to spend some time learning and then deciding what to learn during that time.

Some of the research studies have clustered around three definitions of adult learners:

1. Adults in "organized learning activities" (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; Carp, Peterson, and Roelf, 1974; National Center for Education Statistics, 1980).

2. Adults in self-directed learning activities (Coolican, 1974; Penland, 1977; Tough 1978).

3. Adults in learning activities for activities for academic credit (Holmstrom, 1973; Solmon, Gordon and Ochsner, 1979).

A small body of literature is developing now about self-directed learning in business and industry (Artingstall, 1982; Zemke, 1982; Canning, 1984). Zemke (1982) reports that according to Lucy M. and Paul J. Guglielmino of Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton:

There is a mounting evidence to suggest that workers of the future will need to take more responsibility for the management of their learning . . . and the key to our successfully accepting responsibility for our own learning . . . is our ability to develop a self-directed learning style (p. 28).

As reported by Zemke (1982), in a survey of managers of Fortune 500 companies, Paul Guglielmino found many managers believe that to be successful today and tomorrow requires that they become more innovative and creative. This success is credited to the skill of learning in a self-directed way. In another study for a major communications company, he found even more evidence that self-directed learning is a skill that is both necessary and learnable. Based on the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS)

given to 421 management and 318 non-management employees, Guglielmino's findings suggest that both management and non-management employees who are successful understand the need for, and try to practice, self-directed learning. He also found that employees in jobs which require a high level of problem-solving skills, jobs which require a high level of creativity and jobs which require a high degree of change all scored significantly higher in self-directed learning readiness than the other employees tested.

Lucy Guglielmino's research emphasizes that self-directed learners can be distinguished by several factors: (a) They show initiative, independence, and persistence in learning; (b) they accept responsibility for their own learning by viewing problems as challenges instead of obstacles; (c) they have a high degree of curiosity and are capable of self-discipline; (d) they are self-confident and have a strong desire to learn or change; (e) they organize their time by setting a pace for learning and developing a plan for completing work; and (f) they tend to be goal-oriented and enjoy learning. Therefore, self-directed learners are ones who take charge, accept responsibility, and are not stopped by problems (Zemke, 1982). Joyce (1979) states that "all management development has to be self-development because no one can be developed without his active co-operation" (p. 17).

Relationship of Self-Directed Learning to Career Development

During the past ten years, researchers and practitioners have become increasingly interested in the topic of employee "career development" (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975; Hall, 1976). Sikula and Mckenna (1983) report that literature in this field is extensive. Although two perspectives have developed—the organization's responsibility (Montana, 1979; Cohen &

Meyer, 1979; Griffith, 1980) and the individual's responsibility (Barkhaus & Bolyard, 1978; Kleiner, 1980), the more appropriate approach today to career development emphasized the employee's ultimate responsibility with the organization providing assistance (Walker & Gutteridge, 1979; Sikula & McKenna, 1983; Kaye, Leibowitz, Farren, Remick, & Jones, 1984). "However, many individuals lack the insight, skills, or initiative to determine their own career progress effectively" (Walker & Gutteridge, 1979, p. 6).

Accordingly, organizations are setting up programs to assist employees in their career planning. One technique used to aid employees is the assessment center, which provides useful evaluative feedback information (Walker & Gutteridge, 1979). However, very little has been written linking career development directly to assessment centers (Hart & Thompson, 1983).

Another technique is a career resource center, which "offers self-directed, self-paced learning and provides resources without creating a dependency on the organization" (Kaye et al., 1984, p. 112). The General Electric Company (cited in Kaye et al., 1984) recently began a career resource center at its Nuclear Energy Business Operation (NEBO) in San Jose, CA. The management at General Electric felt the center "would be a cost-effective, efficient way to supplement existing career development seminars, indicate to employees that there was still a place for them in the company and encourage employees to consider options rather than promotion for career development" (p. 114). Kaye et al., (1984) reports that from a study undertaken a few months after the General Electric career resource center opening, pre-post mean scores indicated that individuals who used the center increased their career development knowledge and skills; and

more importantly, in the interviews, employees showed more proactive attitudes and behaviors toward developing their careers.

Canning (1984) describes a self-development program used by the Housing Corporation and emphasizes that the objective of the self-development approach "is for the manager to develop qualities of productivity, initiative, and independence in his learning and growth. The organization's role in this process is described by McGregor. . .'to provide the climate and proper nourishment and let the people grow themselves' " (p. 11).

In sharing his views about the future of career development, Tim Hall (cited in Hurley, 1983), a leading career development theorist, identifies the self-directed career in which the employee seeks more control over its terms and conditions. His research indicates that during the past five years, the self-directed career has become more important to employees. From his research he also emphasizes that three factors influence the self-directed career: (a) The total of values and preferences of the employee, (b) the career stage from which the employee surveys the perspective, and (c) the organization's norms, particularly those related to the economy. He predicts that in addition to individual careers becoming more self-directed, they will be more carefully planned through several approaches. These approaches include (a) fewer geographic moves to reach the top, (b) development within jobs and lateral moves, and (c) increased interest in developing skills rather than adding new titles.

Glitzer and Maher (1982) similarly indicate that employees in the 1980s are not content to allow the company to control their destinies. As a result, the traditional approach to career development, which assumes the company

is the primary mover of the individual's career, has given way to the contemporary approach, in which both the individual (70 percent responsibility) and the organization (30 percent responsibility) participate (See Figure 1).

Transfer of Learning--The Linkage Between Learning and Behavioral Change on the Job

One interpretation that has been made concerning the AT&T Management Progress Study is that it showed that adults cannot change relative to the abilities assessed in the study. The basis for this interpretation was that the participants in the study changed very little between the first and second assessment, which occurred eight years later. Thornton and Byham (1982) indicate that the study actually shows "that individuals left to their own decisions and exposed only to generalized training and development procedures will not change" (p. 344). However, one major point of interest is that participants in this study were given no feedback whatsoever concerning their performance in the first assessment center, and, therefore, no self-developmental actions were planned. Also, at the time of the first assessment AT&T was trying a new procedure, and participants were told that the procedure was experimental and would have nothing to do with careers. It can be fairly safe to assume, then, that most individuals would not have taken their performance in the assessment too seriously as it related to their careers. These two leading assessment center authorities emphasize that they believe that change can be accomplished in spite of the problems in changing behavior and in spite of the lack of research "if subjected to a major development effort targeted to the individual's particular and specific needs (p. 335).

Traditional Model	Contemporary Model
Directed by: Organization	Directed by: Individual
Viewpoint: Top down, macro	Viewpoint: Bottom up, micro
Centers on: Selection & Placement Transfer & Promotion	Centers on: Input from the individual on goals and needs
Assumptions:	Assumptions:
People need to be directed and controlled.	Individuals want and are capable of exercising a responsible voice in matters which affect them.
Managers are the best people to direct and control.	Individuals know best how to control and direct their careers.
The measure of one's career success & satisfaction is upward mobility.	Individual needs and feelings about one's career are just as important as traditional status symbols.
Structure: Informal & unilateral decisions - options determined by management	Structure: Formalized systems for identifying talent and eliciting information on individual goals; everyone knows how jobs are filled and ground rules for getting them
Responsibility: Falls on organization	Responsibility: Shared responsibility

Figure 1

CAREER DEVELOPMENT MODELS

NOTE. Reprinted with permission from the December 1982 issue of Training, The Magazine of Human Resources Development. Copyright 1982, Lakewood Publications, Inc., Minneapolis, MN (612) 333-0471. All rights reserved.

(Glitzer & Maher, 1982, p. 48).

Since the 1970s, transfer of learning from the classroom to the workplace has been revolutionized by certain techniques such as role play, behavior modeling, and reinforcement of learning on the job (Kent, 1982). One of the organization's major tasks in evaluating training and development programs is to determine whether learning was effectively transferred to the workplace. This is especially important in the evaluation of a diagnostic assessment center to determine if participants' learning (from developmental activities pursued after assessment and from self-insight of their abilities from participation in the program) was effectively transferred to the job.

Kelly (1982) emphasizes that learning which transfers is tested when an individual has to respond on the job to a situation. If employees can apply what they learned to solve on-the-job problems, then learning has been transferred.

The purpose of the Mid-Management Development Program of the organization in this study is development. It is assumed that knowledge, skills, and attitudes judged in this program are susceptible to change in management behavior in a positive way in response to planned developmental efforts. Verification of this assumption would confirm that "prescriptions" for development are effective in that new or sharpened behaviors have been produced (Dunnette, 1976).

Several authorities have written about various approaches to learning transfer (Huczynski, 1978; Kent, 1982; Olivas & Newstrom, 1981; Parry & Reich, 1984). Kent (1982) provides the results of two supervisory skill training programs "refuting the hypothesis that on-the-job boss reinforcement is essential for transfer of skill training. So long as the job climate does not restrict skill usage, intrinsic reinforcement from the successful application of

supervisory skills may be sufficient to maintain skill use" (p. 19). He stresses there is evidence to suggest that self-monitoring and follow-up meetings are useful additions to skill training.

Olivas and Newstrom (1981) report that several trainers have indicated "that current training programs often fail to consider adequately the 'neglected half of training'—facilitating the transfer of training to the work environment" (p. 66). They emphasize the ease of transfer of the new skills or attitudes acquired from simulations has been rated as "probable." In other words, it is probable "that the learning acquired by the trainees will have had enough dramatic impact combined with job-related realism to result in a high probability of transfer" (p. 66). Two other factors—feedback and reinforcement—are assessed as "possible" conditions of transfer. However, both depend on the active role of the trainer and management during and after simulation. Simulations have been found to "incorporate significant degrees of participation, practice, feedback, reinforcement, and transfer" (p. 66).

Jago (1982) investigated whether learning was being effectively transferred to the job in a study of 22 trainees who were selected from three successive Secretary in Personnel Management courses. He concluded that although the numbers involved were small, most trainees were very effective in bringing about a change of attitude in their jobs.

Frank and Margerison (1978) report on research done by Vandeput in which he questioned 62 Belgian organizations to determine the factors that aided or inhibited transfer of learning to their work. Vandeput concluded that the organization has a definite influence upon the transfer of learning. Certain factors which seem to inhibit managers in transferring their learning

from the training session to the work environment were identified: (a) Ineffective relation between trainees and other groups with whom they relate; (b) ineffective relations, making it difficult to influence others; (c) rigidity and conservativeness of other people in the organization; (d) inappropriate organizational structures; (e) ineffective relations between trainees and their superiors; (f) the organization's environment acting upon the trainees; (g) the working conditions surrounding the trainees' jobs; and (h) the perceived lack of relevance of the training for the trainees' work.

This research also identified certain factors that encouraged people to apply their learning: (a) A job giving opportunities for team work, (b) a job which is open to improvement, (c) support from staff groups who are innovation-minded, (d) support from external consultants, (e) support for training from the top level, (f) high wage rates, (g) openness between people, (h) a situation in which the trainee is seen as valuable by his/her boss, (i) a situation in which the boss will delegate, (j) holding a position of decision, and (k) contacts and comparisons with other organizations.

The issue of transfer of learning in the corporate setting is an important one. When organizations spend large sums of money on training and development, they should expect a return on their investment. The success of training, then, can be determined in terms of the amount of learning that can be transferred and applied to the job.

One approach to link learning to on-the-job behaviors is to use the assessment center technique to diagnose individuals' strengths and weaknesses, to recommend actions for development, and then to assess the effectiveness of the learning to job applications.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which participants in a middle management development program implemented developmental activities and the factors influencing implementation of developmental activities following the program. This chapter presents the methods employed in this study: (a) Design of study, (b) population and sample, (c) treatment, (d) instrumentation, (e) collection of data, and (f) data analysis.

Design of Study

To determine the extent to which participants implemented developmental activities following MMDP and to identify the factors that influenced developmental actions of participants, the descriptive case study method was utilized. The purpose of this description was to identify what happened to the participants during and after the program; in particular, what the program was like from the participants' point of view. The case study describes the participants' involvement in the program and their changing behavior over a period of time. The study examined the present status of assessment center graduates. Since facts and conditions were studied as they existed, growth or change during the research period was not indicated.

First, a survey to all the graduates of the program identified the extent of their development and their reactions to the program. Secondly, an interview, confirming the extent of development, probed specific developmental actions, participants' perceptions about their program experience, participants' changes in management behavior, participants' professional outcomes with

respect to job satisfaction and job movement, and participants' recommendations for improving the program.

The follow-up study, which consisted of the preliminary survey of all 120 MMDP graduates and the personal interviewing of 19 selected participants as specific cases, was ex post facto because the researcher did not have direct control of the independent variables. The manifestations had already occurred and must, therefore, be classified as ex post facto.

According to Patton (1980), case analysis is defined as "organizing the data by specific cases which permits in-depth study of those cases" (p. 303). Patton (1980) also indicates that a case study "is to gather comprehensive, systematic, and in-depth information about each case of interest" (p. 303).

The descriptive case study method was advantageous in this research study because of (a) the variety of methods available for data collection and (b) the adaptability to focus on identified issues related to the research questions.

Population and Sample

A selected sample of 20 participants was drawn from the Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP) at Shemano Corporation to serve as cases in this study. One person, however, had been transferred; therefore, only 19 were available. This sample was drawn from a population of 120 MMDP participants in eleven programs from June, 1979, through September, 1983. These 120 participants were surveyed, and 102 completed and returned a mail questionnaire. This questionnaire, as described in Chapter 1, was conducted as a preliminary survey of the 120 assessees (as well as the 24 assessors) who had participated in the program since its inception in 1979.

The preliminary survey sought to identify the extent to which participants had implemented developmental recommendations and their general reactions to the program. The participants were asked to respond on a Likert scale to questions in these categories: (a) Their satisfaction with the program, (b) to what degree they learned from the program, and (c) to what degree they applied the knowledge they acquired from the program. As shown in Table 1, the majority of participants (81%) felt satisfied with the program; 87% indicated they learned what to do to enhance their management skills, and 71% felt they had improved their management skills.

In addition, participants reported their development following assessment and feedback. Three responses to development were reported: (a) Whether they had undertaken one or more of the recommended developmental activities, (b) whether they had undertaken one or more developmental activities (whether recommended or not) as a result of having attended MMDP, and (c) whether they had completed one or more of the developmental activities they had undertaken. The survey revealed that the participants had made various responses to the developmental activities recommended (see Table 2).

The characteristics of these MMDP participants are described in Table 3:

1. Most of the MMDP participants (85.3%) were white males.
2. The majority of MMDP participants (67.7%) were between 30 and 39 years of age.
3. Most of the MMDP participants (85.3%) were college graduates. One third of the participants continued their education in graduate work.
4. All the MMDP participants had a minimum of one year of work experience at Shemano. Forty-nine percent (49.0%) had been employed between 4 and 9 years.

Table 1
PERCEPTIONS ABOUT MMDP^a
Preliminary Survey

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Strongly Agree</u>	
	<u>p%</u> ^b	<u>A%</u> ^c	<u>p%</u> ^b	<u>A%</u> ^c	<u>p%</u> ^b	<u>A%</u> ^c	<u>p%</u> ^b	<u>A%</u> ^c	<u>p%</u> ^b	<u>A%</u> ^c
I was satisfied with MMDP.	2	0	8	5	10	5	56	75	25	15
I learned what to do to enhance my management skills.	2	0	2	0	9	24	77	52	10	24
MMDP improved my skills.	1	0	4	5	25	33	63	62	8	0

^a = % may not equal 100 due to rounding

^b = participants (N = 102)

^c = assessors (N = 24)

(Nichols, 1984, p. 2)

Table 2
 DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITY OF PARTICIPANTS AFTER MMDP^a
 Preliminary Survey
 (N = 102)

	<u>Strongly Disagree%</u>	<u>Disagree%</u>	<u>Neither Agree Nor Disagree%</u>	<u>Agree%</u>	<u>Strongly Agree%</u>
I undertook recommended developmental activities.	2	17	14	60	7
I undertook any developmental activity after MMDP.	4	14	16	57	10
I completed a developmental activity.	1	6	6	74	14

^a = % may not equal 100 due to rounding

(Nichols, 1984, p. 3)

Table 3
CHARACTERISTICS OF MMDP PARTICIPANTS
Preliminary Survey
(N = 102)

Sex and Race

	Black		White	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Male	7	6.9	87	95.3
Female	0	0.0	8	7.8

Age

	No.	Percent
Under 30	9	8.8
30 - 39	69	67.7
40 - 49	21	20.6
50+	3	2.9

Education

	No.	Percent
No high school	0	0.0
Some high school	0	0.0
High school graduate	15	14.7
College graduate	53	52.0
Graduate work	13	12.7
Graduate degree	21	20.6

Experience

	No.	Percent
Under 1 year	0	0.0
1 - 3 years	6	5.9
4 - 6 years	26	25.5
7 - 9 years	24	23.5
10 - 12 years	25	24.5
13 - 15 years	11	10.8
16+ years	10	9.8

Department Employed

	No.	Percent
Engineering	16	15.6
Finance	9	8.8
Manufacturing (Production)	24	23.5
Employee Relations	5	4.9
Leaf	8	7.8
Operation Services	2	2.0
Research and Development	11	10.8
Information Services	5	4.9
Finished Goods	1	1.0
Production (Planning & Control)	2	2.0
Customer Services	1	1.0
Quality Assurance	5	4.9
Transportation	1	1.0
Primary	3	2.9
Processing	3	2.9
Tobacco Technology Group (Standards)	2	2.0
Prefabrication	2	2.0
International	1	1.0
Purchasing	1	1.0

Location

City	No.	Percent
A	90	88.2
B	2	2.0
C	10	9.8

5. The range of departments represented was great. The departments with the greatest number of participants were Manufacturing (23.5%) and Engineering (15.6%).

6. Most of the MMDP participants (88.2%) were located in City A.

From the population in the preliminary survey, a sample was derived as follows:

1. Only classes four through eleven were used for the sample as the program for classes one, two, and three experienced many changes in the development stage (20 participants removed).

2. Only MMDP participants from City A were used for the sample to facilitate interview scheduling (12 participants removed).

3. Only participants who signed the questionnaire were used as names were needed for scheduling interviews (one participant removed).

4. Only MMDP participants who accurately completed survey questions concerning implementation of their developmental activities were used (21 participants removed).

Thus, the population for sample selection was reduced from 102 to 48. This adjusted population was divided into the following four categories for sample selection depending on the extent to which participants implemented developmental activities after assessment:

1. Those who implemented and completed one or more recommended developmental activities and possibly one or more self-selected developmental activities (30 participants).

2. Those who did not implement recommended developmental activities but did implement and complete one or more self-selected developmental activities (5 participants).

3. Those who implemented recommended and/or self-selected developmental activities but did not complete any (5 participants).

4. Those who did not implement either recommended or self-selected developmental activities (8 participants).

Table 4 describes the characteristics of the adjusted population, who were eligible for sample selection, in the four categories based on sex and race, age, education, experience, and department employed.

It was believed that five participants in each category would be sufficient to identify the factors that actually were related to the extent to which people implemented developmental activities. However, one participant was removed from Category 3 at the time of sample selection because he had just been transferred to another location. In Categories 1 and 4, participants for the sample were selected to include representation nearly identical to the population in sex, race, age, education, and experience. One or more persons from each of the eight classes represented in the study were included.

The characteristics of the 19 participants in the sample are described in Table 5. The characteristics revealed the following:

1. Most of the participants in the sample (78.9%) were white males.
2. The majority of participants in the sample (73.7%) were between 30 and 39 years of age.
3. Most of the participants in the sample (89.5%) were college graduates. More than one third of the participants continued their education in graduate work.
4. All of the sample (100.0%) had a minimum of four years' work experience at Shemano. Fifty-two and eight tenths percent (52.8%) of the participants had been employed between four and nine years.

Table 4
CHARACTERISTICS OF MMDP PARTICIPANTS
(Adjusted Population)
(N = 48)

	Sex and Race									
	Category 1 (N = 30)		2 (N = 5)		3 (N = 5)		4 (N = 6)		Total (N = 48)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male										
Black	2	6.7	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	3	6.3
White	25	83.3	5	100.0	3	60.0	8	100.0	41	85.4
Female										
Black	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
White	3	10.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	8.3

	Age									
	Category 1 (N = 30)		2 (N = 5)		3 (N = 5)		4 (N = 8)		Total (N = 48)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 30	3	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.3
30 - 39	20	66.7	5	100.0	4	80.0	4	50.0	33	68.7
40 - 49	5	16.7	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	50.0	10	20.8
50+	2	6.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2

	Education									
	Category 1 (N = 30)		2 (N = 5)		3 (N = 5)		4 (N = 8)		Total (N = 48)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No high school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some high school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
High school grad.	5	16.7	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	12.5	8	16.7
College graduate	16	53.3	2	40.0	3	60.0	2	25.0	23	47.9
Graduate work	4	13.3	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	25.0	8	16.7
Graduate degree	5	16.7	1	20.0	0	0.0	3	37.5	9	18.7

	Experience									
	Category 1 (N = 30)		2 (N = 5)		3 (N = 5)		4 (N = 8)		Total (N = 48)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 1 year	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1 - 3 years	2	6.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.6
4 - 6 years	10	33.3	1	20.0	0	0.0	2	25.0	13	27.1
7 - 9 years	8	26.7	0	0.0	3	60.0	3	37.5	14	29.1
10 - 12 years	5	16.7	3	60.0	2	40.0	2	25.0	12	25.0
12 - 15 years	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	2	4.2
16+ years	5	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.4

	Department Employed									
	Category 1 (N = 30)		2 (N = 5)		3 (N = 5)		4 (N = 8)		Total (N = 48)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Engineering	1	3.3	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	37.5	6	12.5
Finance	3	10.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	8.3
Manufacturing	7	23.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	25.0	9	18.8
Leaf	6	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	7	14.6
Research & Dev.	4	13.3	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	25.0	8	16.7
Information Ser.	2	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.1
Finished Goods	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1
Production (P&C)	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1
Customer Service	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	2.1
Quality Assur.	2	6.7	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.3
Transportation	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1
Processing	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1
Tobacco Tech.	2	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.1
Prefabrication	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	2.1
Purchasing	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1

Table 5
CHARACTERISTICS OF MHPD PARTICIPANTS
Interview Sample
(N=19)

Sex and Race								
	Category 1 (N=12)		Category 2 (N=5)		Category 3 (N=2)		Total (N=19)	
	No.	Percent ^a	No.	Percent ^a	No.	Percent ^a	No.	Percent ^a
Male								
Black	1	5.3	1	5.3	0	0.0	2	10.6
White	9	47.4	4	21.0	2	10.5	15	78.9
Female								
Black	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
White	2	10.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5
Age								
Under 30	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
30-39	8	42.1	4	21.1	2	10.5	14	73.7
40-49	3	15.8	1	5.3	0	0.0	4	21.1
50+	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Education								
No high school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Some high school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
High school graduate	2	10.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5
College graduate	5	26.3	4	21.0	1	5.3	10	52.6
Graduate work	3	15.8	1	5.3	0	0.0	4	21.1
Graduate degree	2	10.5	0	0.0	1	5.3	3	15.8
Experience								
Under 1 year	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1- 3 years	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4- 6 years	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	5.3	2	10.6
7- 9 years	6	31.6	1	5.3	1	5.3	8	42.2
10-12 years	3	15.8	3	15.8	0	0.0	6	31.6
13-15 years	2	10.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5
16+ years	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
Department Employed								
Engineering	4	21.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	5	26.3
Finance	0	0.0	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	5.3
Manufacturing	2	10.5	1	5.3	0	0.0	3	15.8
Leaf	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
Research & Development	2	10.5	1	5.3	1	5.3	4	21.1
Finished Goods	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
Production (Planning and Control)	0	0.0	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	5.3
Customer Service	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
Quality Assurance	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
Purchasing	0	0.0	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	5.3
Program Attendance								
September, 1983 (11)	2	10.5	1	5.3	0	0.0	3	15.8
May, 1983 (10)	3	15.8	1	5.3	0	0.0	4	21.1
March, 1983 (9)	2	10.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5
September, 1982 (8)	0	0.0	2	10.5	1	5.3	3	15.8
July, 1982 (7)	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
November, 1981 (6)	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
August, 1981 (5)	2	10.5	1	5.3	0	0.0	3	15.8
May, 1981 (4)	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	5.3	2	10.6

^aDue to rounding, categories may not total 100%.

5. Over half (52.6%) of the departments from the preliminary survey were represented in the sample. The departments with the greatest number of participants were Engineering (26.3%) and Research and Development (21.1%).

6. All eight classes (Class 4 through Class 11) used in the study were represented. The classes represented most often were Class 10 - May, 1983 (21.1%) followed by Class 11 - September, 1983, Class 8 - September, 1982, and Class 5 - August, 1981, all with 15.8%.

When the characteristics of the 19 participants in the sample are compared with the characteristics of the 102 participants out of 120 from the population, they are almost identical in relation to sex, race, age, education, and work experience. One exception was that all participants in the sample had a minimum of four years' work experience at Shemano compared with one year from the population.

The department with the greatest number of participants from both the population and the sample was Engineering. Therefore, it is evident that the representation in the sample as to sex, race, age, education, and work experience of the participants closely matched that of the population.

Treatment

The developmental assessment center at Shemano Corporation is a group of unrelated exercises which are similar in job content to the targeted job(s) in higher management. This design is based on the results of a job analysis procedure of the target job(s). The job analysis breaks the targeted job(s) into its more basic components and rates them as to their importance for a person to perform successfully in the targeted job. These job components are often

referred to as management abilities and include the following behaviors as defined by Shemano:

1. Leadership: Gets ideas accepted by others. Gets people to willingly work to accomplish an objective.
2. Planning and Organizing: Plans own activities and those of others. Arranges resources to accomplish objectives.
3. Analytical Skill: Processes available information and arrives at logical and practical decisions. Perceives relationships between situations and evaluates the consequences of alternative actions.
4. Management Control (formerly delegation and management control): Effectively assigns work to others (i.e., ensures that activities assigned to others are carried out according to appropriate standards).
5. Sensitivity: Sensitive to the needs of others and able to accomplish objectives without alienating others.
6. Decision Making (formerly decisiveness and flexibility): Makes firm decisions in a timely manner yet is able to modify such decisions or opinions when presented logical alternative ideas.
7. Stress Tolerance: Maintains stable performance under stress and opposition.
8. Oral Communication: Communicates effectively in an oral mode. Absence of annoying or distracting gestures.
9. Written Communication: Communicates effectively in a written mode. Grammar and organization appropriate.

These nine management abilities were used in evaluating Classes 9 through 11 only; for Class 4 through 8, eleven management abilities were used in the evaluation. Delegation and management control (which later changed to

one ability, management control) and decisiveness and flexibility (which later became decision making) were assessed as separate behaviors for Classes 4 through 8.

Shemano's Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP), which is held in a location outside the organization independent of the work site, includes 12 participants who are nominated by management. In addition, the program uses 4 assessors. These assessors, usually in a job position at least one level higher than the targeted job(s) level, usually observe 1 to 3 participants (1:1 - 1:3 ratio). They have been trained prior to the actual program in objective behavioral observation. They are, therefore, trained to observe the participants as they interact in the exercises so that biases, prejudices, or any personal feelings on the part of the assessors regarding the participants do not enter into their observations. The program is administered by a chairperson (Program Administrator) and an assistant to ensure that the program adheres to its strict time schedule and that the observers and participants are in the locations where they belong. The assessment takes three days. It allows for each observer to see each participant more than once during the program and in different types of exercises: one-on-one, role plays, leaderless groups, etc.

When the program is completed, the participants leave, and the assessors independently assign a numerical rating to their observations using a five-point Likert scale. For each of the management abilities, assessors determine whether the performance of the participants was at a level above what is expected of higher management (3.5 to 5.0), at a level typical of higher management (2.5 to 3.5), or at a level which requires additional development in order to meet the standard for higher management (1.0 to 2.4). Then, the assessors and the Program Administrator meet. In an ordered fashion, each

participant is discussed. This discussion is based solely on the numerical ratings and the notes that have been taken during the program. The assessors reach a group consensus regarding the "amount" of each management ability that a participant has by indicating whether the ability is above adequate, adequate, or below adequate of what is expected of higher management and makes recommendations for developmental activities for improvement. No overall rating is determined for the participants. (Classes 1 through 8 were rated on eleven management abilities; classes 9 through 11 were rated on nine management abilities--decisiveness and flexibility became decision making, and delegation was combined with management control).

The assessors' recommendations are accompanied by detailed behavioral examples of strengths and weaknesses in the abilities. They also specify developmental activities which can be pursued by each participant in order to increase his/her ability in those areas which are judged less than adequate of upper management.

After the assessor evaluations and recommendations are completed, the program chairperson prepares a detailed written report for each participant. Participants who have completed the program get the following feedback:

1. A written report listing strengths and areas of needed development based on the assessors' observations during the program.
2. A private interview with the Program Administrator or assistant to the administrator in order to review the report/recommendations and to discuss a developmental plan.

A copy of the Success Report is given to each participant at the feedback interview, and a copy is maintained by the Program Administrator. No other copies of the report are distributed or made available to anyone for any

reason. If a request is made to see a report by someone other than the participant, the requestor is directed to the participant for permission to review the feedback information. It is made clear to the participant before the program that revealing the contents of the feedback report is an option left solely to the discretion of the participant. The executive who makes the initial selection decision meets with the participant and his/her manager to notify them of the selection and to explain the discretionary nature of sharing the feedback information. This early meeting tends to take some of the pressure off the participant who may not wish to share the feedback with upper management. Again during the feedback interview at the conclusion of the program the advantages and disadvantages of discussing the feedback information with upper management are reviewed with the participant, and the discretionary approach is reinforced.

Upon receiving the feedback concerning their participation in the program, the participants have the sole responsibility for implementing their developmental activities.

Instrumentation

The principal instrument for gathering data was an interview schedule. The interview schedule was prepared for each category as follows: (a) Form A: Participants who implemented and completed one or more recommended developmental activities and possibly self-selected developmental activities, (b) Form B: Participants who did not implement recommended developmental activities but did implement and complete self-selected developmental activities, (c) Form C: Participants who implemented one or more recommended and/or self-selected developmental activities but did not

complete any, and (d) Form D: Participants who did not implement either recommended or self-selected developmental activities.

Each of the four forms was divided into five parts. Part One solicited information about the developmental activities that the participants implemented and the reasons why they did or did not implement them. Part Two solicited information about the participants' perceptions of the program operation (pre-assessment, assessment, and post-assessment). Part Three dealt with any changes in management behavior that participants experienced as a result of participation in MMDP (their knowledge of how to develop their managerial skills, improvement in their management skills, and confidence in their management skills). Part Four questioned the participants' professional outcomes (their job satisfaction and job movement). Part Five requested participants' recommendations for improvement of the program. Questions in Part I differed depending on whether participants implemented and completed their developmental activities. With the participants' permission, a copy of their Success Report (containing assessors' evaluation and recommendations for development) was obtained from their confidential personnel file and was used in gathering information for Part One. Questions in Parts Two, Three, Four, and Five were asked to all participants in the sample.

A semi-structured interview method was used to allow the researcher to (a) gather specific demographic data related to assessees, (b) probe more deeply into specific areas identified by assessees in the questionnaire, (c) create a friendly, non-threatening atmosphere between the interviewer and interviewee, and (d) personally observe the assessees' behavior to various closed and open-ended questions.

Collection of Data

A personal, confidential in-depth interview was conducted with each of the 19 participants in the sample. All MMDP participants had been informed about the follow-up interviews in the Survey Report, which contained the results of the questionnaire survey and was mailed to them in May, 1984. Participants for the sample were contacted by interoffice mail requesting their permission to be interviewed. Of the 19 participants contacted, 17 (89.5%) gave permission to be interviewed. One participant could not be interviewed due to travel constraints at that time, and the other did not desire to be interviewed. Two replacements with similar characteristics were selected in their places.

The 19 participants who agreed to be interviewed returned a permission form to the researcher in order that a copy of their SUCCESS Report could be obtained from the personnel files. Each interviewee was then contacted by telephone to schedule a confidential, personal interview in their office or in a conference room for approximately 1 to 1-1/2 hours. At that time, they were asked to confirm their questionnaire survey responses to development after assessment. If participants' developmental status had changed between the questionnaire survey and the telephone contact, they were moved to the appropriate category. All four participants in Category 3 (those who implemented recommended and/or self-selected developmental activities but did not complete any) and three of the five participants in Category 4 (those who did not implement any developmental activities —recommended or self-selected) moved to Category 1 (those who implemented and completed one or more recommended and possibly self-selected developmental activities) or Category 2 (those who did not implement recommended developmental activities but did implement and complete one or more self-selected developmental activities). As

all participants in Category 3 had completed one or more developmental activities—recommended and/or self-selected—, Category 3 (and Form C) was, therefore, eliminated at that time.

The sample of 19 participants was reduced from four categories to these three categories: (a) Category 1: Participants who implemented and completed one or more recommended developmental activities and possibly self-selected developmental activities (12 participants - Form A), (b) Category 2: Those participants who did not complete recommended developmental activities but did implement and complete one or more self-selected developmental activities (5 participants - Form B), and (c) Category 3: Those participants who did not implement either recommended or self-selected developmental activities (2 participants - Form D).

An interview schedule (Form A, B, or D) was followed, and information was recorded on the interview schedule and its accompanying supplements. Comments from the participants were written verbatim in shorthand by the researcher. However, with permission of the interviewees, the interviews were recorded by a tape recorder, and the researcher used the recorder to verify notes or comments as necessary. The tapes were not transcribed. (Eighteen of the 19 participants allowed the interviews to be taped.) Each interview was conducted either in the interviewee's private office or in a conference room and lasted for 1 to 1-1/2 hours.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from the semi-structured interviews were analyzed according to these three categories: (a) Those who implemented and completed one or more recommended developmental activities and possibly some self-selected developmental activities, (b) those who did not implement

recommended developmental activities but did implement and complete one or more self-selected developmental activities, and (c) those who did not implement either recommended or self-selected developmental activities.

First, each case was analyzed for (a) the extent to which participants implemented and completed developmental activities and the reasons why they did or did not implement them, (b) participants' perceptions of the program operation, (c) any changes that occurred in participants' management behavior as a result of participation in MMDP, (d) participants' professional outcomes with respect to job satisfaction and job movement as a result of participation in MMDP, and (e) participants' recommendations for improving the program.

This analysis was done by first reducing the participants' responses from the interview schedules and accompanying supplements to 5" x 8" index cards. The number of responses was counted and transferred to a working table format along with supporting descriptive data.

From these tables, each of the three categories of responses was analyzed for each part of the instrument so that the researcher could describe what occurred in each of these categories. The data concerning participants' evaluation and implementation of developmental activities and their recommendations for improvement of the program were reported quantitatively. Supporting narrative data included verbatim comments from the participants concerning the program.

In addition to the quantitative analysis of the extent of participants' development, participants' perceptions of the program operation, changes in participants' management behavior, participants' professional outcomes with respect to job satisfaction and job movement, and participants' recommendations for improving the program, individual profiles were made for

each of the 19 participants in the sample. The original three categories had to be modified because most participants fell into the same classification of importance. Therefore, participants were categorized in a different way: (a) Those who were high implementers, (b) those who were moderate implementers, (c) those who were low implementers, (d) those who were implementers of self-selected activities only, and (e) those who were non-implementers. Certain factors that enhanced participants' development and other factors that hindered participants' development were identified. Comparisons were made so that relationships, similarities, and differences could be reported.

Finally, some generalizations about all the cases were reported.

Chapter 4

RESULTS: EXTENT OF DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which participants in a Mid-Management Development Program actually implemented developmental activities after assessment and feedback.

The results are presented in the following order: (a) Evaluation of Participants' Management Abilities, (b) Assessor Recommendations, (c) Implementation of Developmental Activities by Participants, (d) Participants' Perceptions of Program Operation, (e) Changes in Participants' Management Behavior, (f) Participants' Professional Outcomes, (g) Other Benefits from Program Participation, and (h) Participants' Recommendations for Improvement of the Program.

Evaluation of Participants' Management Abilities

During the program participants were observed by the assessors as they interacted in various exercises. The observations were written in behavioral terms by the assessors. At the conclusion of the program, participants left, and the assessors independently assigned numerical ratings to their observations. They met, along with the program administrator, in order to reach a group consensus regarding the "amount" of each of the nine management abilities participants had. This evaluation, along with specific recommendations for development, was written in a final report by the program administrator and presented to participants in a feedback interview.

Participants also evaluated themselves and their peers at the conclusion of the program by placing themselves and the other eleven participants in

the upper, middle, or lower third of the class. However, participants did not see the results of the peer evaluations.

Assessor Evaluation

Assessors observed and then evaluated each participant's performance in the program with respect to the following management ability areas: (a) Leadership, (b) planning and organizing, (c) analytical skill, (d) management control, (e) sensitivity, (f) decision making, (g) stress tolerance, (h) oral communication, and (i) written communication. (In September 1982, after Class 8, delegation was combined with management control, and decisiveness and flexibility became decision making.)

For each of these abilities, the assessors determined whether the performance of the participants reflected a higher level of that ability which is typical of higher management, the exact level of that ability which is typical of higher management, or a level of that ability which requires additional development in order to meet the standard for higher management. In some cases, assessors did not observe a particular management ability in the participant, or consensus from assessors could not be reached on a particular ability. Therefore, no assessment for some management abilities was given.

Table 6 indicates that on five of the management abilities--planning and organizing, delegation, decisiveness, stress tolerance, and written communication, all the participants (100.0%) were ranked as adequate or more than adequate. Eighty-nine and five tenths percent (89.5%) were ranked as adequate/more than adequate on analytical skill, 84.3% on sensitivity,

Table 6
Assessors' Evaluation
of Management Abilities
(N = 19^a)

Management Abilities	More than Adequate				Adequate				Less than Adequate				Not Assessed				Total No.
	Cat 1 No.	Cat 2 %	Cat 3 No.	Total %	Cat 1 No.	Cat 2 %	Cat 3 No.	Total %	Cat 1 No.	Cat 2 %	Cat 3 No.	Total %	Cat 1 No.	Cat 2 %	Cat 3 No.	Total %	
Leadership	0	0.0	1	5.3	9	47.4	2	10.5	3	15.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19
Planning and Organizing	2	10.5	1	5.3	10	52.6	5	26.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19
Analytical Skills	2	10.5	0	0.0	9	47.4	3	15.8	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19
Delegation ^c	1	10.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	3	30.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10
Management Control ^c	3	15.8	1	5.3	5	26.3	4	21.1	3	15.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	19
Sensitivity	1	5.3	0	0.0	10	52.6	4	21.1	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	19
Decisiveness ^b	1	10.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	3	30.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10
Flexibility ^b	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	30.0	2	20.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10
Decision Making ^d	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	55.6	2	22.2	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	9
Stress Tolerance	1	5.3	0	0.0	11	57.9	5	26.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19
Oral Communication	1	5.3	1	5.3	7	36.8	4	21.1	4	21.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19
Written Communication	2	10.5	0	0.0	10	52.6	5	26.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19
Total Management Abilities	14	7.3	4	2.1	87	45.5	43	22.5	15	7.9	4	2.1	1	.5	3	1.6	191

^aOf the total, Category 1=12; Category 2=5; Category 3=2.

^bDue to rounding, categories may not total 100%.

80.0% on flexibility, 79.1% on oral communication, 79.0% on management control, 77.8% on decision making, and 68.5% on leadership.

As shown in Table 6, three-fourths of all management ability areas (75.9%) in the three categories were evaluated as adequate; 12.0% were more than adequate. In the management ability areas in which participants were judged less than adequate, 31.6% were judged less than adequate in leadership, 21.1% in oral communication, 20.0% in flexibility, 15.8% in management control, 11.1% in decision making, and 10.6% in sensitivity and analytical skills. No participants were judged less than adequate in planning and organizing, delegation, decisiveness, stress tolerance, and written communication.

Peer Evaluation and Self Evaluation

There were 12 participants in each class, and at the end of each program, they were asked to rank the performance of all participants in their class, including their own performance, into three groups: Four people in the upper third of the class, four people in the middle third of the class, and four people in the lower third of the class. Table 7 indicates that peers ranked 15.8% of the participants in the upper third, 47.4% in the middle third, and 36.8% in the lower third. Those who implemented recommended and possibly self-selected developmental activities (Category 1) were ranked by their peers as follows: 16.7% in the upper third, 50.0% in the middle third, and 33.3% in the lower third. No participants in Category 2 (those who implemented self-selected developmental activities only) were ranked by their peers in the upper third; 40.0% were ranked in the middle third, and 60.0% in the lower third. Those who implemented no developmental

Table 7
 Ranking of Participants' Management Abilities
 in Upper, Middle, and Lower Third of Class
 (N = 19^a)

Participant	Ranking by Peer (N = 19) ^b			Ranking by Self (N = 17) ^b		
	Upper	Middle	Lower	Upper	Middle	Lower
Category 1:						
1:1		x		x		
1:2	x				x	
1:3		x		x		
1:4			x		x	
1:5	x			x		
1:6			x		x	
1:7		x		x		
1:8			x		x	
1:9		x			missing	
1:10			x		x	
1:11		x			x	
1:12		x		x		
Total Category 1	$\bar{2}$ (16.7%)	$\frac{x}{6}$ (50.0%)	$\bar{4}$ (33.3%)	$\frac{x}{5}$ (45.5%)	$\bar{6}$ (54.5%)	$\bar{0}$ (0.0%)
Category 2:						
2:1			x		x	
2:2			x			x
2:3			x		missing	
2:4		x			x	
2:5		x		x		
Total Category 2	$\bar{0}$ (0.0%)	$\frac{x}{2}$ (40.0%)	$\bar{3}$ (60.0%)	$\frac{x}{1}$ (25.0%)	$\bar{2}$ (50.0%)	$\bar{1}$ (25.0%)
Category 3:						
3:1	x				x	
3:2		x			x	
Total Category 3	$\bar{1}$ (50.0%)	$\frac{x}{1}$ (50.0%)	$\bar{0}$ (0.0%)	$\bar{0}$ (0.0%)	$\frac{x}{2}$ (100.0%)	$\bar{0}$ (0.0%)
TOTAL ALL CATEGORIES	(15.8%)	(47.4%)	(36.8%)	(35.3%)	(58.8%)	(5.9%)

^aOf the total, Category 1 = 12, Category 2 = 5, Category 3 = 2.

^bDue to missing information in participants' files.

activities—recommended or self-selected—(Category 3) were ranked by their peers in the upper third (50.0%) and middle third (50.0%) of the class. No participants in Category 3 were ranked in the lower third (0.0%) by their peers.

Regarding the participants' self-ranking, 35.3% ranked themselves in the upper third, 58.8% in the middle third, and 5.9% in the lower third. Participants who implemented recommended and possibly self-selected developmental activities (Category 1) ranked themselves in the upper third (45.5%) and middle third (54.5%) of the class only. Participants who implemented only self-selected developmental activities (Category 2) ranked themselves in all three areas: Upper third (25.0%), middle third (50.0%), and lower third (25.0%). Participants who implemented no developmental activities (Category 3) ranked themselves only in the middle third (100.0%) of the class.

When the ranking by peers and self-ranking are compared, 35.3% of the participants ranked themselves in the upper third as compared with 15.8% of the peers who did. Fifty-eight and eight tenths percent (58.8%) ranked themselves in the middle third while 47.4% of their peers ranked them in the middle third. Five and nine tenths percent (5.9%) of the participants ranked themselves in the lower third as compared with 36.8% of the peers who did. It is evident that participants thought more highly of themselves than their peers did.

Table 7 also reports that when comparing the two groups, twelve participants were ranked differently by the two groups; five participants received identical rankings by the two groups. Two participants' rankings could not be compared as their self-rankings were missing from the files.

Assessor Recommendations

Assessors provided MMDP participants with an evaluation of their program performance and recommendations for development. The assessors' recommendations were accompanied by detailed behavioral examples of strengths and weaknesses in the management abilities. The assessors also provided specific developmental activities, which could be pursued by participants in order to increase their management abilities, particularly in those areas which were judged less than adequate for upper management. The program administrator prepared a detailed written report, which contained the assessors' evaluation and specific recommendations for development. This report was discussed with each participant in a feedback interview upon returning to work.

Table 8 shows the management ability areas recommended and implemented. The management abilities implemented will be discussed later in the chapter. Using eleven management ability areas for Classes 4 through 8 and nine management ability areas for Class 9 through 11, the assessors recommended developmental activities in eight specific management ability areas and one combined multi-ability area (as shown in Table 8). This multi-ability area contained two or more of the specific management ability areas assessed. The most recommended management ability area was leadership (73.7%), followed by oral communication (47.4%), sensitivity and stress tolerance (26.3%), analytical skill and management control (10.5%), and decision making and decisiveness (5.3%). No developmental activities were recommended for four management ability areas—planning and organizing, delegation, flexibility, and written communication.

Table 8
MANAGEMENT AREAS RECOMMENDED AND IMPLEMENTED

Management Areas	Category 1 (N=12)				Category 2 (N=5)				Category 3 (N=2)				Total			
	Number Recom- mended ^a	% Recom- mended	Number Imple- mented ^a	% Imple- mented	Number Recom- mended ^a	% Recom- mended	Number Imple- mented ^a	% Imple- mented	Number Recom- mended ^a	% Recom- mended	Number Imple- mented ^a	% Imple- mented	Number Recom- mended ^a	% Recom- mended	Number Imple- mented ^a	% Imple- mented
Leadership	8	66.7	7	87.5	5	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	14	73.7	7	50.0
Planning & Organizing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Analytical Skills	1	8.3	1	100.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5	1	50.0
Delegation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Management Control	2	16.7	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5	2	100.0
Sensitivity	3	25.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	5	26.3	1	20.0
Decision-Making	1	8.3	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	100.0
Decisiveness	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	0	100.0
Flexibility	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Stress Tolerance	4	33.3	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	5	26.3	3	60.0
Oral Communication	7	58.3	5	71.4	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	47.4	5	55.6
Written Communication	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Multiple Abilities	1	8.3	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	100.0

^aNumber of Participants

Table 9 reports that the number of management ability areas recommended for each participant ranged from 1-4 with two areas being recommended to 14 of the 19 participants. The total number of individual recommended activities for each participant ranged from 2-7 with three or four activities recommended to the majority of the participants. The assessors recommended a total of 70 developmental activities to the 19 participants in the sample.

As shown in Table 10, the assessors recommended nine different categories of activities. Of the 70 activities recommended, the assessors recommended enrollment in a training program/course 37 times. Both internal and external training programs/courses were included but not specified in the recommendations. Self-modification of inappropriate behavior was recommended 8 times, reading of books 5 times, and expansion of area of responsibility 4 times. Special project work, along with feedback from other personnel, was recommended 3 times. Special project work consisted of leading project teams in individual's work area, participation in other work areas, and work assignments with specific orientation. Individual coaching by supervisors and club/association membership were recommended 2 times, and on-the-job training 1 time. Both recommendations for club membership specifically named Toastmasters Club.

Implementation of Developmental Activities

The Mid-Management Development Program serves as a vehicle to provide formal and specific documentation of participants' developmental needs which may not take place in the performance of their day-to-day job responsibilities. The program also uncovers areas of weakness which may not

Table 9
RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENTAL AREAS/ACTIVITIES
(N=19)

<u>Participants</u>	<u>Number of Areas Recommended</u>	<u>Number of Activities Recommended</u>	<u>Number of Areas Implemented</u>	<u>Percentage of Areas Implemented</u>	<u>Number of Activities Implemented</u>	<u>Percentage of Activities Implemented</u>
Category 1:						
1:1	2	2	2	100.0	2	100.0
1:2	4	7	4	100.0	5	71.4
1:3	3	4	2	66.7	2	50.0
1:4	2	5	1	50.0	1	20.0
1:5	2	3	2	100.0	2	66.7
1:6	2	5	2	100.0	2	40.0
1:7	3	4	1	33.3	1	25.0
1:8	2	4	2	100.0	2	50.0
1:9	1	5	1	100.0	1	20.0
1:10	2	2	1	50.0	1	50.0
1:11	2	4	1	50.0	1	25.0
1:12	2	<u>3</u>	2	100.0	<u>3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
TOTAL Category 1		48			23	47.9
Category 2:						
2:1	2	3	0	0.0	0	0.0
2:2	2	3	0	0.0	0	0.0
2:3	1	2	0	0.0	0	0.0
2:4	2	5	0	0.0	0	0.0
2:5	2	<u>2</u>	0	0.0	0	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL Category 2		15			0	0.0
Category 3:						
3:1	2	4	0	0.0	0	0.0
3:2	2	<u>3</u>	0	0.0	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL Category 3		7			0	0.0
TOTAL ALL CATEGORIES						
		70			23	32.9

Table 10
 ACTIVITIES RECOMMENDED BY ASSESSORS
 FOR PARTICIPANTS' DEVELOPMENT
 (N = 18)

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Number of Times Recommended</u>
Job-Related	
Special project work	3
On-the-job training	1
Expanded area of responsibility	4
Training program/course	37
Individual coaching by supervisor	2
Self-modification of inappropriate behavior	8
Feedback from other personnel	3
Read literature	5
Club or association	<u>2</u>
Total ^a	65

^aActivities from one participant could not be included because permission was not granted to access participant's SUCCESS Report.

have been noticed by participants' managers because the ability was not required in any significant degree in their present assignments. After the conclusion of the program, participants are given a plan for development, the Success Report. Although it is reviewed with each participant, responsibility for implementing these activities lies solely with each individual participant. The organization does not formally plan any specific learning activity to help participants implement the recommended development. However, participants may seek out assistance from the organization, such as tuition paid for external training programs/courses, time off from work, counseling by the professional staff in the Department of Organization and Management Development.

The participants have been sampled from the population of all participants in the program using several criteria, one of which was the degree of implementation of developmental activities. Category 1 included participants who implemented recommended and possibly self-selected developmental activities; Category 2, those who implemented only self-selected developmental activities. Category 3 included those who implemented no developmental activities--recommended or self-selected.

Recommended Developmental Areas/Activities Implemented

Twelve (12) participants of the 19 in the sample actually implemented the recommended developmental activities. Table 8 reports that of the nine management ability areas (which included a multi-ability management area) recommended for development, eight areas were implemented by participants in Category 1 only. (No participants in Category 2 or Category 3 implemented recommended management ability areas.) Decisiveness was the

only recommended area not implemented; a person from Category 2 received this recommendation. All participants in Category 1 who received recommendations in four of the management areas (Analytical Skills, Management Control, Decision Making, and Multi-Abilities) implemented one or more activities in each area.

The 12 participants from Category 1 who implemented recommended development completed 23 developmental activities (see Table 9). The number of recommended activities completed by each participant ranged from 1-5. The assessors recommended nine different categories of developmental activities as shown in Table 10. The categories included job-related activities, such as special project work, on-the-job training, and expanded area of responsibility, formal training/course, individual coaching by supervisors, self-modification of inappropriate behavior, feedback from other personnel, reading of relevant literature, and membership in a club/association.

Table 11 shows that participants who implemented the recommendations conducted only six of the nine categories of activities recommended. They did not, for example, implement activities that involved individual coaching by supervisors, on-the-job training, and club/association membership. The category most often used was enrollment in a formal training program/course (7) followed by self-modification of inappropriate behavior (5), reading of literature (4), and expansion of area of responsibility and feedback from other personnel (3). People who actually implemented activities in the management area of leadership used five different categories of activities. In other areas, they used from 1-2 different categories of activities.

Table 11
 ACTIVITIES USED IN IMPLEMENTATION
 OF RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT

<u>Management Area</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>No.</u> ^a
Leadership	Special Projects	1
	Read Literature	1
	Expanded Area of Responsibility	1
	Self-modification	3
	Training program/course	1
Analytical Skill	Training program/course	1
Management Control	Self-modification	2
Sensitivity	Training program/course	1
	Feedback from other employees	1
Decision Making	Expanded Area of Responsibility	1
Stress Tolerance	Read literature	3
Oral Communication	Expanded Area of Responsibility	1
	Training program/course	3
	Feedback from other employees	2
Multi-Abilities	Training Program/Course	<u>1</u>
Total		23

^aNumber of times implemented

Time Elapse between Program Feedback and Development. The time that elapsed after the program between the time that participants received their recommendations and the time they implemented them varied (see Table 12). Two participants reported that they had already begun developmental activities that were recommended by the assessors before attending the program. Five others reported they began developmental activities immediately; one within 1 month; two within 3 months; one within 6 months; and one within 12 months. Enrollment in formal training programs/courses tended to take the longest amount of time to get started. Self-modification of inappropriate behavior, feedback from others, and reading of relevant literature usually tended to take the least amount of time to start development.

Problems Experienced in Implementing Developmental Activities. Of the 19 participants in the sample, 12 reported they implemented 23 recommended developmental activities. According to Table 12, 7 participants cited they had no problems initiating any of the developmental activities. However, 5 participants experienced problems in developing some or all of their recommended activities. No opportunity to pursue activities in their current job positions was mentioned 4 times (3 related to expanded job responsibilities and 1 related to noncommitment of supervisor to set up training program/course for participant). Other reasons mentioned were no money in budget (2 times), priority of others to develop (1 time), difference in philosophy of participant and assessors (1 time), training program/course not available (1 time), and books not readily available (1 time).

Support from Others. As shown in Table 12, participants who implemented recommended developmental activities received both company

Table 12
IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES:
LENGTH OF TIME TO START, PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED, SUPPORT, OTHER SIMILAR ACTIVITIES

<u>Participant/ Management Area</u>	<u>Activity Description</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>Similar Activities</u>
1:1 Leadership	(1) Training Program/Course	12 months	Money in budget, Priority of Others to develop	Time off, Paid Tuition Counseling by Program Administrator	None
Oral Communication	(2) Training Program/Course	12 months	"	"	"
1:2 Leadership	(1) Self-modification	Immediately	Difference between participant's philosophy of assessors	Peers	None
Analytical Skills	(2) Training Program/Course	5 months	Program/Course not available	Time off, Paid Tuition	None
Sensitivity	(3) Feedback from other personnel	Immediately	None	Peers Discussion with supervisor	None
Decision Making	(4) Training Program/Course	8 months	None	Time off, Paid Tuition	None
	(5) Expanded responsibility	9 months	No opportunity to pursue activity in current position	Friends	None
1:3 Stress Tolerance	(1) Reading	2 months	Books not readily available	Wife	Read other books more readily available
Oral Communication	(2) Feedback from other personnel	Immediately	None	Discussion with supervisor, peers, subordinates	None
1:4 Management Control	(1) Self-modification	Immediately	None	None	None
1:5 Leadership	(1) Expanded Responsibility	3 months	No opportunity to pursue activity in current position	None	None
Oral Communication	(2) Training Program/Course	12 months	Program/Course not available	Time off	None
1:6 Leadership	(1) Special Project	Already in progress	None	Discussion with supervisor	None
Multi-Ability	(2) Training Program/Course	Already enrolled	None	Time off, Paid Tuition	None
1:7 Management Control	(1) Self-modification	Immediately	None	None	None
1:8 Stress Tolerance	(1) Reading	6 months	None	Obtained list of books from Dept. of Mgnt. & Org. Dev.	None
Oral Communication	(2) Training Program/Course	3 months	None	Time off, Paid Tuition	None
1:9 Leadership	(1) Reading	Immediately	None	Publications obtained thru Dept. of Mgnt. & Org. Dev.	None
1:10 Leadership	(1) Self-modification	1 month	None	Minister	None
1:11 Leadership	(1) Self-modification	Already in progress	None	Supervisor	None
1:12 Stress Tolerance	(1) Reading	6 months	None	Wife	None
Oral Communication	(2) Training Program/Course	2 years	No opportunity to pursue activity in current position	Supervisor	None
	(3) Expanded responsibility	1 year	No opportunity to pursue activity in current position	Supervisor	None

support and support from individuals. The greatest amount of support was provided by management (time off from job, paid tuition, counseling/discussion with program administrator, supervisor, and professional staff in the Department of Organization and Management Development). Individual support came from company peers, participants' spouses, friends, and minister.

Other Similar Activities. Table 12 indicates that 11 of the 12 participants who implemented recommended developmental activities completed no additional activities similar to the ones recommended by assessors. However, one participant read books which were more readily available than the ones recommended before purchasing the recommended ones. It is apparent that most participants pursued specific recommended developmental activities made by the assessors and did not substitute or add a similar developmental activity.

Recommended Developmental Areas/Activities Not Implemented

Of the 12 participants in Category 1, two (2) participants implemented all of the activities recommended for them in all management ability areas (See Table 9). Five (5) participants completed one or more activities within all management areas recommended, and 5 participants completed activities in some but not all management ability areas. Seven (7) of these 19, participants in Category 2 and Category 3, implemented no recommended developmental activities.

In reporting reasons why recommended developmental activities were not implemented, participants' answers were very specific. Table 13 shows that the reason used most often was that participants rejected the assessors'

Table 13
REASONS WHY RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES
WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED

Reason	Category 1 (N = 12)	Category 2 (N = 5)	Category 3 (N = 2)	Total (N = 19)
	No. of Participants	No. of Participants	No. of Participants	No. of Participants
Already had learning experience (courses)	4	0	0	4
Rejected recommendation:				
Disagreed with recommendation	3	3	0	6
Did not want to implement but substituted another	4	1	0	5
Did not feel important enough to take seriously	1	0	0	1
Artificial environment created different actions from real world	0	2	1	3
Variability in assessors' evaluation	0	0	1	1
Recommendation not specific enough to work with	0	0	1	1
Problems beyond control of participant:				
Application for program not followed with contact by Dept. of Organization & Management Development	1	0	0	1
Required actions by management	3	2	0	5
Course scheduled but then canceled	1	0	0	1
Modified recommendation because too general	1	0	0	1
No interest in management advancement	0	0	1	1

recommendations (17 times) specifying that they disagreed with the recommendation (6), did not want to implement recommendations but substituted another (5), felt the artificial environment created different actions from real world (3), did not feel recommendations were important enough to take seriously (1), saw variability in assessors' evaluation (1), and felt recommendation was not specific enough to work with (1) The second reason included problems beyond the control of participants (8 times) in which further actions were required by management (5), application for training program was not followed up with contact from Department of Organization and Management Development (1), scheduled course was canceled (1), and recommendation was too general and was modified (1). In addition to recommendation rejection and problems beyond the control of participants, four participants reported they already had the learning experience (training program/course) recommended by assessors and one participant reported he had no interest in management advancement.

Self-Selected Developmental Activities Implemented

Twelve (12) of the 19 participants sampled completed recommended developmental activities in addition to completing one or more self-selected activities. Seven (7) did not implement any recommended developmental activities; of the 7, five implemented self-selected activities, and two did not implement any activities. In all, 17 of the 19 participants sampled implemented one or more developmental activities--recommended and/or self-selected.

Table 14 indicates that the number of areas implemented ranged from 1-3; a total of 39 self-selected activities were completed by participants in

Table 14
 SELF-SELECTED DEVELOPMENTAL AREAS/ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED
 (N=19)

<u>PARTICIPANT</u>	<u>NUMBER OF AREAS IMPLEMENTED</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED</u>
Category 1:		
1:1	1	1
1:2	1	1
1:3	1	3
1:4	1	1
1:5	2	2
1:6	2	3
1:7	2	2
1:8	1	2
1:9	1	2
1:10	1	1
1:11	2	2
1:12	1	2
Category 2:		
2:1	1	1
2:2	1	2
2:3	1	1
2:4	1	2
2:5	3	11
Category 3:		
3:1	0	0
3:2	0	<u>0</u>
TOTAL		39

Category 1 and Category 2. The greatest number of self-selected activities reported by participants was 2, and the number of self-selected activities completed by each participant ranged from 1-11.

Table 15 reports that 6 specific management ability areas (leadership, planning and organizing, delegation, management control, stress tolerance, and oral communication) and one multi-ability area were developed when participants selected their own activities. Seven (7) different categories were used including special project, reading of relevant literature, expanded area of responsibility, self-modification of inappropriate behavior, training program/course, feedback from other employees, and club/association membership. The category most often used in implementing these self-selected activities was training program/course (15 times), followed by reading literature and self-modification of inappropriate behavior (7 times), expanded area of responsibility and feedback from other employees (3 times), and club/association membership (1 time). No self-selected developmental activities were completed by on-the-job training and individual coaching by the supervisor. (Of the 15 training programs/courses used, 9 were taken by one participant from Category 2.) People who selected development in the management area of leadership used 7 different categories of activities as shown in Table 15. In the multi-ability area, five categories of activities were used. In other areas they used 1-3. No participants chose developmental activities in the management areas of analytical skills, sensitivity, decision making (including decisiveness and flexibility), and written communication.

Time Elapse between Program Feedback and Development. The time that elapsed after the results of participants' program performance and recommendations for development and implementation of self-selected

Table 15
 ACTIVITIES USED IN IMPLEMENTATION
 OF SELF-SELECTED DEVELOPMENT

<u>Management Area</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>No.</u> ^a
Leadership	Special Project	2
	Read Literature	1
	Expanded Area of Responsibility	1
	Self-modification	2
	Training program/course	10
	Feedback from other employees	1
	Club or association	1
Planning & Organizing	Read literature	1
	Self-modification	1
	Training program/course	1
Delegation	Self-modification	1
Management Control	Self-modification	1
	Training program/course	1
Stress Tolerance	Self-modification	1
Oral Communication	Self-modification	1
Multi-Abilities	Special Project	1
	Read literature	5
	Expanded Areas of Responsibility	2
	Training Program/Course	3
	Feedback from other employees	<u>2</u>
Total		39

^aNumber of times implemented

activities varied from immediate implementation to 3-1/2 years (see Table 16). One participant could not remember when he completed one of his self-selected activities. Twelve participants of the 17 who implemented self-selected developmental activities (70.5%) reported that they began pursuing one or more self-selected developmental activities immediately; one, within two months; one, within three months; two, within six months; and one, within twelve months.

Expanded area of responsibility (2-3 years) tended to take the longest time to get started. Reading and feedback from other personnel tended to take the least time to get started. Enrollment in training programs/courses varied from immediately to 3-1/2 years.

Problems Experienced in Implementating Developmental Activities.

Table 16 indicates that of the 17 participants who implemented self-selected developmental activities, 16 reported they had no difficulty in implementing any of them. One participant experienced problems in implementing four of the eleven activities he chose to pursue on his own. Time constraint was mentioned two times; not receiving announcements of courses, one time; and availability of course only once a year with just one opening per department, one time.

Support from Others. Eight (8) participants implemented developmental activities on their own without support from anyone (see Table 16). The other nine participants who implemented developmental activities on their own received both company support and individual support. The greatest amount of support was provided by management (time off, paid tuition, counseling, discussions with the program administrator, supervisor, and/or

Table 16
IMPLEMENTATION OF SELF-SELECTED ACTIVITIES:
LENGTH OF TIME TO START, PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED, SUPPORT,
SUBSTITUTION OF RECOMMENDED ACTIVITY, FUTURE PLANS

<u>Participant/ Management Area</u>	<u>Activity Description</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Problems</u>	<u>Support</u>	<u>If Activity Substituted Activities</u>	<u>Future Selected Plans</u>
Category 1:						
1:1 Multi-Ability	(1) Feedback from other personal	Immediately	None	Program Administrator, Supervisors	No	None
1:2 Leadership	(1) Training Program/Course	12 months	None	Time off, Paid Tuition	No	Training Program/Course
1:3 Multi-Ability	(1) Feedback for other personal	Immediately	None	Peers, Staff	No	x
	(2) Reading	Immediately	None	None	No	x
	(3) Expanded responsibility	3 months	None	None	No	Training Program/Course
1:4 Leadership	(1) Special Project	3 months	None	Time off	Yes	None
1:5 Management Control Stress Tolerance	(1) Self-modification	Immediately	None	None	No	x
	(2) Self-modification	Immediately	None	None	No	None
1:6 Leadership	(1) Special Project	1 1/2 years	None	Time off	No	x
	(2) Club/Association	3 months	None	Peers	No	x
	(3) Reading	Immediately	None	None	No	None
1:7 Management Control Oral Communication	(1) Training Program/Course	12 months	None	Time off	Yes	x
	(2) Self-modification	within 6 months	None	None	No	None
1:8 Multi-Ability	(1) Expanded responsibility	Not sure	None	Supervisor	No	x
	(2) Training Program/Course	Immediately	None	Paid Tuition	Yes	None
1:9 Multi-Ability	(1) Training Program/Course	Immediately	None	Time off, Paid Tuition	No	x
	(2) Training Program/ Course	Immediately	None	Paid Tuition	No	None
1:10 Multi-Ability	(1) Reading	Immediately	None	None	No	None
1:11 Delegation Multi-Ability	(1) Self-modification	Immediately	None	None	No	x
	(2) Reading	Immediately	None	None	No	None
1:12 Planning & Organization	(1) Self-modification	1 1/2 years	None	None	No	x
	(2) Reading	Immediately	None	None	No	None
Category 2						
2:1 Leadership	(1) Training Program/Course	6 months	None	None	Yes	None
2:2 Leadership	(1) Reading	1 month	None	None	Yes	x
	(2) Self-modification	Immediately	None	None	Yes	None
2:3 Leadership	(1) Expanded responsibility	2 months	None	None	Yes	Academic courses
2:4 Leadership	(1) Self-modification	Immediately	None	None	Yes	None
	(2) Feedback from other	Immediately	None	Peers, Supervisor, and Subordinates	Yes	None
2:5 Leadership	(1) Training Program/Course	2 1/2 years	Not receiving announcements of courses	Supervisor	Yes	x
	(2) Training Program/Course	3 years	None	Time off	Yes	x
	(3) Training Program/Course	Immediately	None	Time off, Paid Tuition	Yes	x
	(4) Training Program/Course	9 months	None	Time off, Paid Tuition	Yes	x
	(5) Training Program/Course	2 years	None	Time off	Yes	x
	(6) Training Program/Course	2 1/2 years	Time constraint	Paid Tuition	No	x
	(7) Training Program/Course	3 years	None	Paid Tuition	Yes	x
	(8) Training Program/Course	14 months	None	Paid Tuition	Yes	x
	(9) Special Project	Immediately	Time conflicts	None	No	x
Planning & Organization	(10) Training Program/Course	3 1/2 years	Available only once a year with 1 opening in department	Time off	Yes	x
Multi-Ability	(11) Reading	Immediately	None	None	Yes	Training Program/Course

professional staff in the Department of Organization and Management Development. Peers and subordinates (staff) provided individual support.

Substitution of Recommended Activity. The 17 participants who implemented self-selected developmental activities were asked if they substituted self-selected developmental activities in place of recommended ones or if they pursued them in addition to the ones assessors recommended. Table 16 notes that 9 of them (52.9%) did not substitute any developmental activities. Instead, the majority of participants pursued both their recommended activities and also some self-selected ones.

Future Plans. As shown in Table 16, thirteen (13) of the 17 participants who had implemented some self-selected developmental activities reported no specific plans for further development; only 4 discussed specific developmental plans, all of which were training programs/courses.

Participants' Perceptions of the Program Operation

Participants were asked for their perceptions about the program operation regarding these nine factors: (a) Pressure from management to attend, (b) effectiveness of the program, (c) immediacy of the feedback, (d) clarity of the feedback report, (e) their agreement with the report, (f) confidentiality of results preserved, (g) sharing of report with their supervisors, (h) their overall satisfaction with the program, and (i) their judgment (descriptive feelings) of the assessment experience.

Table 17 states that participants perceived the program as a positive experience (83.9%). Of the nine factors, judgment of their assessment experience received the highest positive rating (97.4%), followed by lack of pressure from management to attend, confidentiality preserved, and overall

Table 17
PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM OPERATION

	Category 1 (N = 12)				Category 2 (N = 5)				Category 3 (N = 2)				Total (N = 19)					
	Positive No.	%	Negative No.	%	Positive No.	%	Negative No.	%	Positive No.	%	Negative No.	%	Positive No.	%	Negative No.	%		
Pressure to Attend	12	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	18	94.7	1	6.3		
Effectiveness of Program	10	83.3	2	16.7	4	80.0	1	20.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	16	84.2	3	15.8		
Immediacy of Feedback	5	41.7	7	58.3	3	60.0	2	40.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	9	47.4	10	52.6		
Clarity of Feedback Report	11	91.7	1	8.3	5	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	17	89.5	2	10.5		
Agreement with Report	9	75.0	3	25.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	13	68.4	6	31.6		
Confidentiality Preserved	11	91.7	1	8.3	5	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	18	94.7	1	5.3		
Sharing Report with Supervisor	11	91.7	1	8.3	3	60.0	2	40.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	16	84.2	3	15.8		
Overall Satisfaction with Program	12	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	18	94.7	1	5.3		
Judgment of assessment experience	12	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	15	75.0	5	25.0	185	97.4	.5	2.6		
Total															1435	83.9	27.5	16.1

satisfaction with the program (94.7%). Other positive factors included clarity of feedback (89.5%), effectiveness of program and sharing report with their supervisor (84.2%), and agreement with the report (68.4%). Only one factor, immediacy of feedback (52.6) revealed more negative responses than positive ones.

Pressure from Management to Attend

Of the 19 participants, only one said that he was pressured to attend the program, and he reported, "That is hard to answer. I was not asked whether I wanted to attend or not. I was called in and told I was going to this course. I wasn't given the choice."

One participant explained that it was an opportunity—not pressure—to attend. He added that his boss was not overenthusiastic about the program and that his boss's manager actually enrolled him. "My boss said he had known several people to go through it; he had read some of the reports, and he didn't think it was such a big deal anyway. It was something anybody could say about anybody. He was basically not that interested in it."

Another commented, "I wanted to go. I was hurt that I wasn't asked sooner."

Explaining that the pressure came from himself instead of management, a participant said, "When you're offered an opportunity, to turn it down shows some negative attitudes . . . internal pressure."

In expressing that his boss had knowledge of the program, one participant noted, "My boss, who happens to also be an assessor, felt that I would get a lot out of it and would enjoy the experience because quite

frankly I had been asking him for something other than going to a normal seminar."

Effectiveness of Program

As indicated in Table 17, sixteen people (84.2%) reported that the program was very effective in assessing their managerial skills. One participant replied, "On a scale of 1-10, I would say a 9. They zeroed right in on my weaknesses. We had to write a letter to ourselves before our assessment, and it was incredible how having been through the exercise I knew what my weaknesses were . . . about a month to two months later we got our assessment . . . matched the two . . . they did a super job of identifying my weaknesses and my strengths, too. They were right on target."

Another said, "I wasn't surprised at what was pointed out as weaknesses . . . prior to going I could see self lacking some in the leadership area as to assertiveness. . . 'too easy.'"

One replied, "After receiving feedback of the results, I said, 'that's me.'"

Three (3) participants replied negatively. One commented: "They brought out some good points. Some I agreed with; some I didn't. The interruption (phone call from company) concerning a change in job assignments had some bearing on it because I was getting into the program pretty good, and then I started thinking about my new assignment. My interest tailed off from that."

The second participant said, "It did not assess all your managerial skills . . . I felt it really assessed your ability to probably work with others who you have no control over in round table discussions, negotiating, and

persuading, etc. . . . as far as my people who work for you. . . it did not do that other than . . . people could do well who have certain skills in round table discussions with people they don't control, however, could be perfectly bad managers particularly in a subordinate . . . it really didn't assess the total aspects of what a manager is called for."

The final negative comment on effectiveness in assessing managerial skills was, "I thought it was ineffective in assessing my managerial skills. It was nothing but a stress exercise . . . I do not feel I would handle it the same way on the job."

Immediacy of Feedback

This factor was the only one that received more negative responses (10 or 52.6%) than positive ones (see Table 17). The responses were evenly divided among the three categories. The 9 participants who felt comfortable with the time frame between the program and the feedback responded that the length of time ranged from 1 week to 3 months. Those who waited the longest time were contacted about the delay with explanations from the program administrator.

Ten (10) of the 19 participants felt too much time elapsed between the program and the feedback results. The time ranged from 4-6 weeks to 3 months.

One participant replied, "I was really beginning to get worried."

Another said it was longer than he liked and commented further, "I felt I would be talked to within a week . . . it was four weeks or longer . . . I wouldn't mind taking two days toward the end and then do it before you leave. That's obviously the best way."

Most of these 10 people felt feedback should come within two weeks. One participant explained that the delayed results were anticlimatic. He recalled the interview losing impact because it took a while for him to rethink.

Clarity of Feedback Report

In reporting the clarity of the feedback report, 17 (89.5%) out of 19 participants agreed that the report was very clear (see Table 17). One participant replied, "It was specific enough for me to work with it."

Another reported that it was clear but added it "was not specific enough."

In a similar comment, one participant said, "I hoped to get more detail to give depth. I needed more feedback on how got . . ."

One participant commented, "They identified the parameters they wanted to judge . . . good documentation . . . enough detail to convince me that they knew what they were talking about."

Another positive comment was, "They put a lot of time and effort into it. I was impressed with the amount of time that was spent. Part of the clarity was the fact that I agreed with it."

In commenting on the fact that the program administrator wrote the written report, one participant noted, "It was very well done, well, written, well organized. Examples used were good but could have been clearer. Sometimes it was hard to understand exactly because the program administrator wrote the report using somebody else's notes, and she didn't actually observe."

Two participants felt the report was unclear. One commented on the general recommendations: "The four recommendations . . . I did not understand what they were based on. When I asked them (program administrator or assistant) about it, they really didn't have any specifics as to why they recommended these things."

The other stated, "Going back to one situation. I understand what they said and why they said it but . . . hard thing to treat. . . unclear as to whether they thought it was a problem or not on certain things. They should have elaborated . . . really didn't say a whole lot."

Agreement with Report

Table 17 shows that a majority of the participants (13 or 68.4%) agreed with the assessors' evaluation of their performance. One participant replied, "It coincided with some things I had been seeking on my performance appraisals."

Six participants did not agree with the report. One explained, "In one area . . . I thought they were a little nitpicky . . . they used the term 'bouncing up and down on my feet' and when I went to this workshop plus there was a Director of Marketing there who is great on giving presentations. I had to give a presentation, and I made a comment, 'Boy, they were right, I do raise up,' and he said, 'Quite frankly, that's what we teach people to do . . . to get the feel of volume.' . . . I don't think the assessors in that particular area were really trained to assess that . . . that was the dangerous part of the program giving advice or criticizing in that area what I'm not sure they themselves were or what background they have to critique someone in a presentation-type thing."

Another in commenting on the same issue replied, "I did not believe that the criticism relative to presentations was a justifiable criticism. I felt that it was an artifact of the environment . . . I entered it thinking it was gamelike and didn't take it seriously. . . my reaction was more being amused introspectively thinking, 'Gee, I wonder what they're going to try next.' While I answered the questions asked and played the role, I didn't play the role as seriously as someone else may have played the role." (This person added that he got that impression from other attendees that previously participated in the program.)

One participant disagreed with the report because he felt that all recommendations would be focused on weak areas. Since some of his recommendations were in areas of strength instead of weakness, he was puzzled.

Confidentiality Preserved

Eighteen (18 or 94.7%) of the 19 participants felt that the confidentiality of the program had been preserved (see Table 17). The one negative response, from a participant who was not sure a confidence had been breached, contained information that participants were discussing general information about the program after returning to the job. "I knew you would be getting visits in the middle of the night. I think everybody that goes hears that before they go . . . some of them wear the fact that they went to (program) like a Red Badge of Courage . . . and they like to brag about it and they hear you're going. I don't know how they hear you're going, but they do."

In replying positively to the control of confidentiality by management, one person expressed, "I've talked to several people who've been in the program, and they all feel the same way (agree with confidentiality)".

One person added, "Perhaps the program administrator and my supervisor preserved confidentiality too much."

Sharing of Report with Supervisor

As shown in Table 17, most participants (16 or 84.2%) revealed that they shared their reports with their supervisors. Only three did not. They also revealed the reasons why they did or did not share the reports with their supervisors, the person who initiated the contact, and how the report was shared.

Reasons Why Report Not Shared. The three participants who did not share information with their supervisors replied in three different ways. One shared only information about the program with his supervisor before he received the results concerning his performance because the delay of the report was so long.

The second one said, "Up front I was told this was a confidential evaluation of my supervisory skills or lack of them, and he (supervisor) said he did not want to hear it."

The third person who had not shared the report revealed that his supervisor was immediately transferred overseas and, therefore, was not available.

Reasons Why Report Shared. Table 18 shows 11 different reasons (34 responses) why participants wanted to share results of the program with their supervisor. The reason with the greatest number of responses was the

Table 18
SHARING OF REPORT WITH SUPERVISOR

Reasons Why Report Shared with Supervisor

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No.</u> ^a
Nominated me and should receive feedback	8
Was assessor and his comments were valuable	1
Wanted input from him	4
Desired discussing of developmental needs	3
Could cooperate if he knew results	5
Is a friend	2
Was proud of report	3
Is direct chain of command and is best source of help	2
May suspect negativism if didn't share	2
Felt honored to have been selected over peers	2
Thought he would be interested	<u>2</u>
Total	34

^aNumber of times reported. (Participant may have given more than one reason.)

Method of Sharing Report with Supervisor

<u>Method</u>	<u>No.</u> ^b	<u>Futher Assistance Offered</u>	
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Gave copy to him	3	5	11
Gave copy and discussed	11		
Discussed key issues (without copy available)	2		

^bNumber of times reported.

Person Initiating Sharing of Report
(N = 16)

<u>Person</u>	Category	1 (N = 11)		2 (N = 3)		3 (N = 2)		Total No.
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Participant		10	66.7	3	20.0	2	13.3	15
Supervisor		<u>1</u> 11	100.0	<u>0</u> 3	0.0	<u>0</u> 2	0.0	<u>1</u> 16
		(68.8%)		(18.8%)		(12.5%)		(100.0%)

fact that their supervisor had nominated them (8); followed by participants could get cooperation if supervisor knew (5); participants wanted input from him (4), participant desired discussion of developmental needs and participant was proud of report (3); supervisor is friend, supervisor is direct chain of command and is best source of help, supervisor may suspect something negative if don't share, participant felt honored to have been selected over peers, and participant thought supervisor would be interested (2); and supervisor was assessor and his comments were valuable (1).

Person Initiating Contact. As Table 18 indicates, 15 out of the 16 who shared their program results with their supervisor initiated the contact with them. Only one (1) of those who shared the information reported that the supervisor initiated the contact.

How Report Shared. Table 18 reports three methods of sharing the results: (1) Participant gave a copy to the supervisor and then discussed it (11 responses); (2) participant gave a copy to the supervisor with no discussion (3 responses); and (3) participant and supervisor discussed key issues only—without copy available (2 responses). Participants were asked if their supervisors offered further assistance after the report was shared, and according to Table 18, 11 out of 16 replied that no further assistance was made available from the supervisor. One participant commented, ". . . nothing happened. I did not get assistance hoped for."

Another stated, "Nothing happened after because he did not feel I had any problems in the areas recommended."

One reply was, "He would have been happy to help me but knew then I did not want to do developmental activities."

A participant in commenting that his supervisor did not support him explained that after changing job assignments and getting another supervisor he has received more support.

Another replied, "It went from nothing to nothing."

One of the participants who received further assistance commented, "He is doing more than any boss I've ever had."

Overall Satisfaction with Program

Eighteen (18 or 94.7%) of the 19 participants were very satisfied with the program overall (see Table 17). One participant commented, "I think every professional needs an assessment, which should be a self-assessment and assessment by others, about every five years to assess his own behavior patterns, his skills and abilities because quite frankly, I thought that was the value of that (program), plus the workshop (developmental activity). I had never seen myself on video tape in table negotiating or presenting and that was a real learning experience, and I'm just sorry I missed that all these years . . . I think waiting till you are a manager or director is too late."

Another said, "Having been in this job for three months, it is exactly like a continuing (Success) program. The (Success) program simulated what I am experiencing right now . . . it comes from all directions. . . and there is no way you can get it all done . . . it has prepared me well . . . it is an indication of how you can handle a particular-type job."

A participant in commenting positively noted, "It made you see how things happen within a business; there were stressful moments through the program, but felt it was good. After the program was over, I felt good about it—going into it, I did not know what to expect . . . I commented to my

supervisor that all of us should have an opportunity to go through it including my supervisor."

Another participant added, "Putting folks in a worklike atmosphere but where they are totally unfamiliar with details and having to call upon the skills that they would expect to experience on a normal job is good . . . the response, the interpretation from the assessors can be a function of how quickly you get into your role and take that role seriously."

In talking about the realism of the simulation, one commented, "It came much closer to realism than a classroom environment, and that was important."

Still another participant added, "It gave you a chance to show some skills you maybe use once a month in a really confined atmosphere . . . pressure they put on you is good from the standpoint that it makes you work under those conditions . . . in un-ideal circumstances . . . put enough roadblocks in your way. After the program was over, I felt that I had achieved something so there was a lot of personal satisfaction."

Some comments from participants who were satisfied overall with the program brought up several points, one being ". . . the most benefit to be derived would be through self evaluation . . . I don't feel like the report they gave was especially beneficial . . . I got more from my self-evaluation than from theirs."

A second person said, "Maybe I wasn't listening when they were explaining to us what we were going to do . . . I was really surprised; as soon as I checked into my room, all of this information came in . . . and a telephone call . . . at first I thought it was a prank and didn't know what was going on until I was halfway through the conversation. . . It was hard

work, and I found out that the types of meetings that were simulated I have been in situations since then. I often think back to the (Success) program."

Another said, "After the program was over . . . not enough follow-up concerning developmental activities." He added, "The participant and program administrator should develop a specific program to meet the developmental needs identified. The program makes general recommendations and then leave it up to the participant to pursue on his own any further development."

Judgment of Assessment Experience

When relating their judgment (descriptive feelings) of the assessment experience, 18 participants reported they had a positive experience and took the learning and feedback seriously (see Table 17). One participant who implemented no developmental activities (Category 3) had mixed feelings and reported, "I thought the program was good for what it did—evaluating strengths and weaknesses, but after a little, I was down on development and dropped it. I felt unsure."

In describing their feelings about the program in the preliminary questionnaire survey, some participants responded with "unfair" and "confusing." During the interview these participants were asked to follow up their responses with specific examples. The one person who reported mixed feelings about the program had responded with an "unfair" description. He clarified it as being a fair program—not good, not bad. He was concerned about what the assessors really meant in their evaluation as no consensus could be determined in some areas of the evaluation. The participant said that this variability and the fact that some recommendations were too general made it difficult for him to pursue developmental activities.

Changes in Participants' Management Behavior

One of the concerns of the study was to identify changes participants made in their management behavior. Participants were asked to describe three specific changes in their management behavior as a result of participation in MMDP—(a) their learning from the program, (b) their improvement in management skills, and (c) their confidence in their management abilities. As shown in Table 19 in one area, learning from the program, all participants (100.0%) responded positively. In the other two areas, improvement in management skills (94.7%) and confidence in management abilities (78.9%), the majority of participants responded positively.

Learning from Program

After all the participants (100.0%) revealed they had learned what they could do to enhance their managerial skills as a result of participation in MMDP, they indicated, as noted in Table 20, that this learning was a result of one or more of these eight activities: (a) Awareness of their own actions during the program, (b) interactions with and observations of other participants during the program, (c) interactions with and observations of assessors during the program, (d) informal discussions with other participants after the program formally ended, (e) the written feedback report, (f) the feedback interview, (g) interactions with their supervisors related to their MMDP experience, and (h) interactions with other employees related to their MMDP experience.

Table 19
CHANGE IN PARTICIPANTS' MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR

Learning from Program

<u>Participant</u>	Yes		No	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Category 1 (N = 12)	12	100.0	0	0.0
Category 2 (N = 5)	5	100.0	0	0.0
Category 3 (N = 2)	<u>2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total (N = 19)	19	100.0	0	0.0

Improvement in Management Skills

<u>Participant</u>	Yes		No	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Category 1 (N = 12)	12	100.0	0	0.0
Category 2 (N = 5)	5	100.0	0	0.0
Category 3 (N = 2)	<u>1</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>50.0</u>
Total (N = 19)	18	94.7	1	5.3

Increased Confidence in Management Abilities

	Yes		No	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Category 1 (N = 12)	10	83.3	2	16.7
Category 2 (N = 5)	4	80.0	1	20.0
Category 3 (N = 2)	<u>1</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>50.0</u>
Total (N = 19)	15	78.9	4	21.1

Table 20
ACTIVITIES WHICH INFLUENCED LEARNING

	Self-Awareness	Interactions with and observations of other participants during program	Interactions with and observations of other assessors during program	Informal discussions with participants after program	Written Report	Feedback Interview	Interactions with supervisor related to program	Interactions with other employees related to program	Total No. of Activities in Learning
Category 1:									
1:1					x	x			2
1:2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		8
1:3	x	x		x	x	x	x		6
1:4	x	x			x	x			3
1:5					x	x			2
1:6	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		7
1:7	x	x		x	x	x		x	6
1:8	x			x					2
1:9	x	x			x				3
1:10	x	x	x		x	x		x	6
1:11	x				x	x			3
1:12	x	x		x	x	x		x	6
Category 2:									
2:1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	8
2:2	x	x			x	x			4
2:3	x	x	x			x		x	5
2:4	x	x			x	x	x		5
2:5	x	x		x	x	x			5
Category 3:									
3:1					x				1
3:2	x								1
Total	16	13	5	8	16	14	5	6	83

Table 20 shows that the two activities mentioned most often were self-awareness and written report (16) followed by feedback interview (14), interactions with and observations of other participants during the program (13), informal discussions with other participants after the program formally ended (8), interactions with other employees related to the program (6), and interactions with and observations of other assessors during the program and interactions with supervisors related to the program (5). The total number of activities which influenced each participant's learning ranged from 1-8, with 8 being reported by two of the 19 participants.

Activity Which Influenced Learning Most and Least. The participants also identified which one activity influenced their learning the most and least. As Table 21 indicates, the activity influencing participants' learning the most was self-awareness (10), followed by the written report (7), interactions with and observations of participants during the program (4), the feedback interview (3), and informal discussions with participants after the formal program ended (1). Three activities--interactions with and observations of assessors during the program, interactions with supervisor related to the program, and interactions with other employees--were not mentioned at all. The activity which influenced participants' learning the least was informal discussions with participants after the formal program ended.

Self-Directed Approach to Learning. As the program was designed to diagnose participants' strengths and weaknesses and to recommend developmental activities, no formal action plans for development were initiated between management and participants. Instead, participants were

Table 21
 ACTIVITIES WHICH INFLUENCED
 LEARNING MOST AND LEAST^a

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Most No.</u> ^b	<u>Least No.</u> ^b
Self-awareness	10	0
Interactions with and observations of participants during program	4	2
Interactions with and observations of assessors during program	0	0
Informal discussions with participants after formal program ended	1	4
Written report	7	2
Feedback Interview	3	3
Interactions with supervisor related to program	0	0
Interactions with other employees related to program	0	2
No activity listed	0	7

^aParticipants were asked to identify the one activity which influenced their learning most and least, but some indicated that there were more than one or none.

^bNumber of times reported.

responsible for sharing their information with others and for taking the initiative to pursue their developmental activities. Table 22 emphasizes that most participants (84.2%) supported this self-directed learning approach to development.

Commenting on this self-directed learning approach, one participant said, "It is the only approach. People have to take responsibility. At this level of management, someone should not have to nurse individuals."

Another added, ". . . at the level of participants, they ought to know what to do with the results."

One participant expressed, "I am responsible for my own destiny. My development is my responsibility. It is something that I have actively pursued and will continue to pursue."

In a similar statement one person added, "It leaves the individual the opportunity to take the information and weigh it and decide how much is really good for them and then do something about it if they choose to. If they don't choose to then, . . . the company is trying to help us."

One participant explained, "I have no problem with it because when you get to his stage in your career you ought to be willing once you learn what your problems are to work on them or if you need schooling or whatever to have the initiative to resolve whatever your weaknesses or problem areas are."

Concerned about the confidentiality of the program, a participant noted, "Since it is a confidential-type program, it would have to be that way."

Only 3 out of 19 participants (15.8%) felt the company should share the responsibility. For example, one participant responded, "If (company) wants

Table 22
 ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM'S SELF-DIRECTED
 LEARNING APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT

	Support Self-directed Learning Approach				Help Needed in Development			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Category 1 (N = 12)	10	83.3	2	16.7	9	75.0	3	25.0
Category 2 (N = 5)	4	80.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	2	40.0
Category 3 (N = 2)	2	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
Total (N = 19)	16	84.2	3	15.8	13	68.4	6	31.6

to get the most out of the program, they would do some follow-up to see if some objectives were addressed or progress was made. You need some help. Some (recommendations) you can do, some you can't. I pursue on my own the things I can do, but many are out of my control."

One comment on the need for specific commitment from the company concerned immediate developmental training following the program. He stated, "Make the program a full one-week program and do assessment for a portion of the week and then do actual developmental sessions based on whatever needs are identified before you are released . . . have feedback as part of the whole session so there isn't any delay . . . I don't think they can do but so much follow-up."

Another responded, "I am a prime example of someone . . . of something I need to do, as far as taking the time to do it, I'm not." He explained more specific commitment from the program administrator and his staff is needed in order to work with participants in developing their needs. He also felt that the program administrator and staff should follow up by notifying him when specific recommended classes were available (Titles of programs may change, but content can be similar).

Although most participants (16 out of 19) wanted to assume sole responsibility for their own development, 13 (68.4%) of the 19 reported that they preferred some support from the company (see Table 22). Participants felt help from management could come from three sources as indicated in Table 23: (1) the program administrator and/or the professional staff from Management Development (11 times), (2) the participants' supervisors (3 times), and (3) upper management (2 times).

Table 23
SOURCE OF HELP NEEDED FROM MANAGEMENT

<u>Source</u>	<u>No.^a</u>
Program administrator and/or Management Development Staff	11
Identify for participants kinds of support available from Management Development Department	
Offer specific training programs related to participants' needs	
Send letter to participants to jog memory of developmental needs	
Make training programs more readily available (number offered and time)	
Be more specific when discussing recommended development with participants	
Notify participants of specific training programs scheduled (date and content of program)	
Meet with participants' supervisor to determine support is getting to participant when needed on the job	
Supervisor	3
After receiving feedback from participant observe and give feedback concerning deficiencies and recommended courses	
More awareness of what support is available from Management Development	
Upper Management	2
Make formal plan to move participant so that developmental activity can be pursued on the job (supervisor cannot do alone)	
Share career developmental plans with participant	

^aNumber of times reported.

One participant stated, "It's good, but I think possibly there should be some mild pressure to do some structured development. For example, a letter saying, 'Have you done anything?' It jogs your memory, and it also gives you an excuse with your boss to go. The letter should come at six months and again at twelve months."

Another, indicating lack of knowledge about the Department of Management and Organization Development, said, "I would not go to Management Development. Other people do not recognize Management Development for what it can do; (they) do not identify with it."

In replying that participants were released too soon after assessment, one said, "They (Management Development) need to be more specific, indicate where the information is, some other folks to talk with, etc. They left you too much on your own, and that was the problem I had with it."

In needing supervisor support, one participant replied, "Your immediate supervisor is in the best position to help you . . . better opportunity to observe."

A participant who felt higher management should participate in the development process said, ". . . if the company feels you are on a fast track and have some vision of where they think you are to go and that's not shared with you, it's difficult to assess the priority you should put on further development without that knowledge. In my own instance, I brought the report back, shared it with management, and got very little response--certainly no response pertinent to a career development plan. . . had I gone with some knowledge of 'Well, three years down the road you'll be a manager in some area of the company' I think I would have viewed the development more seriously or more urgently."

Six participants (31.6%) reported that they did not need help from management. One of these responded, "I get more satisfaction by doing it on my own. . . . I think as adults and managers for this company, you should basically have your own initiative to want to . . . improve whatever skills you have."

Another commented on the individual's responsibility: "It must be a self-motivating situation."

Improvement in Management Skills

As Table 19 shows, most participants (94.7%) reported they had improved their management skills as a result of MMDP. When provided a list of the management ability areas (11 for classes 4-8 and 9 for classes 9-11) evaluated, participants identified the two management skills they improved most and least (see Table 24). The total number of responses for each management ability ranged from 1-9 in the most improved category with flexibility and written communication getting no responses. In the least improved category, the total number of responses ranged from 1-9 with three areas—decision making, decisiveness, and flexibility—getting no responses.

Most Improved Skill. The management area reported the greatest number of times as the most improved skill was leadership (9), followed by management control (7), oral communication (6), stress tolerance (3), planning and organizing, delegation, and sensitivity (2), and analytical skills, decision making, and decisiveness (1). Of these 34 responses of the skills most improved, 21 (61.8%) were recommended by the assessors as developmental needs.

Table 24
MANAGEMENT SKILLS MOST AND LEAST IMPROVED*

Dimensions	Category 1 (N = 12)		Category 2 (N = 5)		Category 3 (N = 2)		Total (N = 19)	
	<u>Most Improved</u>	<u>Least Improved</u>	<u>Most Improved</u>	<u>Least Improved</u>	<u>Most Improved</u>	<u>Least Improved</u>	<u>Most Improved</u>	<u>Least Improved</u>
Leadership	8	0	1	1	0	0	9	1
Planning and Organizing	0	3	2	0	0	1	2	4
Analytical Skills	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	3
Delegation	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1
Management Control	6	2	1	0	0	0	7	2
Sensitivity	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	3
Decision Making	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Decisiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Flexibility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stress Tolerance	1	3	2	1	0	0	3	4
Communication Oral	5	0	1	1	0	0	6	1
Communication Written	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	24	19	9	7	1	2	34	28

*The numbers do not add up to 19 because participants were asked to identify two skills most and least improved. Some respondents identified only one, and sometimes they identified none.

In discussing the reason why one participant had improved delegation the most, she commented, "On my job I never had an opportunity to assign delegation to anyone. With a new job, I now supervise 60 people and have been forced to do it."

Another person commented on his improvement in the areas of leadership and management control (through self-modification of inappropriate behavior). "I feel that through some of my follow-ups requesting specific dates . . . subordinates are aware of what I expect . . . getting more feedback from them on assignments or projects."

Least Improved Skill. The least improved skill was identified as written communication (9); followed by planning and organizing and stress tolerance (4); analytical skills and sensitivity (3); management control (2); and leadership, delegation, and oral communication (1). Of the 28 management abilities listed as least improved by the participants, only 4 (14.3%) were ones recommended by the assessors as needing development.

As indicated in Table 25, participants responded with reasons why they had least improved certain skills: (1) Already strong in the area (12), saw need but had not addressed the issue (6), unable to practice in current job position (4), did not take time to do (3), and disagreed with assessors' evaluation that area needed improvement (1). Three people could not think of any management areas as least improved.

In describing why he had not improved the area of planning and organizing, one participant said, "I still do not take enough time to do it. That job over there is the first job I've had in years where I've had time to sit down and plan and organize, and it's different. The activity level now is significantly different. You've got to force yourself to do that (on job now)

Table 25
REASONS WHY MANAGEMENT SKILLS LEAST IMPLEMENTED

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No.^a</u>
Already strong in area	12
Saw need but had not addressed the issue	6
Unable to practice in current job position	4
Did not take time to do	3
Disagreed with assessors' evaluation that area needed improvement	1

^aNumber of times reported. (Participants may have given more than one reason.)

. . . you generally don't have the relaxed atmosphere to brainstorm . . . the pace is different."

A second participant commented on planning and organizing: "The main reason is that because of time constraints . . . use shortcuts to get things done." He also commented the same way on analytical skills: ". . . not taking enough time, having time available to look at alternatives, options, etc. to get the job done. . . taking shortcuts, taking the easy road."

Confidence in Management Skills

As shown in Table 19, most participants (15 of the 19) increased their confidence in management skills as a result of participation in the program. Table 26 reveals that the reason cited most often was their own awareness from the experience itself (9), followed by positive feedback (4), and satisfaction with their success in the program exercises (3). One participant could not describe exactly why he was more confident; he just felt it.

Only 4 people out of 19 felt their confidence had not increased as a result of the program. Three of these reported they already had great confidence before the program; they did not gain any but did not lose any. One participant from Category 3 (those who implemented no developmental activities) commented, "I don't think the program is designed to give confidence in abilities. The program is designed to help you identify strengths and weaknesses. Only through developmental activities would you gain confidence, not through the program."

Feedback from Others Concerning Changes in Management Behavior

Table 26
REASONS FOR INCREASED CONFIDENCE

<u>Reason</u>	<u>No.</u> ^a
Positive feedback	4
Self-awareness from experience	9
Satisfaction with success in program exercises	3

^aNumber of times reported. (Some participants gave more than one reason.)

Participants were asked what feedback anyone had given them following the program suggesting that their behavior had changed in some way. Table 27 reveals that 14 (73.7%) reported no feedback had been received from others concerning their behavior. One participant commented, "I probably would have gotten feedback if my boss had stayed the same, but since he moved, there really wasn't anyone else." Of this number, two reported that although they received no verbal feedback, they both had noticed changes in their own behavior and nonverbally through the way others responded to them after the program.

Five of the respondents received verbal feedback about their change in behavior from their subordinates (4), their superiors (2), their peers (1), and a superior external to the company (1). One of these commented, "In dealing with labor relations, I have had it called to my attention that I appear to have more rapport with union officials than I previously had."

Another replied, ". . . comments from group leaders, they appreciate that the management style is different from what I used to do or what is normally expected over there."

Professional Outcomes

Another concern of the study was to identify ways participants had benefitted professionally since participating in MMDP. They were asked to discuss two specific outcomes—their job satisfaction and their job movement.

Job Satisfaction

Participants reported whether their job satisfaction had increased, decreased, both increased and decreased, or remained the same since

Table 27
 FEEDBACK FROM OTHERS CONCERNING
 CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR

	Yes		No		Total	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Category 1 (N = 12)	3	25.0	9	75.0	12	63.2
Category 2 (N = 5)	2	40.0	3	60.0	5	26.3
Category 3 (N = 2)	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	100.0
Total (N = 19)	5	26.3	14	73.7	19	100.0

participating in the program. Table 28 reports that the majority of participants (63.2%) felt an increase in their job satisfaction. The greatest amount of increased satisfaction came from Category 2 (those who implemented only self-selected developmental activities) with 80.0%. One participant from this category commented: "I feel I have a better handle on some of those things that have given me problems prior to attending and have been introspective as to why these things gave me problems and modified my behavior when needed."

Another said, "It made me aware of a weakness, and I was able to see if by modification I, in my mind, could perform better on the job."

A participant (from Category 1) stated increased satisfaction because "a reaffirmation from participation in the program . . . that you do not have to be all knowing to do the job."

Only two participants reported a decrease (10.5%). They commented in the same manner. One of them said, "I'm not growing on the job. From what I found out at (program), I'm still doing the same thing over and over . . . knowing I did well on a lot of things (company) looks at and expects but I can't use . . . see other people having progressed . . . ask myself, 'What happened to me?'"

The other replied, "It showed me I can do a good job in another area . . . and put more focus on a desire to show my stuff in another part of the company, so having not accomplished that possibly my satisfaction has decreased just a little bit—stagnation."

Only two participants (both from Category 1—those who implemented recommended and possibly self-selected developmental activities) reported both an increase and decrease (10.5%) in their satisfaction. One revealed an

Table 28
PROFESSIONAL OUTCOMES

Job Satisfaction

	<u>Increased</u>		<u>Decreased</u>		<u>Both Increased and Decreased</u>		<u>Remained the Same</u>		<u>Change Affected by MMOP</u>			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Yes		No	
									No.	%	No.	%
Category 1 (N = 12)	8	66.7	1	8.3	2	16.7	1	8.3	5	41.7	7	58.3
Category 2 (N = 5)	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0
Category 3 (N = 2)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
Total (N = 19)	12	63.2	2	10.2	2	10.5	3	15.7	10	52.6	9	47.4

Job Movement

	<u>Pre-Program^a</u> One Year Prior to Program				<u>Post-Program^a</u>				<u>None</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Promotion</u>	<u>Demotion</u>	<u>Pro/Dem</u>	<u>Lateral</u>	<u>Promotion</u>	<u>Demotion</u>	<u>Pro/Dem</u>	<u>Lateral</u>		
	Category 1 (N = 12)	0	0	0	1	4	1	1	1	4
Category 2 (N = 5)	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	5
Category 3 (N = 2)	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Total (N = 19)	4	0	0	1	7	1	1	1	5	20 ^b

^aNumber of participants.

^bNumber does not total 19 as one participant from Category 2 received a promotion just prior to the program and again after the program.

increase because she is traveling more and likes it and a decrease because she "would like to have a true management position—not staff."

The other explained it was like a "roller coaster" for 1-1/2 years; first, with a promotion, and then, due to a functional analysis and termination of the new position, back to the original one held.

Three participants (15.7%) reported their satisfaction had remained the same. Two of these already had a high level of satisfaction. As one of them replied, "I love my work. I was pleased I was asked to go . . . opportunity to go shows company had confidence in you. It gives you pleasure."

The third participant in this category had difficulty in answering the question and replied, "There is no way I can answer that."

In addition to stating their satisfaction level since the program, the participants also identified in what way their participation in the program affected that satisfaction level reported. According to Table 28 the majority of participants (52.6%) reported that MMDP participation had influenced their current satisfaction level. Category 2 (those who implemented self-selected developmental only), who felt the greatest increase in satisfaction, also stated that it was influenced by their participation in the program.

Job Movement

Participants were informed that their job movement was relevant to the study as it can be considered a part of their development. Two specific questions were obtained: (a) What job movement occurred up to one year prior to the program, and (b) what job movement occurred following the

program. In that way, participants who received job movement just prior to the program could be identified.

Table 28 reveals that of the 19 participants, five (5) had no job movement at all. One of them had attended the program in September, 1983; three, in May, 1983; and one, in August, 1981. (The data was collected in September-October, 1984.)

Before the program, five (5) participants had job movement—four (4) promotions and one (1) lateral. The lateral movement and the two promotions were identified as immediately prior to the program. Both participants in Category 3 (those who implemented no developmental activities) received promotions before the program and none after.

After the program (see Table 28), seven (7) participants received promotions (one of the participants had also received a promotion just prior to the program); one (1), a demotion; one (1) a promotion/demotion; and one (1), a lateral move. One participant from Category 1 was promoted twice after the program. (This participant attended the fourth class, in May, 1981). The others had one promotion each.

The participant who was demoted (gradewise) reported that he was moved for training for one year only and had not been returned to his previous position or to another position.

The promotion-demotion of one participant was influenced by a functional analysis and termination of the position itself.

As the purpose of MMDP was designed for diagnosis and development only and not for managerial advancement, participants were asked if, as a result of their participation in the program, they had expectations for managerial advancement. As shown in Table 29, most participants (89.5%)

Table 29
EXPECTATION OF MANAGERIAL ADVANCEMENT

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Category 1	1	11
Category 2	1	4
Category 3	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	2 (10.5%)	17 (89.5%)

reported they expected no advancement directly as a result of their participation in the program. The two (2) participants who reported they expected advancement explained the expectations came from their own perceptions of their success in the program and not from management.

Other Benefits from the Program

In addition to the benefits identified in the interview schedule, participants talked about other ways they had benefited from the program. As indicated in Table 30, thirteen (13) responses were given. The greatest benefit was identified as obtaining a network of new contacts (9), followed by experiencing anticipatory socialization—management experience not available on job (2), and becoming a better assessor in another area and providing a list of abilities the company seeks for managers (1).

One participant commented, "I got closer to some people just because we had gone through the experience . . . there develops a bond."

Another replied, "I got the opportunity to meet and work with other people in the company that I did not know prior to the program."

Participants' Recommendations for Improvement of the Program

One purpose of the study was to obtain recommendations from the participants to aid the company in improving the program. Two specific areas of concern were identified: (a) Recommendations to improve implementation of developmental activities and (b) recommendations to improve the overall effectiveness of the program. Participants were asked to be specific in their recommendations.

Table 30
OTHER BENEFITS FROM PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

<u>Benefit</u>	<u>Number^a</u>
Network of new contacts	9
Anticipatory Socialization (experience management situations not available on job)	2
Became better assessor after participating in experience	1
Provided list of abilities company seeks for managers	<u>1</u>
Total	13

^aNumber of responses reported.

Recommendations to Improve Implementation

First, participants identified major obstacles (related to self, related to management, and a combination of the two) to development in three categories: (a) Pre-program obstacles, (b) program obstacles, and (c) post-program obstacles. Table 31 reveals that five (5) obstacles with seven (7) responses related to self were reported: (a) From the program, poor performance of the participant and recommendations too general to pursue; and (b) from the post-program, lack of self-motivation, non-establishment of priority to activity when return to job, and courses taken for the wrong reasons. No pre-program obstacles related to self were reported.

Eight (8) different obstacles with 21 responses related to management were reported. Only one (1) was a pre-program obstacle—selection of participants without basic skills and/or appropriate career level. The other 7 obstacles (all post-program) included (a) time availability due to job responsibilities, (b) lack of follow-up from management to give direction to development, (c) lack of management support, (d) money in budget, (e) company bureaucracy—length of time to get information and approval, (f) position locked in, and (g) company atmosphere—not encouraging or discouraging participants to pursue development.

Two obstacles with 5 responses related both to the individual and to management. They included (a) confidentiality of program providing excuse for participant not to develop and (b) disagreement with results.

Participants were then asked to recommend changes to improve the program. As reported in Table 32, a total of 18 recommendations with 28 responses were made, the majority of responses (19) coming from participants in Category 1 (those who implemented recommended and possibly

Table 31
MAJOR OBSTACLES TO IMPLEMENTATION
OF DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

OBSTACLE	Category	<u>Related to Self</u>			<u>Related to Management</u>			<u>Combination of Two</u>			<u>Total</u>
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	
<u>Pre-Program</u>											
Participant selected to program without basic skills and/or appropriate career level					1						1
<u>Program</u>											
Poor performance in program	1										1
Credibility of program (disagreed with results)								1			1
Confidentiality of program makes it easier for participant not to pursue development								3	0	1	4
Recommendations too general to pursue	1										1
<u>Post-Program</u>											
Lack of follow-up from management to give direction to development					2	1	2				5
Time availability-job responsibility					3	2	1				6
Lack of support from management					3	2					5
Money (budget)					1						1
Company Bureaucracy-length of time to get information and approval					1						1
Lack of self-motivation to pursue	2										2
Participants who take courses for wrong reasons			1								1
Locked in position (hiring freeze)					1						1
Company atmosphere does not encourage or discourage participants to pursue activities					1						1
Participant does not establish activity as priority when returning to job		<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>1</u>
Total		5	2	0	13	5	3	3	1	1	33

Table 32
RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE IMPLEMENTATION
OF DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Category 1</u>	<u>Category 2</u>	<u>Category 3</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Pre-Program</u>				
Modify selection process to identify appropriate people to attend program	2			2
Maintain program as voluntary without pressure from supervisors			1	1
<u>Program</u>				
More specific documentation of recommendations for development	2			2
Expand length of program to enable participants to get into roles comfortably before assessed	1			1
<u>Post-Program</u>				
More follow-up from Management Development Department after program	4	2	1	7
More pressure from Management Development to Department Managers concerning participants	1			1
More money available in budget	1			1
Offer more training programs in response to participants' needs	2			2
Offer training program at appropriate levels to enable participant to enroll	1			1
Present more training programs at job locations rather than control area	1			1
Plan content of training programs to specific needs of homogeneous group	1			1
<u>Use of Results</u>				
Option participants to place results in personal file	1			1
Include recommendation as part of performance appraisal requirement		1		1
Tie program closer to career development		1		1
More commitment from Supervisor	1		1	2
Formalize specific job movement after program	1			1
Time allocation for development with replacement while participant away from job		1		1
More relevant programs to real worth situations offered by management development department		1		1
Total	19	6	3	28

self-selected developmental activities). Two pre-program recommendations with 3 responses included (a) modification of the selection process to more appropriately identify participants and (b) maintenance of program on voluntary basis without any pressure from supervisors.

Two program recommendations (3 responses) were made: (a) More specific documentation of recommendations and (b) expansion of length of program to enable participants to get into role before assessment.

Most of the participants' responses (22 out of 28) were post-program concerns. The largest number of post-program concerns related to the use of results (7 recommendations with 8 responses). These concerns included (a) more commitment from supervisors, (b) option of participant to place results in the personnel file, (c) recommendations included as part of performance appraisal requirement, (d) program and career development tied together, (e) formal job movement after program, (f) time allocation for development with replacement, and (g) more relevant training to real-world situations. The second largest number of post-program responses (7) pertained to the recommendation that more follow-up is needed from Management Development after the program. The other participants offered these six recommendations (7 responses): (a) More training offered in response to participants' needs, (b) more pressure from Management Development to department managers, (c) more money for development in budget, (d) training offered at appropriate levels, (e) training offered at specific job locations rather than centralized, and (f) content of training program for homogeneous group.

Recommendations to Improve Overall Effectiveness of Program

As shown in Table 33, participants also made 14 recommendations (26 responses) which could improve the overall effectiveness of the program. The greatest number of recommendations (13) with 16 responses came from Category 1 (those who implemented recommended and possibly some self-selected developmental recommendations).

Half of the responses contained 9 recommendations about program effectiveness. Of these, 11 participants commented on the design of the program with these recommendations: (a) Explain to participants program as role play, stressful, and need to get into role quickly, (b) equalize role assignments of participants during program, (c) offer more boss-subordinate interpersonal skill activities, (d) computerize scoring of results, (e) meet first 1/2 day out of role before assessment starts, (f) provide real person for participants to delegate role-play responsibilities, (g) add developmental training at end of program based on recommendations, and (h) shorten length of role play (repetitive activities). Two participants recommended that the participants' sleeping and working areas be separated.

The five pre-program recommendations included one recommendation (1 response) about the frequency of program—offering more programs to provide higher attendance opportunity and four recommendations (with 4 responses) about selection—selecting assessors with wide range of management styles, selecting assessors who are qualified to judge assessed areas, selecting participants from homogeneous job areas, and providing supervisors with information to enable them to select appropriate person to attend.

The five (5) post-program recommendations regarded feedback (4 responses), use of results (3 responses), and job movement (1 response).

Table 33
RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS
OF PROGRAM

	<u>Category 1</u>	<u>Category 2</u>	<u>Category 3</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Pre-Program</u>				
<u>Frequency</u>				
Offer program more frequently to provide higher attendance opportunity	1			1
<u>Selection</u>				
Select assessors with wide range of management styles	1			1
Select assessors who are qualified to judge assessed areas	1			1
Select participants to be homogeneous to job areas		1		1
Provide supervisors with information to enable them to select appropriate person to attend		1		1
<u>Program</u>				
Design of program:				
Offer more boss-subordinate interpersonal skill activities such as performance appraisal	1			1
Computerize scoring of results	1			1
Start meeting first 1/2 day out of role before start evaluation of participants		1		1
Identify instructions to participants program as role play, stressful, and need to get into role quickly	2	1		3
Provide real person for participants to delegate responsibilities in role play	1			1
Aid developmental training at end of program based on recommendations	1			1
Equalize Role assignments of participants during program	1	1		2
Shorten length of time of role play (repetitive activities)			1	1
Facilities:				
Separate participants' sleeping and working areas	1	1		2
<u>Post-Program</u>				
Feedback:				
Get results to participants quicker	3	1		4
Job Movement:				
Commitment (formal) by management to rotate participants in jobs	1			1
Use of Results:				
Have option of participants to place results in personnel files for use by management	1			1
Combine program with career development of participant		1		1
Have supervisor assume responsibility of reviewing and discussing results with participants in order to plan development			1	1
Total	16	8	2	26

Participants wanted to receive results more quickly; they also wanted wider use of the results by having the option of placing them in their personnel files to be used by management, by having the results of the program combined with career development, and by having their supervisors assume responsibility of reviewing and discussing results with them in order to plan for development. Concerning job movement, participants wanted more commitment by management to rotate them in various job assignments..

One participant in revealing why he would like more boss-subordinate interpersonal skill activities in the program replied, "Performance appraisal—that is something that's really needed around here that is poorly executed and a lot of us need training in how to give an effective performance appraisal."

In recommending more equalized roles, a participant commented, "All directors were not given equal tasks and/or substantive opportunity to input to group."

The participant who questioned qualifications of assessors replied, "You should be very careful on the selection of the assessors. My understanding of the procedure is that assessors are put up by the individual departments . . . in some cases their vice-president put them there for their own development; when you go there, if you're aware this assessor needs some improvement and maybe got in this position for some reason other . . . I got the impression that some of the assessors ought to go through the program. On the other hand, some of the assessors are head and shoulders above."

Other Comments

At the end of each interview, participants were asked if they would like to share anything else about the program not previously discussed. Comments relating to the pre-program, program, and post-program varied as no two were the same. Table 34 notes that the majority of comments (12) were made by participants in Category 1 (those who implemented recommended and possibly self-selected developmental activities).

The greatest number of comments concerned the program (9), such as program very stressful to attendees who do not experience stress on job, length of program enables participants to plan and implement ideas in role play, program simulates real world work and stress, assessors refraining from recommending developmental activities that cannot be implemented by participants, one benefit of program--evening social--out of mold, participant's prior relationship with assessor may produce bias evaluation, program teaching participants that management, quality, productivity, and personal relations are all inseparable, interruption during program causing complete loss of concentration, and program teaching participants introspection.

One participant who was disrupted during his evaluation commented, "During the program I was actually informed of a transfer . . . to report to this plant when you return . . . it upset me . . . I was in between meetings, and I was supposed to go back to prepare a speech . . . the phone rings . . . I thought it was part of the program at first. As it turned out, I talked to him about 30 minutes. I was more concerned about my job than I was about the remainder of the (Success) program. I think they picked up on that in the evaluation, too."

Table 34
OTHER COMMENTS BY PARTICIPANTS

	<u>Category 1</u>	<u>Category 2</u>	<u>Category 3</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Pre-Program</u>				
Purpose of program reinforced for diagnosis and development, not for selection or promotion		1		1
Possibility that participants are selected to program by quota			1	1
<u>Program</u>				
Program very stressful to attendees who do not experience stress on job	1			1
Length of program enables participants to plan and implement ideas in role play	1			1
Program simulates real world work and stress	1			1
Assessors refraining from recommending developmental activities that cannot be implemented by participant	1			1
Evening social-benefit of program, out of mold		1		1
Participant's prior relationship with assessor may produce bias evaluation		1		1
Interruption during program about change causing complete loss of concentration	1			1
Program teaching participant introspection	1			1
Program teaching participant that management, quality, productivity, and personal relations are inseparable	1			1
<u>Post-Program</u>				
Desire since program to become assessor since participation	1			1
Provided reassessment of participant after period of time to determine if behaviors change	1			1
Company commitment to aid development of participant	1			1
Alumni report provided (where participants are, what they're doing)	1			1
Commitment of participant stagnated by noncommitment of management		1		1
Existence of program questioned because of lack of job openings for development	<u>1</u>	-	-	<u>1</u>
Total	12	4	1	17

Another said, "I'm really surprised that the (Success) program is being pursued. There are no job openings . . . hundreds of people are sitting around twiddling their thumbs at this point that don't have specific assignments."

In commenting on management commitment, a participant said, "I continually seek ways to improve/maintain my abilities. Unfortunately, (company) has not chosen to fully avail themselves of same, and many of my activities have been directed outside (company)."

Several participants commented on the excellence of the program. One said, "The overall program is one of the best I have ever been through . . . nothing came close to what already existed in this program." The second commented, "It is very well run, very well developed . . . no changes."

Chapter 5

RESULTS: FACTORS RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT

Earlier portions of this study have indicated that most participants in the Shemano Corporations's developmental assessment center, Success, do follow up with one or more recommended and/or self-selected activities. Indeed, many of those originally categorized as not having completed any self-initiated activities did, in fact, complete some prior to the final interview. Only two of the nineteen subjects had not initiated developmental activities, and for one of the two, it is still a possibility.

In examining the extent to which Shemano's assumption is true, that through the assessment center process individuals will be motivated to change their managerial behavior, it is important to determine whether individual participants are self-motivated, independent learners as well as to define the impact the program itself had on behavioral changes. This can best be accomplished by reporting the content of the final interviews.

Certain factors that related to participants' development were identified through an analysis of the interviews. The findings were analyzed to identify (a) the participants' responses to their nomination and desire to be part of the program, (b) the participants' responses to the assessors' recommendations and their follow-up (time, reasons, support), (c) the participants' responses to their assessment experience and the extent to which they shared the experience, and (d) the extent to which participants' job satisfaction and job movement served as positive reinforcement. The researcher prepared a general assessment, which is more subjective, about each individual.

The 19 individual profiles have been grouped according to participants' implementation of recommended developmental activities: (a) High Implementers, (b) moderate implementers, (c) low implementers, (d) implementers of self-selected activities only, and (e) non-implementers. In order to preserve the identity of participants who provided confidential and sensitive data during the interview, names have been changed and information such as age, education, work experience, and program attendance has been grouped as this specific information could identify the participants in the sample.

High Implementers

Although 12 of the 19 participants implemented one or more recommended developmental activities, four participants were classified as high implementers of the assessors' recommendations. They pursued and completed 67 - 100 percent of the assessors' recommendations, plus some activities of their own choice.

Case 1:1 - Brian

White male; 40-49 age range; graduate degree; employed at Shemano 13-15 years; attended program in 1983.

Recommended: 2 activities in areas of leadership and oral communication.

Implemented: 2 of 2; both areas; plus 1 activity of his own choice.

Brian provided ambiguous information about his nomination for Success. On one hand, he indicated he had delayed his development for a year out of deference to a limited department budget, giving "others the opportunity to

go before" him. On the other hand, he reported that he had initiated discussions with his supervisor stating, "Quite frankly, I had been asking for something other than seminars." Overall, he appeared to have been quite pleased with his nomination.

Brian's response to the program was generally positive, and Brian felt he performed well. He cited the opportunity to see himself on video-tape in a developmental activity as being particularly valuable, commenting, "I had never seen myself . . . in table negotiating or presenting and that was a real learning experience. I'm just sorry I missed that all these years." He also stated that self-assessment and assessment by others were valuable aspects of the program in terms of "determining his behavioral patterns."

Both recommended activities which targeted leadership and oral communication involved training programs, and Brian completed them within a year. He also completed one self-selected activity. He was provided with time off and paid tuition to pursue his development. He initiated sharing his report with both his supervisor and the person who nominated him and had several follow-up conversations with the Program Administrator. Brian stated the feedback from his supervisor, a former assessor, was "very valuable, especially in comparing my performance to others."

Brian appeared to be somewhat threatened by the fact that he was judged less than adequate in one area. He reported "overreacting to one comment during the feedback interview and (Program Administrator) quickly told me I was overreacting." In his words, "the feedback interview filled some cracks possibly and some interpretations and also helped me in my interpretations." He indicated he knew all but one of the assessors and said it "probably, maybe diluted their effectiveness and my confidence."

Job satisfaction has not improved, primarily because Brian "feels stagnated in his job." He has not had promotions in the year prior to or following the program although he has made others aware of his desire for career advancement and his willingness to invest time in his development.

The researcher's impression of Brian is that although he indicates he is confident, he appears to be easily threatened when confronted with weaknesses. He tends to be "other people oriented" and refers to development as a competitive factor rather than as a challenge to improve observable, measurable skills. Brian is less motivated by desire to learn than by desire to gain approval, and he needs some reward to confirm his value. The Success Program provided him with an opportunity to identify specific skills for improvement, but it remains uncertain how much impact it has had on his continued development. His goals relate primarily to job advancement, and in his anxiety he may be losing sight of the need to apply newly refined skills to his daily interaction where he is.

Case 1:2 - Barbara

White female; 40-49 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 7-9 years; attended program in 1983.

Recommended: 7 activities in areas of leadership, analytical skill, sensitivity, and decision making.

Implemented: 5 out of 7; areas—all recommended; plus 1 activity of her own choice.

Barbara, the only woman in her Success class, was very pleased with the nomination which she thought "would lead to career advancement." In fact, she stated she "felt hurt" that she had not been asked sooner. She

believed she had performed well although she rated herself in the middle third of the group while her peers ranked her in the top third.

Five of the seven recommended activities were completed within nine months, and they focused on each of the four areas cited for improvement. She received company support through time off and paid tuition as she pursued her development. She also completed one self-selected activity. Only a lack of opportunity to use specific activities in her current job prevented her from completing all the recommendations. Not only is she continuing to actively pursue her own development, but also she aspires to develop other managerial skills as an assessor.

Although Barbara thought the assessors were extremely accurate, she reported that they had openly criticized her "stroking leadership style as being overdone." This she attributed to a difference in philosophy, noting that the assessors were all male. On the other hand, a new job assignment with additional supervisory responsibilities confirmed the validity of the program for her. "Having been in this job for three months, it is exactly like a continuing (Success) program. I needed somebody else to confirm what I already suspected my weaknesses were." Barbara shared her report with her supervisor, seeking his input and that of the Program Administrator on numerous occasions as she devised specific plans for her growth.

Barbara left the program with a sense of excitement, hoping for but not actually expecting advancement. Her subsequent promotion has been a real source of satisfaction. She seeks approval from others often, asking for advice and criticism. It is interesting to note that in her new job she places "special emphasis on the personal touch" and often rewards subordinates "with praise."

The researcher's overall impression is that Barbara's approach to the program experience, the recommendations for developmental activities, and her job reflect a highly motivated, goal-oriented person. Success provided Barbara with an awareness of skills needed in higher levels of employment, and she responded enthusiastically. Her one area of weakness, "stroking," was not eliminated but tempered. The combination of the assessment center activities, her career advancement, and her enthusiasm for learning have provided satisfaction without complacency as she continues to establish new goals.

Case 1:5 - Mike

White male; 30-39 age range; college graduate with some graduate work; employed at Shemano 7-9 years; attended program in 1983.

Recommended: 3 activities in areas of leadership and oral communication.

Implemented: 2 of 3; both areas; plus 2 activities of his own choice.

Mike felt no pressure when nominated by his Director to participate in the Success Program. Mike's response to the program was described as "a feeling of success when it was completed." He stated, "There are areas that I personally need to be aware of, and as things present themselves through formal training . . . and time permitting, I'll attempt to take advantage of them."

Three activities were recommended to improve leadership and oral communication skills, and Mike implemented two of the activities within twelve months and self-selected two others. One course recommendation was

not pursued because he did not see a need for it. Mike began to apply some of his targeted skills on the job, and he was very pleased with the feedback from his subordinate group leaders. He received a lateral job assignment just prior to the program and used it as a tool for development, volunteering for expanded responsibilities.

Placed in the upper third of his class by himself and his peers, Mike was also judged adequate in all areas by the assessors. However, they noted his "low-key presence" and cautioned that his "tendency to do things in a nonassuming, behind-the-scene fashion may result in his not receiving the recognition he may deserve on the job." Mike shared his report with his supervisor and was not overly concerned about the lack of support from him.

The researcher's impression of Mike is that he prides himself on being internally rather than externally motivated, and he stated, "If I feel I've got a severe problem in an area, I will seek help." Assertiveness may not be natural for Mike, but Success appears to have made him more sensitive to the need in career advancement. He is not driven by ambition but can establish and work toward goals. Definition of goals may be an area where the corporation can provide focus.

Case 1:12 - Timothy

White male; 30-39 age range; college degree with some graduate work; employed at Shemano 10-12 years; attended program in 1981.

Recommended: 3 activities in areas of stress tolerance and oral communication.

Implemented: 3 out of 3; all areas; plus 1 activity of his own choice.

Timothy entered the program timidly, almost fearful in his reaction to the nomination. He stated, "At the time I was very suspect of it . . . it was one of the best undercover secrets at that time."

All three of Timothy's recommendations related to stress. One activity, reading literature on stress, was completed within six months; the other two within one to two years after a new job assignment. External support from his wife and a supervisor provided the initiative Timothy needed to complete the activities. A need for certain skills in his new job assignment forced Timothy to also pursue activities on his own.

Timothy was very positive about his experience in the program indicating it confirmed things "I always knew about myself but was afraid to talk about." However, he indicated it took some time for him to accept the assessment because he needed more attention to personal development which affected his whole life.

Timothy was pleased when he moved away from a location that offered no opportunities for development or support to one which allowed active commitment from the supervisor. His new job assignment confirmed the need for specific skills assessed as "less than adequate," and provided motivation for change.

The researcher's impression of Timothy is that he is "other people oriented." Although he completed all his recommendations, he expected the initiative to come from somebody else. It appears that he will comply with development but needs to have things forced on him. The program itself had a significant impact on Timothy because it allowed him to begin to look at his developmental needs. His problems are not easily solved because he will

continue to need commitment from others unless he begins to develop more self-commitment.

Summary - High Implementers

Although they are very different in many respects, the four high implementers share one attitude. They each expressed a belief that the program helped them face some aspect of personality and/or leadership style which they had suspected but had not fully faced. (One views development as a means of attaining promotion, while three view it as a means of improving job-related skills). In Brian's case, his overreaction to criticism and perhaps a certain anxiety for career advancement which he has not received seems to interfere with the effectiveness of his development. He tends to view developmental activities as a means of getting a promotion. On the other hand, the other three have had job movements which confirmed the practicality of development and change. There has been a direct relationship between the assessors' recommendations and skills needed to be successful on the job.

Moderate Implementers

The four of the twelve participants who implemented one or more recommended developmental activities were classified as moderate implementers. They pursued and completed 40 - 50 percent of the assessors' recommendations, plus some activities of their own choice.

Case 1 :3 - Karl

White male; 30-39 age range; graduate degree; employed at Shemano 10-12 years; attended program in 1983.

Recommended: 4 activities in areas of sensitivity, stress tolerance, and oral communication.

Implemented: 2 of 4; areas--stress tolerance and oral communication; plus 3 of his own choice.

Karl was very pleased to be selected for Success and viewed it as a vote of confidence by the company, yet he reported he had a high level of self-confidence before his nomination. While considering the program a "very positive learning experience," he was perceptive enough to state that "being conscious that you are being assessed . . . modifies your behavior in a certain sense." He also reported that the activities should have been more rapidly paced, that "it didn't tax me a bit. I had an easier time there than I do at work every week."

Two of the four recommendations Karl implemented at once, and both provided for on-the-job development which he prefers because "weaknesses can be modified on the spot." He did not pursue two recommendations for training programs and stated, "People don't practice afterward what they learn." He did qualify that somewhat by observing that job and family obligations interfered. Despite his rejection of recommended training programs, which he perceived as being too general, Karl sought information about a labor relations course being taught by a Shemano employee. After hearing the comments of those who had taken the course—about its content and the instructor, he enrolled in the class.

In discussing his assessment, Karl was quite proud of it and indicated he thought the assessors were both accurate and sincere. Not only did he freely

share the results with his supervisor, his peers, and his subordinates, but he also enlisted their support and feedback as he pursued his on-the-job development.

Although Karl received no promotions in the year following Success, he remains very confident about his prospects. "I love my work . . . I'll advance on my performance here. This is a private sort of thing."

The researcher's impression of Karl is that he appears to be a confident, analytical person who is motivated for success but not impatient for it. His eagerness to attempt on-the-job improvement with feedback from superiors and subordinates alike attests to his enjoyment of challenges, his acceptance of the need for growth, and his confidence in his own judgment. The Success Program only enhanced his natural bent toward analysis and self-direction.

Case 1:6 - Anne

White female; 40-49 age range; high school graduate with some college; employed at Shemano over 16 years; attended the program in 1983.

Recommended: 5 activities in areas of leadership and multi-abilities.

Implemented: 2 of 5; both areas; plus 3 activities of her own choice.

Anne attended the program voluntarily and viewed her nomination as both a measure of recognition from the organization and an opportunity for upward mobility. Her response to the program experience was very positive. In fact, she called it "true to life." Even though she was already confident in her abilities, she was able to observe others in a similar situation.

Anne implemented two of the five recommended activities; both were started prior to the assessment. Although she wanted to implement more, two recommendations were "beyond her control" and needed management commitment. She did, however, substitute three short courses similar to the one recommended and completed all three within a short time. She chose not to pursue one recommended activity, an academic course, because she disagreed with the learning strategy recommended. She concluded, "I feel I'm to the point where I know what the textbooks say. I practice that daily. I brush up on it periodically through short courses." In addition to her recommended activities, Anne selected several innovative strategies to practice her "leadership" skills. Both activities, which were external to the organization, received full support from Shemano's management. Anne took the feedback very seriously because she felt the assessors targeted her exact strengths and weaknesses. Anne looked to her supervisor as her "direct chain of command" and her "best source of help." From him, she wanted and received both recognition for her good performance and support in her development.

Although Anne has received a lateral assignment within her own department and says she enjoys her work, she is not completely satisfied. She is still hoping for a managerial position.

The researcher's impression of Anne is that she is a person who would be motivated with or without the push. She is definitely a self-directed learner. Anne is a thinker who is goal oriented and profits from her experiences. Being sensitive to the power structure, she will work within it to advance.

Case 1:8 - Edward

White male; under 30 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 7-9 years; attended program in 1982.

Recommendations: 4 activities in areas of stress tolerance and oral communication.

Implemented: 2 of 4; both areas; plus 2 activities of his own choice.

Edward entered the program without clearly defined expectations or enthusiasm. In retrospect, he saw it as a very positive experience particularly citing increased self-awareness and informal discussions with other participants as being beneficial.

Edward implemented two out of four activities recommended and had already scheduled another internal course. However, two of the activities were not pursued. He substituted one activity similar to the specific one recommended because he preferred to associate with a group of people of his own choice. Although different, the learning strategy allowed him to complete his developmental activity. One activity was not taken seriously by him or his supervisor because they felt it was not needed. Edward aggressively pursued other self-selected development. In particular, he scheduled courses quarterly to strengthen and update his technical skills and volunteered for expanded areas of responsibility to practice skills which were not available on his daily assignment. He concluded, "A lot of things I did over the last two years. . . 90 percent of them would have occurred with or without that class."

Edward agreed with his assessment and felt the feedback and discussions with the Program Administrator added to the clarity of the report. However, he responded that the feedback session was less important

because it did not give him any new information. Edward suggested one improvement to expand the program to allow developmental training at the off-site location. Edward's desire to improve and expand his managerial skills was the primary force to his learning. The results of the program were helpful but secondary to his own drive. Believing that support from his supervisor would strengthen his chances for development, he and his supervisor met periodically to discuss his performance and plan for development.

After being promoted after the program, Edward's new position was eliminated as a result of the weakening economy, and he was forced to return to his former position. He felt some frustration in this career lag but did not allow it to interfere with his development.

The researcher's impression of Edward is that he is a self-confident and systematic person who looks at any situation, analyzes it, and then evaluates it. He does not seem overly concerned about pressing for upward job movement because he knows he has what it takes to succeed. Edward is an independent thinker who is sensitive to people but also selective in his associations. The promotion-demotion was a blow to a self-confident person such as Edward, but he is a survivor. Time is definitely in his favor since he started up the management ladder early in his career at Shemano.

Case 1:10 - Frank

Black Male; 30-39 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 7-9 years; attended program in 1981.

Recommended: 2 activities in areas of leadership and stress tolerance.

Implemented: 1 of 2; area - leadership; plus 1 activity of his own choice.

Frank was very pleased to attend the program indicating that it was an opportunity for his career. Overall, Frank's experience was very positive even though he felt he did not perform well.

Frank implemented one out of two recommended activities. Somewhat lacking in self-confidence, Frank chose not to pursue the second recommendation. He explained, "I think I really got off on the wrong foot." Commenting that he was caught off guard in his role play, Frank indicated he does not like surprises. Concerning support from the organization, Frank indicated none was needed. He did choose to seek outside resources, which may have been safer and more personal. He used the formal route to mail the program results to his supervisor, thereby lessening the possibility of any negative feedback.

Frank seemed shocked at the results, expecting more negative comments from the assessors. The assessors noticed Frank's "uncomfortableness in the role play and lack of forcefulness and confidence" although Frank indicated the program was ego building to his self-confidence and his career expectations.

The researcher's impression of Frank is that he is a person who sets high standards but chooses to play it safe to lessen potential negatives. He does not want to "rock the boat" and will probably continue to seek help from outside sources. Even though he was uncomfortable in his role play, the experience was good for Frank as he also saw other people in role play situations. Frank is very cautious about stereotyping and as a result wants no surprises. Since he favors development through self-modification on the

job, it would help to establish a good mentor relationship for internal support.

Summary - Moderate Implementers

Three of the four moderate implementers consider themselves to be highly confident individuals, and they show a great deal of respect for their own judgment by substituting freely when they disagree with the kinds of developmental activities needed. Yet they tend to focus attention on the same areas targeted by the assessors. Only one, Frank, appeared to be somewhat lacking in confidence. The fact that he was totally unprepared for the role-playing activity might explain why he appeared to be less than confident. He, like the other moderate implementers, is a person who sets high standards for his own performance and works within the system to accomplish his goals. Like them, he exercises his own judgment in selecting resources for development. As a group, the moderate implementers appear to have profited by the Success experience, but they probably would have pursued their own self-improvement without it.

Low Implementers

The four out of the 12 participants who implemented one or more recommended developmental activities were classified as low implementers who pursued and completed only 20 - 25 percent of the assessors' recommendations.

Case 1:4 - David

White male; 30-39 age range; junior college graduate; employed at Shemano 13-15 years; attended program in 1983.

Recommended: 5 activities in areas of leadership and management control.

Implemented: 1 out of 5; area management control; plus 1 activity of his own choice.

David's nomination and response to the Success Program was generally positive, but he was unable to clearly define his feelings. He believed the interaction with other participants made him more sensitive to his strengths and weaknesses. He stated, "Prior to going, I could see myself lacking in the leadership area as to assertiveness."

Although he immediately initiated one recommended activity and soon afterward one self-selected, David did not pursue four other recommended activities each of which was a course/training program. Of those he did implement, one involved self-modification on the job, and the second involved expanding job responsibility and was done at his supervisor's request. David indicated he was interested but wouldn't take the time to pursue activities on his own. In his own words, he "needed a push," and he needed his supervisor to take the initiative for enrolling him in a specific course. Actually, he could give no substantial reason for not pursuing his development more aggressively. He stated some specific actions which the corporation could take "to help people who are not highly motivated or independent enough to start development on their own."

David agreed with the assessors' evaluation. Following the interview which he felt provided "nothing new," David asked his supervisor for

assistance when he shared his report. He stated, "I didn't get the assistance I hoped for."

The researcher's overall impression of David is that because there is no indication that he is goal oriented, it is doubtful that the Success Program has had a significant impact on him. He complies with the requests made of him, and he reports positive feedback from his subordinates in those areas which he made an effort to improve, yet he passively rejects the challenge to undertake self-improvement in a significant way. There has been no job movement in the year prior to or following his Success involvement, yet his nomination implies potential.

Case 1:7 - John

White male; 30-39 age range; college degree with some graduate work; employed at Shemano 7-9 years; attended program in 1983.

Recommended: 4 activities in areas of management control, sensitivity, and oral communication.

Implemented: 1 of 4; area - management control; plus 2 activities of his own choice.

John was one of the few who approached his nomination to the program with reservations and actually stated he felt obligated to go because of his selection. He remembered his boss actually presenting a negative picture of the program, thus affecting his interest and enthusiasm. John revealed mixed feelings about his experience. On one hand, he was satisfied with the program because it pointed out some valid strengths and weaknesses he had suspected. On the other hand, he reacted stressfully to an unplanned situation, which distracted his attention to his assignment.

John implemented one out of four recommended activities. He immediately worked with a self-modification activity. He was not interested in taking two training programs. One he had taken previously and disagreed with the assessment; the other he and his supervisor felt no need for development. John, however, chose one training program on his own because it was readily available, and he felt a need for the skill. Working the 3 p.m. to 11 p.m. shift, John found it difficult to schedule development other than self-modification on the job, which was easily accessible.

The assessors noticed John's low tolerance for interpersonal sensitivity during his role play and recommended development in the area—none of which was implemented. John may have been afraid he would not measure up when he commented about the withholding of results from his supervisor saying, "If you shared this information with your supervisor or whomever, there may be some pressure on you."

John was very unhappy with his job assignment and explained that a temporary one-year training assignment, which was a demotion, had become a permanent one. His confidence and enthusiasm had lessened.

The researcher's impression of John is that he is a very practical person who expects everything to be relevant and useful. He does not have much patience; thus his interpersonal relations sound shaky. John did not feel he had been an "in" member of the group and his confidence was shaken. In fact, he was one of the few who made no reference to positive interaction with other people during the program. The program was not a strong learning experience since John had his mind made up before he attended as to his strengths and weaknesses. He did not share the results for nebulous reasons—it might put pressure on him. Through the role play in the program

and emotional input during the interview, John has expressed some emotional/interpersonal problems. These problems must be dealt with before he is ready for upper management.

Case 1:9 - Thomas

White male; 30-39 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 7-9 years; attended program in 1981.

Recommended: 5 activities in one area--leadership.

Implemented: 1 of 5; area--leadership; plus 2 activities of his own choice.

Thomas felt internal, rather than external, pressure to attend the program. He was particularly concerned about how other people's perceptions would affect his climb when he said, "to turn it down would show a negative attitude on my part."

Showing both ambition and independence, Thomas substituted a learning strategy when the recommended course could not be scheduled. Although he expressed no plans to pursue the remaining three recommended courses, he responded by practicing his skills on the job through special projects and expanded areas of responsibility. He also selected two accounting/finance courses, which he pursued at night and on weekends, because he felt a deficiency in these skills needed in upper management. In looking to other people for support, Thomas was disappointed with both the time frame and the content of the follow-up interview and explained, "It was hurried." Indicating lack of support from his department, he added they pushed for performance—not development.

Thomas was pleased with his performance and agreed with the assessors' evaluation because they had confirmed his own perceptions. In sharing his report with his supervisor after being approached, Thomas wanted to make a good impression and indicated "not to have shared it with him would have given him very negative feelings."

The researcher's impression of Thomas is that he is a person who feels a need for support from both subordinates and supervisors; yet he does not seem to interact with others in a way to get their support. Even the assessors questioned the lack of acceptance and response from others during the program believing that it "resulted from a lack of understanding as opposed to a lack of agreement." Not being a very flexible person, Thomas might be more comfortable in a working environment with structure, such as accounting and finance, where responsibilities are clearly spelled out.

Case 1:11 - Gary

White male; 30-39 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 10-12 years; attended program in 1981.

Recommended: 4 activities in areas of leadership and oral communication.

Implemented: 1 activity; area--leadership; plus 2 activities of his own choice.

Gary willingly entered the program with high expectations; yet he tended to underrate it during the interview and rated it "fair."

Gary only implemented one of the four recommended activities, which he had already initiated before the program. He was ambitious for upward movement and showed anxiety when the feedback was delayed. He blamed lack of support from management for not pursuing two recommendations

requiring managerial action. He was critical of the generality of the Report itself. Gary had pursued a college degree for nine years at night, and he was not interested in the course recommendation, which he had already taken.

Gary's supervisor disagreed with the results. Having had good relations with his supervisor, Gary blamed higher management, rather than his boss, for the lack of support.

The researcher's impression of Gary is that he is a person who is very ambitious for upward movement; yet he creates his own pressure that tends to get in the way. On one hand he says he is confident and even rated himself in the upper third of his class. On the other hand, he seems unsure of himself by being sensitive to the reactions of other people. Gary is not particularly self-directed and needs more direction from management in his development. In his mind, management is not contributing enough to his development, thus creating a negative block. A general discontent runs underneath everything Gary said. In fact, he had stronger negative responses than almost everybody else. Gary put so much pressure on himself that the program was not highly successful for him.

Summary - Low Implementers

In reviewing the case studies of the four low implementers, the researcher noted low levels of assertiveness, a degree of passivity, a lack of ease with interpersonal relations, and sensitivity to pressure in each of the individuals. David was unclear about his feelings regarding the program and stated he "needed a push." John had reservations about going, felt obligated to attend, and thought sharing the results might cause pressure from others. Thomas felt internal pressure to attend and was afraid that to do otherwise

might result in negative thoughts by others. Gary was generally negative about the program and the report despite the fact that he is anxious for upward movement. As a group, the low implementers appear to be very sensitive to the opinions of others and not particularly skillful in interpersonal relations. They give little evidence of being strongly self-directed although each did complete one or two activities of his own choice and one which had been recommended.

Implementers of Self-Selected Activities Only

Five of the 19 participants chose not to implement any of the assessors' recommendations but did pursue and complete some activities of their own choice. Most of these participants completed 1 - 2 activities; however, one completed 11 self-selected activities.

Case 2:1 - Nat

White male; 40-49 age range; college degree; employed at Shemano 10-12 years; attended program in 1983.

Recommended: 3 activities in areas of leadership and analytical skill.

Implemented: None; selected 1 activity of his own choice.

Nat's supervisor encouraged but did not pressure him to participate in the program. His overall impression of the program was positive through his self-awareness and interactions with other participants. However, he felt the program had not adequately assessed his management skills and commented, "It was nothing but a stress exercise."

In accepting the favorable comments and rejecting the rest as being too limited and/or unreal, Nat chose not to pursue the recommendations. He expressed negative feelings about the recommendations--all courses--saying that courses did not prepare one for the "real world." On the other hand, he chose to enroll in a course on labor relations because he felt the skill was needed in his job.

Although the assessors reported that Nat had performed well, they observed some inconsistencies in his management style. Nat disagreed, indicating his role play position had not given him the opportunity to perform adequately. Nat refused to share his assessment with his supervisor deciding instead to discuss it with a fellow participant. Displaying his disinterest and perhaps undermining the program prior to Nat's attendance, his supervisor commented, "I do not want to hear it."

Nat reported that his job satisfaction increased after the program. He explained, "I feel I have a better handle on some of the things that have given me problems prior to attending."

The researcher's impression of Nat is that he is a practical man who feels all development should relate to the "real world" of work. He accepts favorable but rejects unfavorable information from others. He seems to relate better to peers and subordinates than to people in upper levels of management. He is a determined person who sets his own standards of what he expects from others and expects them to fall in line. Nat's rigid personality and his inability to accept constructive criticism is hindering any development. His expectations are very low, limiting his interest and drive for career advancement.

Case 2:2 - Ray

White male; 30-39 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 10-12 years; attended program in 1983.

Recommended: 3 activities in areas of leadership and oral communication.

Implemented: None; selected 2 activities of his own choice.

Although his supervisor encouraged his participation, Ray entered the program with a gamelike rather than a serious attitude. This impression was confirmed from comments by former attendees. Ray's response to the Success Program was described as enjoyment of "the challenge of the environment." He added, "I came away with the feeling that I needed to be more assertive."

Ray rejected all three recommendations believing two did not require correction and one could be corrected on the job. He immediately implemented two self-selected activities through reading and self-modification on the job. Although no specific plans had been made, he indicated he will continue development through in-house training.

The assessors rated Ray adequate or above adequate in 8 of the 9 management abilities and found Ray to be "people oriented who seemed to lead more effectively in small group environments." Both Ray and his peers, however, placed him in the lower third of the class.

Ray expected support from his supervisor when he shared his assessment with him and was disappointed when nothing happened. Even though he has had no job movement one year prior to or after the program, Ray's job satisfaction increased slightly. He prides himself on using self-modification to change inappropriate behaviors.

The researcher's impression of Ray is that he is not a very intuitive or perceptive person. Although he has motivation and potential, he needs someone else to establish his goals. This is an area where the organization can provide support. Ray looks for external rewards by commenting, "Had I gone with some knowledge of . . . down the road maybe you'll be a manager . . . I would have viewed the development more seriously or more urgently."

Case 2:3 - Ronald

White male; 30-39 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 10-12 years; attended program in 1982.

Recommended: 2 activities in area of leadership.

Implemented: None; selected 1 activity of his own choice.

Ronald volunteered to attend the program, and his supervisor provided encouragement. His overwhelming support of the program was evident when he commented, "The overall program is one of the best I have ever been through . . . it indeed represented the real business world." Ronald cited his self-awareness and the confirmation of his strengths and weaknesses by the assessors as being most beneficial.

Placing other priorities ahead of development, Ronald implemented neither of the two recommended activities—both courses. Yet he was able to complete an activity through on the job self-modification. Recognizing his need for development, he added, "My background is technical . . . I am going to have to . . . expand in the business end . . . I will be going back to take some undergraduate courses in the basic business area--economics, accounting, finance." Ronald's supervisor was already supporting his development before the program. Even though he did not present the report

itself, he and his supervisor discussed his part in the program immediately after returning to the job. His reason for not sharing the report was simply that the information had already been discussed.

Both his confidence and his job satisfaction has increased as a result of the program assessment and a promotion with a new assignment in a different area. He explained, "It's just added another dimension."

The researcher's impression of Ronald is that he is a responsible and perceptive person who recognizes conflicting priorities, yet has the ability to re-evaluate situations and establish new goals. Commitment is the key to Ronald. He entered the program, saw its potential, recognized its opportunities while also recognizing conflicting priorities, and took full responsibility for his decisions. The Success Program had a significant impact; he was less concerned about not taking courses immediately than about the fact that the experience itself provided opportunities. Even though he is not driven for immediate success and career advancement, he will confidently make decisions in his own best interests.

Case 2:4 - Wayne

Black male; 30-39 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 7-9 years; attended program in 1982.

Recommended: 5 activities in areas of leadership and oral communication.

Implemented: None; selected 2 activities of his own choice.

Expressing a lack of self-worth, Wayne revealed that he was "honored" to attend the program saying that the "company spent a lot of money on the program." Although management encouraged but did not pressure his

participation, Wayne felt internal pressure. His response to the Success Program was very positive, rating it an A+. His one negative response was his lack of recommended development following the program; he blamed himself for not implementing the recommendations.

Strongly protective of his assessment results, Wayne refused to furnish a copy of his assessment report for confirmation and reluctantly provided sketchy information about his assessment, the recommendations, and his development. Records indicated that five activities were recommended; Wayne had no recollection of the number but did vaguely remember them to be in the areas of leadership and oral communication. Indicating his dislike of courses as a developmental tool, Wayne preferred to strengthen his management skills through self-modification on the job and completed two self-selected activities. He also cited the lack of immediate follow-up after the program and his procrastination as reasons for non-implementation. Other than possible self-modification of behaviors on the job, no interest in further development was specified. Feeling the need to protect himself and others, Wayne discussed the key issues from the program with his supervisor adding that not sharing might "leave the supervisor with the attitude you got blasted and would not tell . . . (and) if I don't care . . . the next person may not have the opportunity to go."

Although Wayne revealed an increased satisfaction in his job, he could not attribute it to anything specific. His career advancement skyrocketed with two promotions--one just before and another after the program.

The researcher's impression of Wayne is that he is a person who lacks self-confidence and who has a strong need to protect himself against threatening forces. He is obviously suspicious of permanent records and the

motives of other people. Although he is realistic about his weaknesses, he procrastinates and chooses not to persevere. Yet he feels guilty about the decision. The program was good for Wayne because it reinforced some things he already felt about himself, but at the same time, it also enhanced guilt for his own lack of initiative.

Case 2:5 - Robert

White male; 30-39 age range; college degree with some graduate work; employed at Shemano 4-6 years; attended program in 1981.

Recommended: 2 activities in areas of leadership and decisiveness.

Implemented: None; selected 11 activities of his own choice.

Urged by his supervisor to attend the program, Robert volunteered. His specific interests were self-improvement and acknowledgment of abilities important to higher management. His success in the program and the positive evaluation gave him high expectations for development and advancement; yet frustration and disappointment followed when Robert was unable to carry out the recommended development.

Robert implemented neither of the recommended activities because both required commitment from higher management. A highly motivated and resourceful person, he channeled his developmental efforts in other ways. He completed 11 developmental activities--nine of them courses (internal and external).

Robert agreed with the assessment although he felt the report needed more specific details. His supervisor seemed to be filling a mentor's role by keeping up with his development and advising him about the lack of

opportunity in his small office environment. For this reason, Robert refused to deviate from the "chain of command" to seek support from other superiors.

His lack of career advancement other than a "quasi-promotion" within his own department increased his general discontent and feeling of "uselessness" in his job. On the other hand, he was receiving both commitment from superiors and rewards of promotion from his external outlet. Robert remains loyal to the organization "hopeful" that something will happen.

The researcher's impression of Robert is that he is a creative, bright, and ambitious person who becomes stifled by repetition. He is very resourceful and aware of his own abilities, and yet he is not easily satisfied. Although he was tapped early in his career at Shemano as "upper management potential," he seems impatient for success and sees promotion as the ultimate goal. To reach this goal, he has turned to outside resources. Robert has aggressively pursued development; yet he feels discontent because the company has not rewarded him. He blames his position in the corporation and his lack of promotion for his discontent, yet a certain amount of unrest is often the nature of people who have inquiring minds and enjoy the challenge of learning. Robert might not be a corporation man who can accept routine and repetition. A new assignment where he can be more innovative and creative might channel his tremendous talent and energy in a more positive way.

Summary - Implementers of Self-Selected Activities Only

The five individuals who completed only self-selected activities are difficult to categorize. They are vastly different individuals. For example, Nat viewed the Success program a little more than a stress exercise while Ronald was greatly impressed by it. Nat felt it was not related to the real world; Ronald said it "indeed represented the real world." Both implemented one self-selected activity but none of those recommended. Ray entered the program with a game-like attitude and indicated that he needed some assurance that "down the road, maybe, you'll be a manager" to clarify the goal. Wayne, on the other hand, felt honored to be included and blamed himself for procrastinating in terms of the developmental activities.

Unique within the group is Robert who completed eleven self-selected activities on his own--a highly motivated, resourceful person with a high level of discontent. It is difficult to determine how much of his discontent is job related because he has not advanced as rapidly as he feels he should or how much it relates to his intellectual curiosity and need for innovation.

These individuals can only be considered a group in terms of completing only self-selected activities. In all other respects, they must be viewed as individuals.

Non-Implementers

Most participants (17 out of 19) pursued and completed some developmental activities--recommended and/or self-selected--following the Success Program. However, two participants chose not to implement any development.

Case 3:1 - Gene

White male; 30-39 age range; graduate degree; employed at Shemano 7-9 years; attended program in 1982.

Recommended: 4 activities in areas of leadership and sensitivity.

Implemented: None; no self-selected.

Although he expressed no desire to attend the program when approached, Gene volunteered to "fill a slot." He reasoned, "I'm not interested in management—if the company wants me to perform in a management function and if that's what they need me to do, I'll do it . . . because that's the only reason I would do it." Gene, feeling confident about his abilities even before his participation in the program, explained, "I had already experienced on the job what the program offered." The greatest impact of the program was the reinforcement of his dislike of managerial responsibilities.

Gene implemented none of the recommendations, even though support was available, because of his lack of interest in management advancement. He explained, "I felt that the recommendations that were made with the thought in mind if a person pursued and if accomplished, he would be in a much better position for management, which I don't want." For the same reason, no other development was pursued.

Gene agreed with the assessment saying that the assessors were significantly accurate in identifying his strengths and weaknesses. He felt that his "raw language" during role play offended some assessors. In sharing the report with his new supervisor, Gene stated it was an opportunity to let his new supervisor know his preference for technical rather than managerial advancement.

Being a natural, Gene filled an extremely difficult and exhausting managerial position early in his career with Shemano and simply "burned out." He received a managerial promotion just prior to the program and decided against one when approached after the program. Although his superiors continued to seek his assistance, he was willing to help temporarily but was not willing to perform managerial responsibilities on a permanent basis.

The researcher's impression of Gene is that he is a capable, loyal, and straightforward individual who is probably so gifted he can do anything. He shows superior management skills, his deficiency being his "raw language," which he uses to express his lack of interest in and respect for managerial positions. In fact, Gene's superior management abilities runs counter to his interests, which are technical. Promotions aren't the key to keeping this individual; the right job is. The Success Program only reinforced Gene's lack of interest in managerial advancement. He continues to passively resist managerial responsibilities with a "condescending attitude." His discontent has to show.

Case 3:2 - Earl

White male; 30-39 age range; college graduate; employed at Shemano 4-6 years; attended program in 1981.

Recommended: 3 activities in areas of sensitivity and stress tolerance.

Implemented: None; no self-selected.

Earl attended the program because he was told it was mandatory; he felt he had no choice. His response to the program was mixed and

contradictory. On one hand, Earl indicated he was pleased with the "learning" experience and the reasonably accurate assessment of his abilities. On the other hand, he disliked the artificial environment in which he was assessed.

Citing the inconsistency and uncertainty of his evaluation as reasons for not implementing any developmental activities—recommended or self-selected, Earl reported that the recommendations lacked direction and commented, "I didn't think they took you far enough before they let you go . . . they left you too much on your own." Earl has scheduled an in-house training course dealing with one of the recommended areas and wants to pursue others at a later date. Deciding to share only his deficiencies with his supervisor, Earl did not include any strengths from the assessment report.

Earl's promotion just prior to the program and his confidence from his performance have produced a mild interest in future development.

The researcher's impression of Earl is that he is a person who seems to be lacking in resourcefulness, creativity, and flexibility. He is definitely not an independent learner. To him everything has to be real, specific, and detailed; he needs a great deal of external support. Because he had just been promoted and was relatively young in the job, someone thought he would profit from the Success Program. Had he been more intuitive, he might have.

Summary - Non-Implementers

The two non-implementers share one characteristic: Both were disinterested in attending the Success program. At that point, their similarities end. Gene simply rejects management as an area without personal satisfaction for him. His talent is such that he is repeatedly being placed in

management positions, but he is disdainful of it and would prefer technical responsibilities. Earl, on the other hand, seems to be less than resourceful and independent in his thinking. He needs a great deal of external motivation and specificity—the very type of pressure Gene finds so distasteful.

Summary

In reviewing the personal characteristics of the Success graduates in this study, it is apparent that they differ greatly. While most seem to have relatively high levels of independent thinking, some appear to be very "other people oriented," needing strong confirmation about their abilities and/or a great deal of specificity in recommendations for their growth and development.

They also differ greatly in terms of aggressive pursuit of goals and in ambition, with some having established career goals apart from their Success involvement while others interpreted their selection for the program as a promise for upward movement and felt frustrated and stagnant when the perceived promise was not immediately fulfilled. Generally, non-implementers, along with implementers who pursued few or no recommended activities, tend to be less goal oriented.

Another area of wide variability among individuals relates to resourcefulness and flexibility. This quality was most often reflected in their reports of self-selected activities and/or away-from-job involvement with individuals and groups which could provide opportunities for further growth. It was also reflected in the efforts by some to create opportunities to practice targeted skills on their present jobs. Implementers who pursued few

or no recommended activities tend to be less flexible and resourceful in their pursuit of development.

In general, the group shared an appreciation for the opportunity the Success Program provided. They recognized the investment it represented for the corporation. A certain company loyalty might be implied by the fact that even those who were disappointed with a lack of upward movement still hoped for future opportunities within Shemano rather than looking outside for similar opportunities.

Significant for Shemano is the fact that there was a widely expressed need for additional support, both in terms of on-the-job supervisory assistance and in terms of availability of training courses aimed at improving specific skill areas. In addition, recommendations regarding the timing and content of the individual interviews suggest areas for potential improvement of future Success Programs.

It is also significant that many participants seem unsure about the purpose of the Success program. A clear definition of what the corporation expectations are might remove some of the problems which result from "upward bound" expectations and expected levels of support on the part of participants. The follow-up interview might be structured to address this problem.

In summary, the Success Program has included individuals who differ greatly in personal characteristics and skills related to self-directed learning behavior. Yet the program has stimulated most of its participants to further their own development in areas targeted by the assessors. Despite its success in managerial development, Shemano could improve the overall effect with a few modifications in the Success Program.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the study, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations to improve the Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP) at Shemano Corporation.

Summary

Assessment centers, described in the press as "the hottest management potential evaluation technique in U. S. industry" (Millard & Pinsky, 1980, p. 85), have been widely researched and found to be successful as strategies for selecting and developing managers within an organization. Yet most of the efforts for refining such centers have focused on planning and implementing them. This study addressed an aspect generally neglected: Evaluation of the follow-up activities conducted by the participants themselves. Specifically, the study examined that follow-up and various factors which influenced it by analyzing five sub-problems:

1. To what extent did participants implement recommended developmental activities?
2. For those who implemented developmental activities (recommended and/or self-selected), what was the process by which the recommendations were implemented and completed?
3. To what extent did the program operation affect the participants' implementation of developmental activities?
4. What changes in management behavior resulted from participation in the program?

5. What professional outcomes did the participants experience with respect to job satisfaction and job movement as a result of participation in the program?

The sample of this study was drawn from 120 graduates of Shemano Corporation's Success Program. These 120 were surveyed to identify the extent to which they actually implemented developmental activities. They were subdivided into four different groups. The sample was drawn from each of those subgroups, which gave a total sample of 20. Before the final interview one person was removed from the sample after a job transfer, and one of the four subgroups was eliminated as all participants in the group had completed some development. Three groups remained with Category 1 being the largest by far with 12 of the 19 participants. Five remained in Category 2; only two were left in the newly renamed Category 3. A total of 19 persons participated in all phases of the research study. A special interview schedule was prepared so that participant responses could be further explored. Information obtained from the interview schedules was analyzed and reported in quantitative form with supporting narrative data. In addition, profiles on each case study described participants' personal characteristics relating to their program experience and follow-up implementation. Comparisons with respect to the degree of implementation were made so that relationships, similarities, and differences could be reported.

The findings of this study were as follows:

1. A majority of the participants did follow-up with one or more of the recommended developmental activities suggested, and many used additional self-selected activities to further their own development. Only two did not follow-up: One already had demonstrated exceptional managerial

skills but preferred to advance in technology; the second is still anticipating follow-up at a later time. Overall, this is impressive. However, of the 12 who completed suggested development, four were highly responsive, completing two-thirds or more, four were moderately responsive, completing approximately one-half, and four were barely responsive, completing approximately one-fourth. Five others rejected the recommendations but selected activities of their own choice, and two pursued no developmental activities.

2. Although they were less frequently used than recommended, specifically recommended training programs/courses were most often selected for follow-up activities. When courses/training had already been completed, alternate courses were often substituted. Other processes used often were self-modification of inappropriate behavior, reading of literature, expansion of areas of responsibility, and obtaining feedback from other personnel. The time that elapsed between the program and development varied from immediately to three years. Enrollment in a training program/course tended to take the longest time to start. The majority of those who implemented activities experienced no major problems. Those with problems cited no opportunities to develop within their current job responsibilities as the biggest problem.

3. In terms of the impact of the program operation on later development, several factors were often mentioned by the participants. The high and moderate implementers were in Success by choice; they sought or willingly accepted their nomination. They also reported feeling comfortable with role-playing and interacting with fellow participants. Their response to the assessment was that it targeted their own perceptions about strengths

and weaknesses, and they pursued follow-up activities which were directly related to suggested areas of improvement. When they needed support and resources for development, they generally sought help from within the corporation. Finally, the appropriateness of the timing of the training was best for the highest implementers; several had job changes in close proximity to the training which made the experience seem more practical.

Those who implemented self-selected activities only formed the most difficult group to categorize. They differed considerably in their response to the activities of the program as well as in personal characteristics. The number of activities they actually implemented ranged from 1 to 11. Their attitudes varied from a game-like approach to the training to feeling very stressful in the learning environment. They differed in terms of resourcefulness with one feeling a strong need to be assured that there was some hope for advancement and another who is dissatisfied because he has not advanced.

Low and non-implementers frequently reported feeling obligated or pressured to attend the Success Program. They were less comfortable with role-playing and sometimes appeared to have difficulty interacting with other people, especially supervisory personnel. The assessment generally was viewed as being unrealistic or relatively unimportant. They perceived the organization as being less supportive than necessary for furthering their development. Finally, they had experienced no job changes which would encourage development; the timing of the program did not enhance their perceptions about needed changes.

4. The majority of participants reported positive changes in their behavior in three areas: (a) Learning what to do to enhance their

managerial skills, (b) improving their managerial skills, and (c) demonstrating more confidence in their management abilities. The two activities which influenced their learning the most were self-awareness and the written report. Some participants reported that the feedback interview sessions were mostly repetition of the report itself and did not reveal any additional information. Two of the three most improved skills--leadership and oral communication-- were also identified by the assessors as the skills most needing improvement. Most participants believed their confidence had improved. Of those who reported no increase in confidence, three out of four indicated they already had great confidence in their skills. On the other hand, the majority of participants revealed they had received no feedback from others concerning a change in their behavior, and the few participants who did indicated it came from subordinates.

5. The extent to which job satisfaction increased varied among the participants with most reporting a positive impact. Those who entered the program with a high level of satisfaction did not report any significant difference. A few felt that satisfaction actually decreased because of lack of upward mobility and/or expansion of job responsibilities. In reporting job movement before and after the program, five participants revealed no job movement at all; one was promoted prior to and again after the program. Four identified job movement--mostly promotions--prior to the program only; nine revealed job movement--mostly promotions--after the program only.

Factors which enhanced development were similar for most participants and included positive feelings about the program, increased self-awareness, and a desire for skill improvement. Factors which interfered with development were similar for many participants and included limited

rejection of the assessment, limited resources for follow-up, and lack of support from management.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from this study relating to the extent of implementation of developmental activities by graduates of a diagnostic assessment center and the factors that influenced that implementation.

The fact that seventeen of the nineteen Success graduates followed-up with recommended and/or self-selected developmental activities is significant. While they differed in terms of the number of activities they pursued, they targeted the same skills cited by the assessors for improvement. Those with the highest levels of self-motivation and goal-directed behavior generally pursued both recommended and self-selected activities. In examining the processes used in implementing activities, it was found that participants generally followed the processes recommended by the assessors although they reserved for themselves the right to substitute specific activities as long as they were relevant to the managerial skill areas targeted. This is predictable for self-directed, independent learners and in no way reflects negatively on the assessors' recommendations. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that the Success Program effectively motivates individuals to continue their own development in terms of specific managerial skills which have been brought to their attention.

The influence of the program itself was significant primarily as a self-awareness and a motivational force. It can be concluded that participation in Success was a positive learning experience for almost all of its members. Self-awareness is heightened and serves as a catalyst for

further development in targeted managerial skills. Two conditions, however, must exist. First, the participants must accept the need for development. Secondly, resources must be available. It will continue to be important for participants to know that many of the skills may not be essential to their present jobs, but that they are critical at higher levels of employment. The decisions about follow-up will then be based on creating opportunities for themselves in the future as well as exploring potentials for innovative responses to current job demands.

Self-reported changes in management behavior tended to focus on improved skills in leadership and oral communications. The fact that most participants stated they learned what skills needed improvement and how to approach that improvement as a result of the Success Program is significant. It is also notable that most saw themselves as demonstrating more confidence in their management skills on the job. On the other hand, all assessment of change has been the subjective judgment of the participants or their subordinates. No objective criteria have been established related to changes in skills targeted during the assessment. One justification for this could be found in the emphasis on the developmental aspects of the assessment center at Shemano. On the other hand, it is possible that greater change could be accomplished if participants were assisted in developing a set of criteria to use in their own self-evaluation of improvement in management skills. In any event, the participants' perception of change is an important consideration since it has possible implications in motivating individuals for continued development.

Generally participants experienced some problems in pursuing development. Most were surmountable when participants accepted the need

for learning. On the other hand, when development required support by management to create job opportunities such as special projects, job rotation, and expanded job responsibilities in order to practice skills recommended by the assessors, participants experienced a feeling of frustration and helplessness when management did not provide that support. It was further noted that although participants were aware that the purpose was developmental as opposed to selective, they tended to derive expectations of upward mobility after assessment. When these expectations were not fulfilled, there tended to be a decrease in job satisfaction or loss of self-confidence. Both the creation of job opportunities and clarification of the developmental purpose of the program represent organizational responsibilities which need attention. However, some types of support provided by the corporation, such as time-off, paid tuition, and counseling by administrators or supervisors, enhanced the follow-up as did the assistance of peers, spouses, friends, and in one instance a minister.

It can be concluded that both individual and organizational responsibilities were reflected in the problems encountered and reasons given for not pursuing development. Personal factors generally related to the willingness to devote time and energy to self-development and to the individuals' perceptions about the importance of change. The levels of initiative and motivation influenced decisions involving innovations and substitutions when specific recommendations were difficult to implement. Organizational factors and responsibilities generally related to feedback, relevance of the training to job functions, and post program support. One critical area in which the program seemed to have a deficiency was the length of time between the program and feedback. When the time frame

exceeded two weeks, many participants exhibited increased anxiety and less desire and enthusiasm for development. Another critical area which appeared to undermine the purpose of the program was the disconfirmation of the assessors' recommendations by some supervisors. When this happened, individuals tended to believe their supervisors and did not attempt to improve the skill needed for higher management.

From the results of this study, it can be concluded that the graduates of MMDP believe that the program (a) provides individuals the opportunity to identify specific managerial skills valued by the corporation, skills which are important in upward job mobility, (b) provides individuals the opportunity to enhance self-awareness through a combination of role playing and assessment strategies, and (c) enables individuals to approach their own improvement with a sense of direction yet with enough flexibility to allow for individual differences. As a result, the Success Program is basically a sound one that motivates individuals who participate in it to pursue development through a variety of recommended and/or self-selected activities.

Recommendations

This study provides evidence to support Shemano's assumption: Through the assessment center process, individuals will be motivated to change their managerial behavior. On the other hand, the following recommendations should increase the effectiveness of Success by addressing organizational responsibilities which enhance the transfer of learning from the assessment center program to day-to-day performance of job responsibilities. All recommendations have been derived from observations made by participants and interpretations of their impact on the total effect of the program.

1. Managers who have not themselves attended the Success Program should be provided with an overview of it so that they select the most appropriate people to attend and in order for them to provide appropriate support upon the conclusion of the program.

2. In order to assure that all participants have a common understanding of the purpose of the program, the Program Administrator should clarify the purpose of the training, the organizational expectations, and the potentials for individual development.

3. As soon as the program begins, the Program Administrator should control, whenever possible, any outside distractions which could interfere with both the participants' concentration and evaluation by assessors. In particular, telephone calls other than role play should be restricted except for emergencies. In case of emergency, all telephone calls to participants should come through the Program Administrator.

4. Every participant should be evaluated in a way that reflects the differences between (a) those abilities observed with a rating by consensus, (b) those abilities observed but not rated due to lack of consensus, and (c) those abilities not observed and thus not rated. For example, in addition to the existing rating scale of A+ for more than adequate ability, A for adequate ability, and A- for less than adequate ability, two additional ratings should be included: 0 for ability not observed, and X for ability observed but no consensus reached. The non-rating of a management ability creates a false impression about that ability to both the participants and those with whom they share the results.

5. The program designers and evaluators should redefine their position regarding peer evaluations. If that information is not going to be

used in any way, it should be deleted. If the information continues as part of the program, the participant has every right to receive feedback on that portion of the assessment.

6. Because participants' motivation is highest and the ability to recall the specifics about their own performance is greatest immediately after the program, the feedback of participants' performance and recommendations for development should follow no later than two weeks after assessment. If extenuating circumstances prevent follow-up within that period of time, the participant should be contacted and an alternate date be given.

7. The follow-up feedback should be divided into two parts: First, the written report which includes evaluation results and recommendations for development should be mailed to the participants no later than two weeks after assessment; and secondly, a personal interview should be scheduled by the Program Administrator to discuss any concerns and/or discrepancies and to plan for development. In this way, participants can review the results promptly and later attend the interview session ready to discuss their developmental plans. The interview session should not be a mere repetition of the Success Report itself. At this time, a specific developmental action plan can be developed with the individuals.

8. Since participants indicated that many of the observational comments and recommendations for development were too general or vague to pursue, assessors should be as specific as possible in detailing developmental needs. For example, instead of recommending that participants read books in a certain area or subject, assessors can recommend specific books. In addition, the Department of Management and Organization

Development should establish a Professional Reading Library so that participants can check out recommended materials at their convenience.

9. The Program Administrator or one of the professionals in the Department of Management and Organization Development should follow up the graduates of the program in six months and again one year after the program to ensure that developmental needs are being met, particularly when assistance from management is necessary. For example, a questionnaire can be mailed to the graduates concerning their developmental progress indicating a place to request a follow-up meeting. In this way, individuals have a choice of independently pursuing their development or getting organizational support when needed. The follow-up meeting should be geared to the individual's developmental needs.

10. All participants should be informed about the organization's policy on confidentiality and use of the Success Reports in the orientation part of the program and again during the closing segment. Observing the confidentiality of the program, some participants may not know that their reports can be voluntarily placed in personnel files to be used in management decisions.

11. Some participants perceive they are getting a great deal of assistance from management. The perceptions of others, however, are that they need more. The organization should clearly state how much accountability supervisors and Management Development professionals should have in the individuals' development and relay this information to the participants, their supervisors, and the Management Development staff so that participants will not feel "let down" when they share the results with management and get nothing in return.

12. Individual and organizational roles/responsibilities should be clarified in the orientation part of the program. Although the skills are critical for higher management, there are ways that individuals can use these management skills in both on-the-job and out-of-work experiences. The responsibility for career development can be shared by the individual and the organization. As self-directed learners, individuals are responsible for initiating their own career development, implementing the assessors' developmental recommendations and their own self-selected developmental activities. In addition, three parts of the organization (upper management, immediate supervisors, and the Management Development professionals) should reinforce and support the participants' developmental efforts. Upper management who is responsible for policy making decisions about the individuals' career movement can commit organizational resources and provide opportunities for job movement and/or expanded areas of responsibility. Immediate supervisors can provide first line feedback and guidance. Management Development professionals can provide information, tools, and guidance to help employees plan and implement their development.

Future Research Considerations

In reflecting on this study, the researcher perceives other design strategies which would be useful in future studies of a similar nature. These considerations could be implemented only with the full support of the corporation providing the assessment center since they would involve individuals other than the participants and the assessors. They would, however, enhance the efforts to determine the motivational value of assessment centers.

1. A study which utilized a control group of individuals with characteristics similar to those of the participants but who did not attend the program could be used to determine whether the control group pursued development without assessment and feedback.

2. A study which included inventories of participants' developmental behavior before the program could be used to determine the extent to which they already have been involved in self-improvement activities and thereby determine whether change actually resulted from the assessment experience.

3. A study which included data from subordinates, superiors, and/or peers regarding observed changes in behavior in the participants could confirm the validity of data from participants themselves.

4. A follow-up study involving both participants and a control group who did not attend the program could be used to compare the advancement of the two groups.

REFERENCES

- Arttingstall, B. (1982). Learning through self-development. Journal of European Industrial Training, 6(1), 8-12.
- Barkhaus, R., & Bolyard, C. (1978). Career development: Whose responsibility? SAM Advanced Management Journal, Summer.
- Bender, J. M. (1973). What is "typical" of assessment centers? Personnel, 50(4), 50-57.
- Bray, D. W. (1964). The assessment center method of appraising managerial potential. In J. W. Blood (Ed.), The Personnel Job in a Changing World. New York: AMACOM.
- Bray, D. W. (1971). The assessment center: Opportunities for women. Personnel, 48(5), 30-34.
- Bray, D. W. (1976). The assessment center method. In R. L. Craig (Ed.), Training and Development Handbook, (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Bray, D. W., Campbell, R. J., & Grant, D. L. (1974). Formative years in business: A long-term AT&T study of managerial lives. New York: Wiley.
- Bray, D. W., & Grant, D. L. (1966). The assessment center in the measurement of potential for business management. Psychological Monographs, 80(17), 1-27.
- Brush, D. H., & Schoenfeldt, L. F. (1980). Identifying managerial potential: An alternative to assessment centers. Personnel, 57(3), 68-76.
- Butteriss & Albrecht. (1979). New management tools. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Byham, W. C. (1970). Assessment centers for spotting future managers. Harvard Business Review, 48(4), 150-167.
- Byham, W. C. (1971). The assessment center as an aid in management development. Training and Development, 25(12), 10-22.
- Byham, W. C. (1978). How to improve the validity of an assessment center. Training and Development Journal, 32(11), 4-6.
- Byham, W. C. (1980a). Starting an assessment center the correct way. The Personnel Administrator, 25(2), 27-32.
- Byham, W. C. (1980b). The assessment as an aid in management development. Training and Development Journal, 34(6), 24-36.

- Campbell, R. J., & Bray, D. W. (1967). Assessment centers: An aid in management selection. Personnel Administration, 30(2), 6-13.
- Canning, R. (1984). Management self-development. Journal of European Industrial Training, 8(1).
- Carp, A., Peterson, R., & Roelfs, P. (1974). Adult learning, interests, and experiences. In K. P. Cross, J. R. Valley & Associates, Planning Nontraditional Programs: An Analysis of the Issues for Postsecondary Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, B. M. (1974). The assessment center: Whom to develop. Training, February, 19-21.
- Cohen, S. L. (1980). The bottom line on assessment center technology. The Personnel Administrator, 25(2), 50-56.
- Cohen, S. L., & Meyer, H. H. (1979). Toward a more comprehensive career planning program. Personnel Journal. September.
- Coolican, P. M. (1974). Self-planned learning: Implications for the future of adult education. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Research Corporation.
- Cross, L. (1982). Career management development: A system that gets results. Training and Development Journal, 37(2), 54-63.
- Dunnette, M. D., (Ed.). (1976). Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Finkle, R. B. (1976). Managerial assessment centers. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial & Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 861-888.
- Fitz-enz, J., Hards, K. E., & Savage, G. E. (1980). Total development: Selection, assessment, growth. The Personnel Administrator, 25(2), 58-62.
- Frank, E., & Margerison, C. (1978). Training methods & organization development. Journal of European Industrial Training, 2(4), 5-6.
- Glitzer, B., & Maher, B. (1982). Six steps to contemporary career development. Training, 19(12), 48-49, 53.
- Griffith, A. R. (1980). Career development: What organizations are doing about it. Personnel, March-April.
- Hall, D. T. (1976). Careers in organizations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Hart, G., & Thompson, P. (1983). Assessment centers: For selection or development. In L. Baird, C. E. Schneier & D. Laird (Eds.), The

Training and Development Sourcebook (pp. 144-153). Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

- Hinrichs, J. R., & Haanpera S. (1976). Reliability of measurement in situational exercises: An assessment of the assessment center method. Personnel Psychology, 29, 31-40.
- Holmstrom, E. I. (1973). "Older" freshmen: do they differ from "typical" undergraduates? ACE Research Reports, 8(7).
- Houle, C. C. (1961). The inquiring mind. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Howard, A. (1974). An assessment of assessment centers. Academy of Management Journal, 17(1), 115-134.
- Huck, J. R. (1974). Determinants of assessment center ratings for white and black females and the relationship of these dimensions to subsequent performance effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University.
- Huck, J. R. (1977). The research base. In J. L. Moses and W. C. Byham (Eds.), Applying the Assessment Center Method. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Huck, J. R., & Bray, D. W. (1976). Management assessment center evaluations and subsequent performance of black and white females. Personel Psychology, 29, 13-20.
- Huczynski, A. (1978). Approaches to the problems of learning transfer. Journal of European Industrial Training, 2(1), 26-29.
- Hurley, P. (Ed.). (1983). Conversations with Edgar Schein, Tim Hall and Marlys Hanson. Training and Development Journal, 37(2), 66-70.
- Jaffee, C. L., Bender J., & Calvert, O. L. (1970). The assessment center technique: A validation study. Management of Personnel Quarterly, 9(3), 9-14.
- Jaffee, C. L., & Cohen, S. L. (1980). Improving human resource effectiveness through assessment center technology: Emergence, design, application and evaluation. In E. Miller and E. Burack (Eds.), Human Resource Management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jaffee, C. L., & Sefcik, J. T., Jr. (1980). What is an assessment center? The Personnel Administrator, 25(2), 40-43.
- Jago, A. (1982). The transfer of learning to the workplace: A practical study. Journal of European Industrial Training, 6(7), 21-24.

- Jeffrey-Smith, E. C. (1981). The development and evaluation of an assessment center in a hospital setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Jeswald, T. A. (1977). Issues in establishing an assessment center. In J. L. Moses & W. C. Byham (Eds.), Applying the Assessment Center Method. New York: Pergammon Press.
- Johnstone, J. W., & Rivera, R. J. (1965). Volunteers for learning. Chicago: Aldine.
- Joyce, L. (1979). Management training: Development and trends. Journal of European Industrial Training, 3(6), 15-19.
- Kaye, B., Leibowitz, Z., Farren, C., Remick, K., & Jones, P. (1984). Whose career is it, anyway? Training and Development Journal, 38(5), 112-116.
- Kelly, H. B. (1982). A primer on transfer of training. Training and Development Journal, 36(11), 102-106.
- Kent, R. H. (1982). Transfer of training without the boss. Journal of European Industrial Training, 6(3), 17-19.
- Kleiner, B. H. (1980). Managing your career. Supervisory Management, March.
- Klimoski, R. J., & Strickland, W. J. (1977). Assessment centers—valid or merely prescient. Personnel Psychology, 30, 353-361.
- Knowles, M. S. (1975). Self-directed learning. Chicago: Association Press.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy. Chicago: Association Press.
- Koontz, H., & O'Donnell, C. (1974). Essentials of management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Kraut, A. I. (1972). A hard look at management assessment centers and their future. Personnel Journal, 51(5), 317-326.
- Kraut, A. I. (1976). New frontiers for assessment centers. Personnel, 54(4), 30-38.
- Massie, J. L. (1979). Essentials of management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Mcloskey, J. L., Slivinski, L. W., & Bourgeois, R. P. (1980). Identification of senior executive potential through an assessment centre. Optimum, 11(3), 37-50.

- Millard, C. W., & Pinsky, S. (1980). Assessing the assessment center. The Personnel Administrator, 25(5), 85-88.
- Montana, P. J. (1979). Implementing a career life planning program. Personnel, September-October.
- Moses, J. L. (1973). The development of an assessment center for the early identification of supervisory potential. Personnel Psychology, 26, 569-580.
- Moses, J. L. (1977). The assessment center method. In J. L. Moses & W. C. Byham (Eds.), Applying the Assessment Center Method. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Mumford, A. (1979). Flavour of the Month? Journal of European Industrial Training, 3(3), 13-15.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1980). Preliminary Data, Participation in Adult Education, 1978. Washington, DC: Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Nichols, B. E. (1984). Evaluating a developmental assessment center in a manufacturing environment. Petersburg, VA: Shemano Corporation.
- Nichols, L. C., & Hudson, J. (1981). Dual-role assessment center: Selection & Development. Personnel Journal, 60, 380-386.
- Olivas, L. (1980). Using assessment centers for individual and organization development. Personnel, 57(3), 63-67.
- Olivas, L., & Newstrom, J. W. (1981). Learning through the use of simulation games. Training and Development Journal, 35(9), 63, 66-67.
- Parker, B. C. (1980). Assessment centers: A statistical study. The Personnel administrator, 25(2), 65-67.
- Parry, S. B., & Reich, L. R. (1984). An uneasy look at behavior modeling. Training and Development Journal, 38(3), 57-62.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Penland, P. (1977). Individual self-planned learning. Washington, DC: Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., & Hackman, J. R. (1975). Behavior in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Rowland, K. M., London, M., Ferris, G., & Sherman, J. L. (Eds.). (1980). Current issues in personnel management. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

- Schiffhauer, J. A. (1972). Developing human resources through an employee upgrading program. Personnel, 51(3), 199-203.
- Sikula, A. F., & McKenna, J. F. (1983). Individuals must take charge of career development. The Personnel Administrator, 28(10), 89-90, 92, 97.
- Slevin, D. P. (1972). The assessment center: Breakthrough in management appraisal and development. Personnel Journal, 51(4), 255-261.
- Solmon, L. C., Gordon, J. J., & Ochsner, N. L. (1979). The characteristics and needs of adults in postsecondary education. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Souder, W. E., & Leksich, A. M. (1983). Assessment centers are evolving toward a bright future. The Personnel Administrator, 28(11), 80-87.
- Steiner, R. (1975). New use for assessment centers--training evaluation. Personnel Journal, 54(4), 236-237, 248.
- Szilagyi, A. D., Jr. (1981). Management and performance. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.
- Teel, K. S., & DuBois, H. (1983). Participants' reactions to assessment centers. The Personnel Administrator, 28(3), 85-91.
- Thornton, G. E., III. (1979). Professional issues in assessment center applications. Journal of Assessment Center Technology, 2(2), 1-6.
- Thornton, G. C., III, & Byham, W. C. (1982). Assessment centers and managerial performance. New York: Academic Press.
- Tough, A. (1967). Learning without a teacher. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Tough, A. (1978). Major learning efforts: Recent research and future directions. In The Adult Learner: Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Tough, A. (1979). The adult's learning projects (2nd ed.). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Walker, J. W. & Gutteridge, T. G. (1979). Career planning practices. New York: AMACOM.
- Wessman, F. (1975). Determining the training needs of managers. Personnel Journal, 54(2), 109-113, 125.
- Wilson, J. E., & Tatge, W. A. (1973). Assessment studies--further assessment needed? Personnel Journal, 52(3), 172-179.

Zemke, R. (1982). Self-directed learning: A must skill in the information age. Training, 19(8), 28-30.

APPENDIX A
Memo with Survey Questionnaire
(Participants and Assessors)

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: . Participants-Mid-Management Development
Program (MMDP) Date: February 16, 1984

From: . Billie Nichols - Research Extern, Dept. of Management and Organization
Development

Subject: . MMDP Evaluation

Recently, you received a memo requesting your participation in an evaluation of MMDP (formerly known as TRAC). At this time, you are being asked to complete the attached questionnaire as part of an evaluation of the program. Your responses will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of MMDP and to determine what changes, if any, should be made in the program.

This questionnaire requires approximately 15 minutes to complete. It is designed to gather three kinds of information concerning your participation in MMDP:

- your satisfaction with the program;
- how much you learned through the program;
- to what degree you applied the knowledge that you acquired from the program.

If you have any questions prior to or during the completion of the questionnaire, please do not hesitate to call me at _____, extension _____, or to leave a message at _____, extension _____. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it to me in the enclosed envelope.

I am asking you to sign the questionnaire so that your responses can be compared with evaluation data you provided at the conclusion of the program. All your responses will be kept confidential. No employee will have access to your individual questionnaire responses. However, though requested, your signature is optional. Please complete and return this questionnaire with or without your signature. Should you desire, a summary of the evaluation results will be sent to you.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Billie Nichols

/jtw
003.22/M4/2

Enclosure: MMDP Questionnaire
Return Envelope

C O N F I D E N T I A L

MID-MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (MMDP)

PARTICIPANT SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS: Using the five numbers on the rating scale below, mark your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate number. Please respond to all remaining questions by filling in the blanks. Thank you.

<u>Rating Scale</u>	
5	= Strongly Agree
4	= Agree
3	= Neither Agree nor Disagree
2	= Disagree
1	= Strongly Disagree

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I was aware of MMDP prior to being nominated to attend.	5	4	3	2	1
2. My supervisor encouraged my participation in MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
3. My participation in MMDP was voluntary.	5	4	3	2	1
4. I understood MMDP's goals before I attended.	5	4	3	2	1
5. Prior to attending MMDP, I had acquired information about specific (and possibly confidential) program content other than that provided by the Program Administrator.	5	4	3	2	1
IF YOU MARKED 4 OR 5 IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION 5, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 6 AND 7; OTHERWISE, PROCEED TO QUESTION 8.					
6. I received this information from:					
a. Supervision	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX
b. Work associates	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX
c. Previous MMDP participants	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. The specific information that I acquired aided my performance in the program.	5	4	3	2	1
8. My behavior in MMDP was the same as it would have been in a comparable "real life" situation.	5	4	3	2	1
9. The assessors were believable in their role as Vice-Presidents of TRAC. Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
10. I believe that the assessors in MMDP were well-qualified to evaluate my strengths and weaknesses.	5	4	3	2	1
11. The following program facilities were satisfactory:					
a. Meeting rooms	5	4	3	2	1
b. Materials	5	4	3	2	1
c. Guest rooms	5	4	3	2	1
12. MMDP was effectively administered. Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
13. Following my participation in the program, I had an increased desire to enhance my managerial skills.	5	4	3	2	1
14. The time frame between program participation and the feedback session was of appropriate length. Comments:	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. The feedback report I received was clearly written (i.e., communicated clearly). If not, why not?	5	4	3	2	1
16. The assessors accurately identified my strengths and weaknesses.	5	4	3	2	1
17. I feel that I performed well in the program.	5	4	3	2	1
18. I gained more confidence in my management abilities as a result of participating in MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
19. Following the feedback interview, I was motivated to pursue the recommended developmental activities. If not, why not?	5	4	3	2	1
20. I shared the feedback report and/or information conveyed in the report with the following:					
a. Person who nominated me	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX
b. Supervisor	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX
c. Work associate	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX
d. Others: Specify _____	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX
21. To the best of my knowledge, the Program Administrator has preserved the confidentiality of my performance in MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
22. To the best of my knowledge, the assessors have preserved the confidentiality of participants' performance in MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
23. To the best of my knowledge, program participants have preserved the confidentiality of their peers' performance in MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
24. To the best of my knowledge, my supervisor has preserved the confidentiality of my performance in MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
25. Through my participation in MMDP, I learned more about what I could do to enhance my managerial skills.	5	4	3	2	1
IF YOU MARKED 4 OR 5 IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION 25, PLEASE COMPLETE QUESTION 26. OTHERWISE, PROCEED TO QUESTION 27.					
25. I learned more about what I could do to enhance my managerial skills as a result of:					
a. Awareness of my own actions during the program.	5	4	3	2	1
b. Interactions with and observations of other participants during the program.	5	4	3	2	1
c. Interactions with and observations of assessors during the program.	5	4	3	2	1
d. Informal discussions with other participants after the program formally ended.	5	4	3	2	1
e. The written feedback report.	5	4	3	2	1
f. The feedback interview.	5	4	3	2	1
g. Interactions with my supervisor related to my MMDP experience.	5	4	3	2	1
h. Interactions with other PM employees related to my MMDP experience.	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
27. Following the feedback interview, I undertook one or more of the recommended developmental activities. If not, why not?	5	4	3	2	1
28. I have undertaken one or more developmental activities (whether recommended or not) as a result of having attended MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
IF YOU MARKED 4 OR 5 IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION 28, PLEASE COMPLETE QUESTION 29. OTHERWISE, PROCEED TO QUESTION 30.					
29. I have completed one or more of the developmental activities I undertook. If not, why not?	5	4	3	2	1

30. Since MMDP, which of the activities listed below have you used to strengthen your managerial skills (whether recommended or not):

Check as many as appropriate.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Special project work | h. <input type="checkbox"/> Self-modification of inappropriate behavior |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> On-the-job training | i. <input type="checkbox"/> Internal educational programs (workshops, seminars, conferences) |
| c. <input type="checkbox"/> Career counseling | j. <input type="checkbox"/> External educational programs (workshops, seminars, conferences) |
| d. <input type="checkbox"/> Discussions with other PM personnel | k. <input type="checkbox"/> University/college courses |
| e. <input type="checkbox"/> Individual coaching by supervisor | l. <input type="checkbox"/> Others: Specify _____ |
| f. <input type="checkbox"/> Read relevant literature | m. <input type="checkbox"/> None |
| g. <input type="checkbox"/> Expanded area of responsibility | |

Which of the items you endorsed were most useful in enhancing your management skills?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
31. I have improved my managerial skills as a result of participation in MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
IF YOU MARKED 4 OR 5 IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION 31, PLEASE INDICATE THE SOURCE BY COMPLETING QUESTION 32; OTHERWISE, PROCEED TO QUESTION 33.					
32. This improvement in my managerial skills is a result of:					
a. What I learned during the three-day program itself.	5	4	3	2	1
b. What I learned during my feedback interview.	5	4	3	2	1
c. What I learned while undertaking developmental activities after the program ended.	5	4	3	2	1
d. Other (Please explain)	5	4	3	2	1
33. After my participation in MMDP, my supervisor more actively assisted my professional development than before.	5	4	3	2	1
34. Overall, I was satisfied with MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
35. I have experienced a lateral job move since attending MMDP.	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX
36. I have been promoted since attending MMDP.	XXXXXXXX	4	XXXXXXXX	2	XXXXXXXX

37. From the list below, please check as many words as appropriate to describe your major feelings about the experience of participating in MMDP:

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Boring | f. <input type="checkbox"/> Irritating | k. <input type="checkbox"/> Challenging | o. <input type="checkbox"/> Frustrating |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> Stressful | g. <input type="checkbox"/> Tiring | l. <input type="checkbox"/> Embarrassing | q. <input type="checkbox"/> Discouraging |
| c. <input type="checkbox"/> Interesting | h. <input type="checkbox"/> Revealing | m. <input type="checkbox"/> Exciting | r. <input type="checkbox"/> Pleasurable |
| d. <input type="checkbox"/> Overwhelming | i. <input type="checkbox"/> Threatening | n. <input type="checkbox"/> Stimulating | s. <input type="checkbox"/> Informative |
| e. <input type="checkbox"/> Confusing | j. <input type="checkbox"/> Fair | o. <input type="checkbox"/> Competitive | t. <input type="checkbox"/> Harmful |

38. In reflecting on the program, I would recommend the following changes in MMDP:

39. When did you attend MMDP: _____
 Year

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 40 THROUGH 43 AS OF THE DATE OF YOUR PARTICIPATION IN MMDP.

40. How long had you worked for PH? _____ (years)

41. In which department were you employed (e.g., Engineering, Finance, Manufacturing, etc.)?

42. How much formal education had you received?

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> No high school | d. <input type="checkbox"/> College graduate |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> Some high school | e. <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate work |
| c. <input type="checkbox"/> High school graduate | f. <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate degree |

43. What age group did you fall within: Under 30 30-39 40-49 50+

44. Race: a. White b. Black c. Hispanic
 d. Oriental e. Other: Specify _____

45. Sex: a. Female b. Male

 Name (Please Print)

I would like to receive a summary of
 the evaluation results. YES ___ NO ___

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE ON OR BEFORE MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27 TO:

Billie Nichols
 Department of Management and Organization Development
 Operations Center A-1

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: . Assessors - Mid-Management Development
 Program (MMDP) Date: February 16, 1984

From: . Billie Nichols - Research Extern, Dept. of Management and Organization
 Development

Subject: . MMDP Evaluation

Recently, you received an introductory memo requesting your participation in an evaluation of MMDP (formerly known as TRAC). At this time you are being asked to complete the attached questionnaire as part of an evaluation of the program. The questionnaire data will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of MMDP and to determine what changes, if any, should be made in the program. This questionnaire requires approximately 15 minutes to complete.

I am asking you to sign the questionnaire for record keeping purposes. However, your responses will be kept confidential. No employee will have access to your individual questionnaire responses. However, though requested, your signature is optional. Please complete and return this questionnaire with or without your signature. Should you desire, a summary of the evaluation results will be sent to you.

It is extremely important to get feedback from you. As an assessor, your comments will be helpful in promoting program effectiveness. If you have not yet served as an MMDP assessor, please only complete the ten asterisked items (10a, 12, 15, 16-22).

If you have any questions regarding the completion of this questionnaire, please do not hesitate to call me at _____, extension _____, or to leave a message at _____, extension _____. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it to me in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Billie Nichols

/jtw
 003.22/M3.1/2

Enclosure: MMDP Questionnaire
 Return Envelope

C O N F I D E N T I A L

MID-MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (MMDP)

ASSESSOR SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS: Using the five numbers on the rating scale below, mark your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate number. Please respond to remaining questions by filling in the blanks. Thank you.

<u>Rating Scale</u>	
5	= Strongly Agree
4	= Agree
3	= Neither Agree nor Disagree
2	= Disagree
1	= Strongly Disagree

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
1. Assessor training adequately prepared me to work as an assessor in MMDP. Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
2. Program facilities were satisfactory:					
a. Meeting Rooms	5	4	3	2	1
b. Materials	5	4	3	2	1
c. Guest Rooms	5	4	3	2	1
3. MMDP was effectively administered. Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
4. The instructions and assistance I received from the Program Administrator during MMDP were sufficient to enable me to successfully fulfill my assessor responsibilities.	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. The following exercises contributed to MIDP:					
a. Committee Meetings	5	4	3	2	1
b. Interviews with Vice-Presidents	5	4	3	2	1
c. Telephone Role Plays	5	4	3	2	1
d. Meals	5	4	3	2	1
e. Cocktail Parties	5	4	3	2	1
f. Management Speech	5	4	3	2	1
g. Follow-up Meeting to Committee Meetings	5	4	3	2	1
h. Written Correspondence	5	4	3	2	1
6. The program was designed in such a way as to provide sufficient information to allow the accurate evaluation of participants' performance on the following dimensions:					
a. Leadership	5	4	3	2	1
b. Planning and Organizing	5	4	3	2	1
c. Analytical Skill	5	4	3	2	1
d. Management Control	5	4	3	2	1
e. Sensitivity	5	4	3	2	1
f. Decision Making	5	4	3	2	1
g. Stress Tolerance	5	4	3	2	1
h. Oral Communication	5	4	3	2	1
i. Written Communication	5	4	3	2	1
Identify any of the above dimensions which you think should be modified or no longer evaluated as a part of the program.					
Please explain.					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. Overall, MMDP accurately assessed participants' strengths and weaknesses.	5	4	3	2	1
8. MMDP was effective in establishing a development program for each participant.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Through my participation as an assessor in MMDP, I have learned more about what I could do to enhance my management skills.	5	4	3	2	1
IF YOU MARKED 4 OR 5 IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION 9, PLEASE INDICATE THE SOURCE BY COMPLETING QUESTION 10; OTHERWISE, PROCEED TO QUESTION 11.					
10. I have learned more about what I could do to enhance my managerial skills as a result of:					
*a. My participation in assessor training.	5	4	3	2	1
b. Awareness of my own actions during MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
c. Interactions with and observations of program participants during MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
d. Discussions with other assessors during MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
e. Discussions with Program Administrator before, during, and after MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
f. Interactions with my supervisor related to my MMDP experience.	5	4	3	2	1
g. Interactions with other PM employees related to my MMDP experience.	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11. I have changed some of my own work-related behavior as a result of my participation as an assessor in MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
*12. My experience in MMDP has improved my:					
a. Ability to evaluate the long-term potential of my subordinates.	5	4	3	2	1
b. Ability to conduct appraisal discussions with subordinates.	5	4	3	2	1
c. Ability to conduct selection interviews.	5	4	3	2	1
d. Ability to discipline subordinates.	5	4	3	2	1
e. Estimation of the worth of the program.	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					
13. Overall, I am satisfied with MMDP.	5	4	3	2	1
14. From the list below, please check as many words as appropriate to describe the major feelings that you experienced while participating in MMDP:					
a. <input type="checkbox"/> Boring	f. <input type="checkbox"/> Irritating	k. <input type="checkbox"/> Challenging	p. <input type="checkbox"/> Frustrating		
b. <input type="checkbox"/> Stressful	g. <input type="checkbox"/> Tiring	l. <input type="checkbox"/> Embarrassing	q. <input type="checkbox"/> Discouraging		
c. <input type="checkbox"/> Interesting	h. <input type="checkbox"/> Revealing	m. <input type="checkbox"/> Exciting	r. <input type="checkbox"/> Pleasurable		
d. <input type="checkbox"/> Overwhelming	i. <input type="checkbox"/> Threatening	n. <input type="checkbox"/> Stimulating	s. <input type="checkbox"/> Informative		
e. <input type="checkbox"/> Confusing	j. <input type="checkbox"/> Fair	o. <input type="checkbox"/> Competitive	t. <input type="checkbox"/> Harmful		

*15. My overall comments on MMDP:

- *16. How long have you worked for PM? _____ Years
- *17. How many times have you served as an assessor? _____
- *18. Would you serve (again) as an assessor? a. Yes b. No

Why or why not: _____

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 19 AND 20 AS OF THE DATE OF YOUR PARTICIPATION IN MMDP.

- *19. How much formal education had you received?
 - a. No high school
 - b. Some high school
 - c. High school graduate
 - d. Some college
 - e. College graduate
 - f. Graduate work
 - g. Graduate degree
- *20. What age group did you fall within:
 - a. Under 30
 - b. 30-39
 - c. 40-49
 - d. 50+
- *21. Race: a. White b. Black c. Hispanic d. Oriental
 - e. Other: Specify _____
- *22. Sex: a. Female
 - b. Male

 Name (Please Print)

I would like to receive a summary
 of the evaluation results. YES _____ NO _____

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS EVALUATION!

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE ON OR BEFORE MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27 TO:

Billie Nichols
 Department of Management and Organization Development
 Operations Center A-1

APPENDIX B

Memo to Participants in Sample

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: Participants - Mid-Management Development
Program (MMDP) - (Formerly TRAC) Date: August 27, 1984

From: Billie Nichols - Research Extern, Dept. of
Management and Organization Development

Subject: MMDP Evaluation

Recently, you received a summary of the results of the survey questionnaire, which you completed in February. It was indicated that interviews would follow up the survey in order to obtain more information concerning program improvement.

At this time, I am requesting your participation in a follow-up interview concerning your implementation of developmental activities after assessment. Your interview responses will be kept anonymous, and no Philip Morris employee will have access to your specific interview information.

In talking with you, I would like to discuss the developmental recommendations that were made after assessment. If you have a copy of your TRAC Report that you can make available to me before the interview, it will assist me in preparing questions. If you cannot obtain a copy for me, I would like your permission to obtain a copy of your TRAC Report from the Program Administrator. Although it would be preferable to have the Report prior to the interview, I would be interested in interviewing you even if I do not have access to your TRAC Report. As you know, the TRAC Report is strictly confidential and cannot be used by anyone without your permission. The report will be used only for the interview. I assure you that I will not share the report with anyone else, and you may have the report copy when the interview is finished.

Your responses to the interview will be used to acquire more in-depth information about MMDP not available from the questionnaire. Both the survey questionnaire and the interview will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of MMDP and to determine what improvements can be made to the program.

I would appreciate your support and cooperation in order to obtain a thorough evaluation of this project. This interview should last between 1 and 1 1/2 hours maximum, depending on the extent of your developmental activities. I believe the results will have significance to both employees and management of

Please complete and return the attached form to me by Friday, September 7. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at extension , or to leave me a message at extension . If you agree to be interviewed, I will contact you in early September.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Billie Nichols

cc:

003.15/M4/2

Please return to Billie Nichols, c/o Org. Planning., OC/A-1 by

Friday, September 7

_____ YES, I will be glad to participate in the interview, and I will furnish you a copy of my TRAC Report.

_____ YES, I will be glad to participate in the interview, and you have my permission to obtain a copy of TRAC Report from the Program Administrator.

_____ YES, I will be glad to participate in the interview without your use of the TRAC Report.

_____ NO, I cannot participate in the interview.

Signature

Telephone

APPENDIX C

Interview Schedules

Form A
Form B
Form C
Form D

* * * * *

Form A
MMDP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

* * * * *

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

FORM A

INTERVIEWEE _____
DATE _____

MID-MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (MMDP)
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Good (morning-afternoon)! I'm Billie Nichols, a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, and I have been appointed by _____ to evaluate the effectiveness of its Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP) to determine what improvements can be made to the Program. As you know, this is the first follow-up study of MMDP, and with your interest and support, the results of this project can be beneficial to both the employees and management of PM--especially in the area of management training and development.

The first part of the evaluation--a questionnaire sent to all MMDP participants and assessors--has been completed. The second part of the evaluation will consist of interviews conducted with approximately 20 MMDP participants. I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in the second part of the evaluation.

This interview today is a follow-up to your responses in the questionnaire survey, which was conducted in February. I would like to discuss several areas with you:

I will start out by asking you about some of the developmental areas indicated in your TRAC Report and your implementation of the activities. I will also be asking you about some of your perceptions about the Program operation, about any changes in management behavior you experienced after MMDP, and about any professional outcomes you experienced with respect to job satisfaction and job movement since MMDP. Finally, I will be asking you about any recommendations you might have for improving MMDP.

Although the interview findings will be made available to management in a final report, your individual responses will be kept anonymous, so please be candid. If, at any time, you prefer not to answer a question, please let me know, and I will proceed. At this time, DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW OR ITS PROCEDURE?

PART I: IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

I would like to begin by confirming some information on the survey questionnaire that you completed earlier. For example: You indicated that you implemented and completed some recommended developmental activities and possibly some self-selected developmental activities. Is that accurate?

Thank you for allowing me to have access to your TRAC Report for this interview. This is the only copy that I have, and I shall be returning it to you at the end of this interview. According to the Report, some of the recommended developmental areas for you were:

A. Which of these recommended developmental areas have you implemented? (USE SUPPLEMENT A)

1. If YES to Area No. 1, did you (describe activity recommended in report)

a. If YES . . .

- (1) Describe how you went about implementing this activity.
- (2) How long after the program did it take you to start this activity?
- (3) What problems did you experience in getting this activity implemented? (Probe if completed)
- (4) What support did you receive from others, for example: your supervisor?
 - (a) If YES . . .
 - (1.1) From whom?
 - (1.2) What kind?

(b) If NO, how could support from others have helped you?

b. If NO . . .

- (1) What prevented you from doing this?
- (2) What plans, if any, do you have to implement this activity in the future? If YES, when?
- (3) What kind of assistance would be helpful to you in implementing this activity?

c. Have you done anything else similar to this recommended activity? If YES, explain.

(REPEAT FOR EACH ACTIVITY LISTED IN AREA NO. 1)

2. If NO to Area No. 1 . . .

- a. What prevented you from doing this?
- b. What plans, if any, do you have to implement this area in the future? If YES, when?
- c. What kind of assistance would be helpful to you in implementing this area?

(REPEAT FOR EACH RECOMMENDATION MADE) (USE SUPPLEMENT A)

B. So far, I have been asking you about your problems and concerns in implementing developmental activities that were SPECIFICALLY recommended to you in your TRAC Report. You may also have

pursued some developmental activities that were not specifically recommended to you. What self-generated developmental activities beyond the ones recommended to you did you pursue? (USE SUPPLEMENT E) If YES...

1. Explain the activity (PROBE IF COMPLETED).
2. Did you choose to substitute this activity for a recommended developmental activity?
 - a. If YES, are there any reasons for this we haven't already discussed?
 - b. If NO, did you choose this developmental activity in addition to one/ones recommended?
If YES, why?

(REPEAT FOR ANY OTHER SELF-SELECTED ACTIVITIES) (USE SUPPLEMENT E)

PART II: PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM OPERATION

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about your perceptions of the program operation.

A. Pre-Assessment

1. What pressure, if any, did you receive from others to attend MMDP? If YES, how?

B. Assessment

1. How effective do you think the program was in assessing your managerial skills?

a. If YES, why?

b. If NO, why not?

C. Post-Assessment

1. How soon after the program ended did you have the feedback interview?

2. How clearly was the feedback report written? If not, what was not clear to you?

3. Were there any discrepancies between the report and your perception of what your strengths and weaknesses should have been? If YES . . .

a. What were they?

b. Do you have any idea why they occurred?

4. Was the confidentiality of your performance preserved by those who participated in the program and by those with whom you shared your report? If not, why do you suspect there was a breach in confidentiality?

5. Overall, were you satisfied with the program?

a. If YES, why?

b. If NO, why not?

6. As best you can remember, how did you feel about your MMDP experience following assessment?

a. Positive - took learning and feedback seriously. Why?

b. Negative - did not take learning and feedback seriously. Why?

c. Unknown - not sure how felt. Why?

7. (If appropriate) In the questionnaire, you described your major feelings about the program overall.
 - a. You did not check "fair" as a major description.
 1. Since there is more than one meaning of the word, could you explain what you meant by this?

 2. (If appropriate) What changes could you recommend to make the program more fair?

 - b. You checked "confusing" as a description.
 1. What about the program was confusing to you?

 2. What changes could you recommend to make the program less confusing?

8. You indicated that you (did, did not) share the feedback report with your supervisor.
 - a. If YES . . .
 1. Why did you share the report with your supervisor?

 2. Who initiated the contact? For example, did you go to the supervisor or did he/she ask?

 3. How did you share the report? For example, did your supervisor read the entire report or did you explain the key points?

 - b. If NO, what were your reasons for not talking to your supervisor?

PART III: CHANGES IN YOUR MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR

I would now like to ask you some questions concerning any changes in your management behavior you experienced after assessment.

A. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of participation in MMDP, you (did, did not) learn what you could do to enhance your managerial skills.

1. (If YES) You indicated that this learning was a result of (state activities).

a. Which of these activities influenced your learning the most? Why?

b. Which of these activities influenced your learning the least? Why?

2. If NO . . .

a. Is that still true, or are there now ways that you have increased your knowledge of how to develop your managerial skills?

b. How do you account for this?

3. The program is designed so that after you participate and get feedback, you are left pretty much on your own to share information with others and to take the initiative to pursue developmental activities.

a. How do you feel about this approach? (Probe) -

b. Would it have been helpful to have had someone to work with you in your developmental plans? In what way?

B. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of your participation in MMDP, you (did, did not) improve your management skills?

1. If YES . . . (provide interviewee handout listing skills evaluated)

a. Which two skill areas do you feel you improved the most? Why?

b. Which two skill areas do you feel you improved the least? Why?

2. If NO . . .
 - a. How do you account for this?

 - b. What could have been done to help you improve your management skills?

 - c. By whom could that have been done?

- C. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of participation in MMDP, you (do do not) have more confidence in your management abilities
 1. If YES, why do you think your confidence was helped by the program?

 2. If NO, why do you think your confidence was not helped by the program?

- D. What feedback has anyone given you following the program suggesting that your behavior had changed in a some way?

PART IV: PROFESSIONAL OUTCOMES

Now, I would like to talk with you about some ways you have benefitted professionally since your participation in MMDP.

A. Job Satisfaction

1. Has your overall job satisfaction increased, decreased, or remained the same since participating in MMDP?

2. In what way did your participation in MMDP (increase, decrease, or not affect) your job satisfaction in your current job level?

B. Job Movement

We have been discussing some of your developmental activities at PM. I would now like to talk with you about any job movement you have experienced. This area is particularly relevant to the study as job movement can be considered a part of your development.

My records show that you attended MMDP in (state month, year). Is that accurate?

1. Could you roughly go back to (state month, year earlier than attendance in MMDP) and tell me what position you were holding (probe title, department)?

2. What job movement did you have that occurred between this time and the date you attended MMDP? If YES, probe title, department, and if believe it was a lateral move or promotion).

3. What job movement have you had since attending MMDP? If YES, probe title, department, and if believe it was a lateral move or promotion.

4. As a result of your participation in MMDP, did you expect managerial advancement? If YES, why did you come to this conclusion?

- C. We've talked about a number of ways you may have benefitted from participation in MMDP. What other ways than the ones we have talked about have you benefitted? If YES, could you explain?

PART V: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROGRAM

- A. When you think about people going through the program, what two major obstacles make it difficult for them to implement developmental activities?

- B. What changes, if any, could be done to facilitate the implementation of developmental activities?

- C. What changes, if any, would you recommend to improve the overall effectiveness of MMDP?

- D. Is there anything else you would like to share about the program that I have not asked?

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS INTERVIEW!

SUPPLEMENT A (Forms A and C)

1. I have worked on Area No. : (name area).
 - a. I did (describe activity).
 - (1) How I implemented this activity.
 - (2) Length of time after program it took to start this activity.
 - (3) Problem(s) I experienced in getting this activity implemented.
 - (4) Support I received from others.
 - (a) If YES, from whom and what kind.
 - (b) If NO, how support from others could have helped.
 - b. I did not work on (describe activity).
 - (1) What prevented me from doing this.
 - (2) Future plans to implement this activity.
 - (3) Kind of assistance that would be helpful to me in implementing this activity.
 - c. I (have, have not) done anything else similar to this recommended developmental activity. If YES, explain.
2. I have not worked on Area No. : (name area).
 - a. What prevented me from doing this.
 - b. Future plans I have to implement this area.
 - c. Kind of assistance that would be helpful to me in implementing this area.

SUPPLEMENT E (Form A)

A. I have pursued a self-selected developmental activity.

1. Explain (probe if have completed).

2. I (did, did not) choose to substitute this activity for a recommended developmental activity.

a. If YES, any reasons for this not already discussed.

b. If NO, I (did, did not) choose this developmental activity in addition to one(s) recommended. If YES, why.

B. I have not pursued a self-selected developmental activity.

* * * * *

Form B
MMDP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

* * * * *

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

FORM B

INTERVIEWEE _____

DATE _____

MID-MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (MMDP)
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Good (morning-afternoon)! I'm Billie Nichols, a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, and I have been appointed by _____ to evaluate the effectiveness of its Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP) to determine what improvements can be made to the program. As you know, this is the first follow-up study of MMDP, and with your interest and support, the results of this project can be beneficial to both the employees and management of PM--especially in the area of management training and development.

The first part of the evaluation--a questionnaire sent to all MMDP participants and assessors--has been completed. The second part of the evaluation will consist of interviews conducted with approximately 20 MMDP participants. I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in the second part of the evaluation.

This interview today is a follow-up to your responses in the questionnaire survey, which was conducted in February. I would like to discuss several areas with you:

I will start out by asking you about some of the developmental areas indicated in your TRAC Report and your implementation of the activities. I will also be asking you about some of your perceptions about the program operation, about any changes in management behavior you experienced after MMDP, and about any professional outcomes you experienced with respect to job satisfaction and job movement since MMDP. Finally, I will be asking you about any recommendations you might have for improving MMDP.

Although the interview findings will be made available to management in a final report, your individual responses will be kept anonymous, so please be candid. If, at any time, you prefer not to answer a question, please let me know, and I will proceed. At this time, DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW OR ITS PROCEDURE?

PART I: IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

I would like to begin by confirming some information on the survey questionnaire that you completed earlier. For example: You indicated that you did not implement recommended developmental activities but did implement and complete self-selected developmental activities. Is that true?

Thank you for allowing me to have access to your TRAC Report for this interview. This is the only copy that I have, and I shall be returning it to you at the end of this interview. According to the Report, some of the recommended developmental areas for you were:

A. In Area No. 1 (name), it was recommended that you (name activity). (USE SUPPLEMENT B)

1. Why was this recommended developmental activity not pursued?
2. What plans, if any, do you have to implement this activity in the future? If YES, when?
3. What kind of assistance would be helpful to you in implementing this activity?

(REPEAT FOR EACH ACTIVITY LISTED IN AREA NO. 1)

(REPEAT FOR EACH RECOMMENDATION MADE) (USE SUPPLEMENT B)

So far, I have been asking you about your reasons for not implementing developmental activities that were specifically recommended to you in your TRAC Report. As you indicated in the survey, you did pursue some self-selected developmental activities. I would like to discuss these activities with you.

B. What developmental activity did you select to pursue? (USE SUPPLEMENT B)

1. Why did you select it in place of the one(s) recommended?
2. How long after the program did it take you to start this activity?
3. Did you complete this activity?
4. (If NO to Question 3) What progress have you make for this activity?
5. What problems did you experience in getting this activity implemented?
6. What support have you received from others?
 - a. If YES . . .
 - (1) From whom?
 - (2) What kind?
 - b. If NO, how could support from others have helped you?

(REPEAT FOR ALL SELF-SELECTED DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED AND COMPLETED)
(USE SUPPLEMENT B)

C. What other self-selected developmental activities do you plan to pursue? If YES, when?

PART II: PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM OPERATION

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about your perceptions of the program operation.

A. Pre-Assessment

1. What pressure, if any, did you receive from others to attend MMDP? If YES, how?

B. Assessment

1. How effective do you think the program was in assessing your managerial skills?

- a. If YES, why?
- b. If NO, why not?

C. Post-Assessment

1. How soon after the program ended did you have the feedback interview?

2. How clearly was the feedback report written? If not, what was not clear to you?

3. Were there any discrepancies between the report and your perception of what your strengths and weaknesses should have been? If YES . . .

- a. What were they?
- b. Do you have any idea why they occurred?

4. Was the confidentiality of your performance preserved by those who participated in the program and by those with whom you shared your report? If not, why do you suspect there was a breach in confidentiality?

5. Overall, were you satisfied with the program?

- a. If YES, why?
- b. If NO, why not?

6. As best you can remember, how did you feel about your MMDP experience following assessment?

- a. Positive - took learning and feedback seriously. Why?
- b. Negative - did not take learning and feedback seriously. Why?
- c. Unknown - not sure how felt. Why?

7. (If appropriate) In the questionnaire, you described your major feelings about the program overall.
 - a. You did not check "fair" as a major description.
 1. Since there is more than one meaning of the word, could you explain what you meant by this?

 2. (If appropriate) What changes could you recommend to make the program more fair?

 - b. You checked "confusing" as a description.
 1. What about the program was confusing to you?

 2. What changes could you recommend to make the program less confusing?

8. You indicated that you (did, did not) share the feedback report with your supervisor.
 - a. If YES . . .
 1. Why did you share the report with your supervisor?

 2. Who initiated the contact? For example, did you go to the supervisor or did he/she ask?

 3. How did you share the report? For example, did your supervisor read the entire report or did you explain the key points?

 - b. If NO, what were your reasons for not talking to your supervisor?

PART III: CHANGES IN YOUR MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR

I would now like to ask you some questions concerning any changes in your management behavior you experienced after assessment.

A. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of participation in MMDP, you (did, did not learn what you could do to enhance your managerial skills.

1. (If YES) You indicated that this learning was a result of (state activities).

a. Which of these activities influenced your learning the most? Why?

b. Which of these activities influenced your learning the least? Why?

2. If NO . . .

a. Is that still true, or are there now ways that you have increased your knowledge of how to develop your managerial skills?

b. How do you account for this?

3. The program is designed so that after you participate and get feedback, you are left pretty much on your own to share information with others and to take the initiative to pursue developmental activities.

a. How do you feel about this approach? (Probe)

b. Would it have been helpful to have had someone to work with you in your developmental plans? In what way?

B. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of your participation in MMDP, you (did, did not) improve your management skills?

1. If YES . . . (provide interviewee handout listing skills evaluated)

a. Which two skill areas do you feel you improved the most? Why?

b. Which two skill areas do you feel you improved the least? Why?

2. If NO . . .

a. How do you account for this?

b. What could have been done to help you improve your management skills?

c. By whom could that have been done?

C. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of participation in MMDP, you (do do not) have more confidence in your management abilities

1. If YES, why do you think your confidence was helped by the program?

2. If NO, why do you think your confidence was not helped by the program?

D. What feedback has anyone given you following the program suggesting that your behavior had changed in a some way?

PART IV: PROFESSIONAL OUTCOMES

Now, I would like to talk with you about some ways you have benefitted professionally since your participation in MMDP.

A. Job Satisfaction

1. Has your overall job satisfaction increased, decreased, or remained the same since participating in MMDP?

2. In what way did your participation in MMDP (increase, decrease, or not affect) your job satisfaction in your current job level?

B. Job Movement

We have been discussing some of your developmental activities at PM. I would now like to talk with you about any job movement you have experienced. This area is particularly relevant to the study as job movement can be considered a part of your development.

My records show that you attended MMDP in (state month, year). Is that accurate?

1. Could you roughly go back to (state month, year earlier than attendance in MMDP) and tell me what position you were holding (probe title, department)?

2. What job movement did you have that occurred between this time and the date you attended MMDP? If YES, probe title, department, and if believe it was a lateral move or promotion).

3. What job movement have you had since attending MMDP? If YES, probe title, department, and if believe it was a lateral move or promotion.

4. As a result of your participation in MMDP, did you expect managerial advancement? If YES, why did you come to this conclusion?

- C. We've talked about a number of ways you may have benefitted from participation in MMDP. What other ways than the ones we have talked about have you benefitted? If YES, could you explain?

SUPPLEMENT B (Form B)

A. In Area No. : , it was recommended
that I (name activity).

1. Why this recommended developmental activity was not pursued.
2. Future plans to implement this activity.
3. Kind of assistance that would be helpful to me in implementing this activity.

B. A developmental activity I selected to pursue: (name).

1. Why it was selected in place of the one(s) recommended.
2. Length of time after program it took to start this activity.
3. I (did, did not) complete this activity.
4. (If not completed) Progress I have made for this activity.
5. Problem(s) I experienced in getting this activity implemented.
5. Support I received from others.
 - a. If YES . . .
 - (1) From whom.
 - (2) What kind.
 - b. If NO, how support from others could have helped.

* * * * *

Form C
MMDP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

* * * * *

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

FORM C

INTERVIEWEE _____
DATE _____MID-MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (MMDP)
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Good (morning-afternoon)! I'm Billie Nichols, a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, and I have been appointed by _____ evaluate the effectiveness of its Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP) to determine what improvements can be made to the program. As you know, this is the first follow-up study of MMDP, and with your interest and support, the results of this project can be beneficial to both the employees and management of PM--especially in the area of management training and development.

The first part of the evaluation--a questionnaire sent to all MMDP participants and assessors--has been completed. The second part of the evaluation will consist of interviews conducted with approximately 20 MMDP participants. I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in the second part of the evaluation.

This interview today is a follow-up to your responses in the questionnaire survey, which was conducted in February. I would like to discuss several areas with you:

I will start out by asking you about some of the developmental areas indicated in your TRAC Report and your implementation of the activities. I will also be asking you about some of your perceptions about the program operation, about any changes in management behavior you experienced after MMDP, and about any professional outcomes you experienced with respect to job satisfaction and job movement since MMDP. Finally, I will be asking you about any recommendations you might have for improving MMDP.

Although the interview findings will be made available to management in a final report, your individual responses will be kept anonymous, so please be candid. If, at any time, you prefer not to answer a question, please let me know, and I will proceed. At this time, DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW OR ITS PROCEDURE?

PART I: IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

I would like to begin by confirming some information on the survey questionnaire that you completed earlier. For example: You indicated that you implemented some recommended and/or self-selected developmental activities but did not complete any. Is that true?

Thank you for allowing me to have access to your TRAC Report for this interview. This is the only copy that I have, and I shall be returning it to you at the end of this interview. According to the Report, some of the recommended developmental areas for you were:

A. Which of these recommended developmental areas have you implemented? (USE SUPPLEMENT A)

1. If YES to Area No. 1, did you (describe activity recommended in report)?

a. If YES . . .

- (1) Describe how you went about implementing this activity.
- (2) How long after the program did it take you to start this activity?
- (3) What problems did you experience in getting this activity implemented? (Probe why activity was not completed)
- (4) What support did you receive from others, for example: your supervisor?
 - (a) If YES . . .
 - (1.1) From whom?
 - (2.1) What kind?

(b) If NO, what kind of support from others would have helped you?

b. If NO . . .

- (1) What prevented you from doing this?
- (2) What plans, if any, do you have to implement this activity in the future? If YES, when?
- (3) What kind of assistance would be helpful to you in implementing this activity?

c. Have you done anything else similar to this recommended activity? If YES, could you explain?

(REPEAT FOR EACH ACTIVITY LISTED IN AREA NO. 1)

2. If NO to Area No. 1 . . .

- a. What prevented you from doing this?
- b. What plans, if any, do you have to implement this area in the future? If YES, when?
- c. What kind of assistance would be helpful to you in implementing this area?

(REPEAT FOR EACH RECOMMENDATION MADE) (USE SUPPLEMENT A)

B. What self-selected developmental activity did you choose to pursue? (USE SUPPLEMENT C) If YES . . .

1. Did you select it in place of the one(s) recommended? If YES, why?
2. How long after the program did it take you to start this activity?
3. What problems did you experience in getting this activity implemented? (Probe why this activity was not completed)
4. What support have you received from others?
 - a. If YES . . .
 - (1) From whom?
 - (2) What kind?
 - b. If NO, how could support from others have helped you?

(REPEAT FOR ALL SELF-SELECTED DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES PURSUED AND COMPLETED)
(USE SUPPLEMENT C)

PART II: PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM OPERATION

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about your perceptions of the program operation.

A. Pre-Assessment

1. What pressure, if any, did you receive from others to attend MMDP? If YES, how?

B. Assessment

1. How effective do you think the program was in assessing your managerial skills?

a. If YES, why?

b. If NO, why not?

C. Post-Assessment

1. How soon after the program ended did you have the feedback interview?

2. How clearly was the feedback report written? If not, what was not clear to you?

3. Were there any discrepancies between the report and your perception of what your strengths and weaknesses should have been? If YES . . .

a. What were they?

b. Do you have any idea why they occurred?

4. Was the confidentiality of your performance preserved by those who participated in the program and by those with whom you shared your report? If not, why do you suspect there was a breach in confidentiality?

5. Overall, were you satisfied with the program?

a. If YES, why?

b. If NO, why not?

6. As best you can remember, how did you feel about your MMDP experience following assessment?

a. Positive - took learning and feedback seriously. Why?

b. Negative - did not take learning and feedback seriously. Why?

c. Unknown - not sure how felt. Why?

7. (If appropriate) In the questionnaire, you described your major feelings about the program overall.

a. You did not check "fair" as a major description.

1. Since there is more than one meaning of the word, could you explain what you meant by this?

2. (If appropriate) What changes could you recommend to make the program more fair?

b. You checked "confusing" as a description.

1. What about the program was confusing to you?

2. What changes could you recommend to make the program less confusing?

8. You indicated that you (did, did not) share the feedback report with your supervisor.

a. If YES . . .

1. Why did you share the report with your supervisor?

2. Who initiated the contact? For example, did you go to the supervisor or did he/she ask?

3. How did you share the report? For example, did your supervisor read the entire report or did you explain the key points?

b. If NO, what were your reasons for not talking to your supervisor?

PART III: CHANGES IN YOUR MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR

I would now like to ask you some questions concerning any changes in your management behavior you experienced after assessment.

- A. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of participation in MMDP, you (did, did not learn what you could do to enhance your managerial skills.
1. (If YES) You indicated that this learning was a result of (state activities).
 - a. Which of these activities influenced your learning the most? Why?
 - b. Which of these activities influenced your learning the least? Why?
 2. If NO . . .
 - a. Is that still true, or are there now ways that you have increased your knowledge of how to develop your managerial skills?
 - b. How do you account for this?
 3. The program is designed so that after you participate and get feedback, you are left pretty much on your own to share information with others and to take the initiative to pursue developmental activities.
 - a. How do you feel about this approach? (Probe)
 - b. Would it have been helpful to have had someone to work with you in your developmental plans? In what way?
- B. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of your participation in MMDP, you (did, did not) improve your management skills?
1. If YES . . . (provide interviewee handout listing skills evaluated)
 - a. Which two skill areas do you feel you improved the most? Why?
 - b. Which two skill areas do you feel you improved the least? Why?

2. If NO . . .

a. How do you account for this?

b. What could have been done to help you improve your management skills?

c. By whom could that have been done?

C. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of participation in MMDP, you (do do not) have more confidence in your management abilities

1. If YES, why do you think your confidence was helped by the program?

2. If NO, why do you think your confidence was not helped by the program?

D. What feedback has anyone given you following the program suggesting that your behavior had changed in a some way?

PART IV: PROFESSIONAL OUTCOMES

Now, I would like to talk with you about some ways you have benefitted professionally since your participation in MMDP.

A. Job Satisfaction

1. Has your overall job satisfaction increased, decreased, or remained the same since participating in MMDP?

2. In what way did your participation in MMDP (increase, decrease, or not affect) your job satisfaction in your current job level?

B. Job Movement

We have been discussing some of your developmental activities at PM. I would now like to talk with you about any job movement you have experienced. This area is particularly relevant to the study as job movement can be considered a part of your development.

My records show that you attended MMDP in (state month, year). Is that accurate?

1. Could you roughly go back to (state month, year earlier than attendance in MMDP) and tell me what position you were holding (probe title, department)?

2. What job movement did you have that occurred between this time and the date you attended MMDP? If YES, probe title, department, and if believe it was a lateral move or promotion).

3. What job movement have you had since attending MMDP? If YES, probe title, department, and if believe it was a lateral move or promotion.

4. As a result of your participation in MMDP, did you expect managerial advancement? If YES, why did you come to this conclusion?

- C. We've talked about a number of ways you may have benefitted from participation in MMDP. What other ways than the ones we have talked about have you benefitted? If YES, could you explain?

SUPPLEMENT C (Form C)

A. I pursued a self-selected developmental activity (name activity).

1. I (did, did not) select it in place of one(s) recommended. If YES, why.

2. Length of time after program it took to start this activity.

3. Problem(s) I experienced in getting this activity implemented (probe why this activity was not completed).

4. Support I received from others.

a. If YES . . .

(1) From whom.

(2) What kind.

b. If NO, support from others that could have helped.

B. I did not pursue any self-selected developmental activities.

* * * * *

Form D
MMDP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

* * * * *

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

FORM D

INTERVIEWEE _____
DATE _____MID-MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (MMDP)
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Good (morning-afternoon)! I'm Billie Nichols, a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, and I have been appointed by _____ to evaluate the effectiveness of its Mid-Management Development Program (MMDP) to determine what improvements can be made to the program. As you know, this is the first follow-up study of MMDP, and with your interest and support, the results of this project can be beneficial to both the employees and management of PM--especially in the area of management training and development.

The first part of the evaluation--a questionnaire sent to all MMDP participants and assessors--has been completed. The second part of the evaluation will consist of interviews conducted with approximately 20 MMDP participants. I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in the second part of the evaluation.

This interview today is a follow-up to your responses in the questionnaire survey, which was conducted in February. I would like to discuss several areas with you:

I will start out by asking you about some of the developmental areas indicated in your TRAC Report and your implementation of the activities. I will also be asking you about some of your perceptions about the program operation, about any changes in management behavior you experienced after MMDP, and about any professional outcomes you experienced with respect to job satisfaction and job movement since MMDP. Finally, I will be asking you about any recommendations you might have for improving MMDP.

Although the interview findings will be made available to management in a final report, your individual responses will be kept anonymous, so please be candid. If, at any time, you prefer not to answer a question, please let me know, and I will proceed. At this time, DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW OR ITS PROCEDURE?

PART I: IMPLEMENTATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

I would like to begin by confirming some information on the survey questionnaire that you completed earlier. For example: You indicated that you did not implement either recommended or self-selected developmental activities? Is that true?

Thank you for allowing me to have access to your TRAC Report for this interview. This is the only copy that I have, and I shall be returning it to you at the end of this interview. According to the Report, some of the recommended developmental areas for you were:

A. In Area No. 1 (name), it was recommended that you (name activity). (USE SUPPLEMENT D)

1. Why was this recommended developmental activity not pursued?
2. What plans, if any, do you have to implement this activity in the future? If YES, when?
3. What kind of assistance would be helpful to you in implementing this activity?

(REPEAT FOR EACH ACTIVITY LISTED IN AREA NO. 1)

(REPEAT FOR EACH RECOMMENDATION) (USE SUPPLEMENT D)

B. Are you interested in pursuing another developmental activity of your choice? If not, why not?

PART II: PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM OPERATION

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about your perceptions of the program operation.

A. Pre-Assessment

1. What pressure, if any, did you receive from others to attend MMDP? If YES, how?

B. Assessment

1. How effective do you think the program was in assessing your managerial skills?

a. If YES, why?

b. If NO, why not?

C. Post-Assessment

1. How soon after the program ended did you have the feedback interview?

2. How clearly was the feedback report written? If not, what was not clear to you?

3. Were there any discrepancies between the report and your perception of what your strengths and weaknesses should have been? If YES . . .

a. What were they?

b. Do you have any idea why they occurred?

4. Was the confidentiality of your performance preserved by those who participated in the program and by those with whom you shared your report? If not, why do you suspect there was a breach in confidentiality?

5. Overall, were you satisfied with the program?

a. If YES, why?

b. If NO, why not?

6. As best you can remember, how did you feel about your MMDP experience following assessment?

a. Positive - took learning and feedback seriously. Why?

b. Negative - did not take learning and feedback seriously. Why?

c. Unknown - not sure how felt. Why?

7. (If appropriate) In the questionnaire, you described your major feelings about the program overall.
 - a. You did not check "fair" as a major description.
 1. Since there is more than one meaning of the word, could you explain what you meant by this?
 2. (If appropriate) What changes could you recommend to make the program more fair?
 - b. You checked "confusing" as a description.
 1. What about the program was confusing to you?
 2. What changes could you recommend to make the program less confusing?
8. You indicated that you (did, did not) share the feedback report with your supervisor.
 - a. If YES . . .
 1. Why did you share the report with your supervisor?
 2. Who initiated the contact? For example, did you go to the supervisor or did he/she ask?
 3. How did you share the report? For example, did your supervisor read the entire report or did you explain the key points?
 - b. If NO, what were your reasons for not talking to your supervisor?

PART III: CHANGES IN YOUR MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR

I would now like to ask you some questions concerning any changes in your management behavior you experienced after assessment.

A. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of participation in MMDP, you (did, did not) learn what you could do to enhance your managerial skills.

1. (If YES) You indicated that this learning was a result of (state activities).

a. Which of these activities influenced your learning the most? Why?

b. Which of these activities influenced your learning the least? Why?

2. If NO . . .

a. Is that still true, or are there now ways that you have increased your knowledge of how to develop your managerial skills?

b. How do you account for this?

3. The program is designed so that after you participate and get feedback, you are left pretty much on your own to share information with others and to take the initiative to pursue developmental activities.

a. How do you feel about this approach? (Probe)

b. Would it have been helpful to have had someone to work with you in your developmental plans? In what way?

B. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of your participation in MMDP, you (did, did not) improve your management skills?

1. If YES . . . (provide interviewee handout listing skills evaluated)

a. Which two skill areas do you feel you improved the most? Why?

b. Which two skill areas do you feel you improved the least? Why?

2. If NO . . .

a. How do you account for this?

b. What could have been done to help you improve your management skills?

c. By whom could that have been done?

C. On the Questionnaire you indicated that as a result of participation in MMDP, you (do do not) have more confidence in your management abilities

1. If YES, why do you think your confidence was helped by the program?

2. If NO, why do you think your confidence was not helped by the program?

D. What feedback has anyone given you following the program suggesting that your behavior had changed in a some way?

PART IV: PROFESSIONAL OUTCOMES

Now, I would like to talk with you about some ways you have benefitted professionally since your participation in MMDP.

A. Job Satisfaction

1. Has your overall job satisfaction increased, decreased, or remained the same since participating in MMDP?

2. In what way did your participation in MMDP (increase, decrease, or not affect) your job satisfaction in your current job level?

B. Job Movement

We have been discussing some of your developmental activities at PM. I would now like to talk with you about any job movement you have experienced. This area is particularly relevant to the study as job movement can be considered a part of your development.

My records show that you attended MMDP in (state month, year). Is that accurate?

1. Could you roughly go back to (state month, year earlier than attendance in MMDP) and tell me what position you were holding (probe title, department)?

2. What job movement did you have that occurred between this time and the date you attended MMDP? If YES, probe title, department, and if believe it was a lateral move or promotion).

3. What job movement have you had since attending MMDP? If YES, probe title, department, and if believe it was a lateral move or promotion.

4. As a result of your participation in MMDP, did you expect managerial advancement? If YES, why did you come to this conclusion?

- C. We've talked about a number of ways you may have benefitted from participation in MMDP. What other ways than the ones we have talked about have you benefitted? If YES, could you explain?

PART V: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROGRAM

A. When you think about people going through the program, what two major obstacles make it difficult for them to implement developmental activities?

B. What changes, if any, could be done to facilitate the implementation of developmental activities?

C. What changes, if any, would you recommend to improve the overall effectiveness of MMDP?

D. Is there anything else you would like to share about the program that I have not asked?

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS INTERVIEW!

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**

FACTORS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES
FOLLOWING PARTICIPATION IN A
DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT CENTER
FOR MIDDLE MANAGERS

by

Billie E. Nichols

Committee Chairman: Harold W. Stubblefield
Adult/Continuing Education

(ABSTRACT)

The assessment center is a contemporary approach to identifying managerial potential for purposes of selection, placement, promotion, or development. This research determined the extent to which participants actually implemented developmental activities following assessment. The organization assumed that learners would follow-up with recommended activities on their own. There has been no study to determine they did. This study set out to determine if participants did implement development and the conditions under which they did or did not.

First, a preliminary questionnaire was administered to all 120 graduates of the Success Program. Nineteen participants who were originally divided into (a) those who completed one or more recommended developmental activities and some self-selected developmental activities, (b) those who did not implement recommended developmental activities but did complete one or more self-selected developmental activities, (c) those who implemented recommended and/or self-selected developmental activities but did not complete any, and (d) those who did not implement either recommended or self-selected developmental activities were interviewed. It

was found that most people did. Individuals were further classified into levels of implementation: (a) High implementers, (b) moderate implementers, (c) low implementers, (d) implementers of self-selected activities only, and (e) non-implementers.

This study provides evidence to support the organizations's assumption:

Through the assessment center process, individuals will be motivated to change their managerial behavior. Seventeen of the nineteen Success graduates followed up with development. While they differed in the number of activities they pursued, they targeted the same skills cited by the assessors for improvement. Further, the program was a positive learning experience for almost all its members. Self-awareness was heightened and served as a catalyst for further development in targeted managerial skills. Self-reported changes in management behavior tended to focus on the same skills targeted by the assessors for improvement. Both individual and organizational responsibilities were reflected in the problems encountered and reasons given for not pursuing development. Personal factors generally related to the willingness to devote time and energy to self-development and to the individuals' perceptions about the importance of change. Organizational factors generally related to feedback, relevance of the training to job functions, and post-program support.

Although it was concluded that the Success Program is basically a sound one, recommendations were made to aid the organization in strengthening its program.