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The issue of transfer of training and its problems have been studied by a number of researchers and practitioners in training and development. Many of these (Broad, 1982; Huczynski & Lewis, 1980; Leifer & Newstrom, 1980) have reported that pre-training information enhances trainee learning and transfer. Many questions remain, however, as to what types of pre-training information might impact on learning and subsequent transfer of learning.

The primary objective of the present study was to investigate the impact of two different types of training "preview" on subjects: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training. A secondary objective was to investigate the impact of these training previews on subjects' self-efficacy and motivation, and to investigate the extent to which self-efficacy and motivation were related to training outcomes.

A training workshop on communication and feedback skills was conducted. Prior to the training workshop, subjects were randomly divided into two groups. One group received a "realistic" training preview, while the other received an "optimistic" training preview. Data were collected from 83 people who attended the training preview and the training workshop. Subjects, volunteer students at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, completed questionnaires which were given to them immediately after the training preview session and prior to the training.
workshop, immediately after the training workshop, and two to three weeks after the training workshop.

A number of statistical comparisons were made among the study measures. These comparisons failed to indicate that the realistic training preview resulted in superior training outcomes. A relationship between the type of training preview and subjects' self-efficacy was not found. On the other hand, a difference was found between the type of training preview and subjects' motivation level. Subjects in the optimistic training preview group reported higher motivation than those in the realistic training preview group. Finally, there were no differences between groups in the relationship between motivation, self-efficacy, and the three training outcomes. Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are included.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

A great deal of money is invested in the American training industry each year. Based on the training investment estimates of Carnevale (1986) and Eurich (1985), Brinkerhoff (1989) noted that, "the profession of training has grown to tremendous proportions and is more pervasive than ever before" (p. 1). In 1990, approximately 45.5 billion dollars was spent for formal training by American organizations. This figure comes from the ninth annual survey of employer-sponsored training in the United States, reported by Lee (1990). In addition, the report indicated that the total number of individuals who received formal, employer-sponsored training in 1990 was 39.5 million. Brinkerhoff (1989), in an evaluation of a training program in a leading Fortune 500 corporation, found that even though almost 100 percent of the trainees demonstrated on skill and knowledge tests that they had learned the training content, less than nine percent indicated that they had used what they learned from the training on their job. Thus, this author concluded, "Despite the 100 percent learning rate, about 90 percent of the training investment was wasted" (p. 14).

A number of studies focusing on strategies to facilitate transfer of training have been conducted, for example, Baldwin and Ford (1988), Baumgartel and Jeanpierre (1972), Hicks (1983), Hicks and Klimoski (1987), and Wexley and Baldwin (1986). However, there are only a few (e.g., Hicks, 1983; Hicks & Klimoski, 1987; Noe & Schmitt, 1986) that address pre-training strategies as a means to enhance transfer of training. Several researchers such as Hicks (1983), Hicks and
Klimoski (1987), and Noe and Schmitt (1986) have called for research on pre-training strategies. The emphasis of the present study is on a pre-training intervention which is hypothesized to have an impact on trainees' subsequent transfer of training.

Organization of the Paper

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter is concerned with the statement of the problem, conceptual basis, and importance of the study. Chapter II provides a relevant synopsis of previous studies and research. Chapter II begins with a review of the related literature which includes the importance of transfer of training, previous research on factors that facilitate transfer of training, a proposed need for a pre-training strategy, a review of both the realistic job preview and the realistic training preview literature, and ends with research questions and hypotheses. Chapter III discusses the research methodology including the setting, recruitment of subjects, training preview presenters and sessions, training workshop, research instruments, and data collection. Statistical methods used to analyze data are also included in this chapter.

Data analysis and discussion of results are presented in Chapter IV. Conclusions drawn from each research question are presented and summarized. The final chapter, Chapter V, contains an overall summary and an interpretation of major findings. Limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are also included.

Conceptual Basis of the Study

In the past ten years, a number of researchers and practitioners, for example, Baldwin and Ford (1988), Huczynski and Lewis (1980), Leifer and Newstrom (1980),
Wexley and Baldwin (1986), and Wexley and Latham (1981), have extensively studied the issue of training, its importance, process, and effectiveness. Much effort has been expended in finding ways to increase the effectiveness of training so that the organization can maximize its training investment. A number of strategies to increase trainee learning and satisfaction with training programs have been used. These strategies are, for example, analyzing training needs, designing more effective training sessions, and providing follow-up support to trainees. While all of these strategies have been effective to varying degrees, the problem of transfer of training remains a major issue.

A pre-training intervention as the emphasis of the present study was chosen for several reasons. First, because of the lack of research and supporting data on the effects of pre-training interventions on transfer of training, further studies were recommended by Hicks (1983), Hicks and Klimoski (1987), and Noe and Schmitt (1986). The pre-training intervention examined in the present study consisted of a "realistic" training preview and an "optimistic" training preview. A "realistic" training preview refers to positive and negative information about the training program provided to participants by a training preview presenter in a verbal form prior to the training workshop. On the other hand, an "optimistic" training preview consists only of positive information about the training program and is likewise provided to participants by a training preview presenter prior to the training workshop. Second, a more specific type of pre-training intervention such as a realistic training preview might have a positive impact on training outcomes. In the present study, training outcomes are: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training. Finally, the present study extends
past research by examining the feasibility of applying past research on realistic job previews to training situations in the form of training previews.

The concept of a realistic training preview is based primarily on the work of Wanous (1973, 1977, 1978, 1980). In studies of the process of organizational entry or job recruiting, Wanous provided potential job applicants with information about the organization prior to their job acceptance. Wanous later termed this prior information a realistic job preview (RJP) and explained it as "an atypical, untraditional approach that stresses efforts to communicate—before an applicant's acceptance of a job offer—what organization life will actually be like on the job" (p. 51). He compared the effects of this realistic job preview between job applicants who received it and those who entered the job without prior information about the organization. From his findings, Wanous claimed that the realistic job preview had an impact on reducing employees' turnover rate. He further explained that the realistic job preview helped job applicants see in what ways the job fits into their career plans. Ilgen and Seely (1974) proposed several psychological processes such as: (a) air of honesty, (b) self-selection, (c) ability to cope, and (d) met expectation, to explain how a realistic job preview could impact employee turnover.

The notion that realistic job previews might also be applied to a training situation has been studied by Hicks (1983), Hicks and Klimoski (1987), and Huczynski and Lewis (1980). In these studies, researchers provided various types of training previews to trainees prior to training programs. For example, in the Huczynski and Lewis study (1980), employees discussed the course content with their immediate supervisor before taking the course. Both Hicks (1983) and Hicks and Klimoski (1987) operationalized a realistic training preview as a written announcement given to trainees prior to the training program. A realistic training
preview, in their studies, was constructed using both neutral and unfavorable statements, as opposed to the "traditional" announcement in which information about the training was given to trainees in primarily positive statements. It was reported that the degree of freedom for trainees to choose to participate in the training program had stronger effects on trainees' mastery of training than the type of training announcement given. The type of training preview given failed to show an effect on measures of the mastery of training.

In the present study, two types of training previews were constructed: a "realistic" training preview and an "optimistic" training preview. The goal was to improve upon the studies of Hicks (1983) and Hicks and Klimoski (1987) by providing a more complete training preview to training participants in an active verbal presentation form, instead of a written form. Written communication has several limitations; for example, a person who receives written information might not read it carefully, and might not understand the information clearly. Written communication does not provide individuals with the opportunity to ask further questions. In the present study, training preview presenters communicated directly with the training participants during the training preview sessions.

The assumption of the present study was that the realistic training preview presents a promising direction in improving transfer of training. It was based on several notions. The basis assumption is that, when receiving training, it is the "job" of trainees to learn the training they have received. Thus, the concept of a realistic job preview can be extended to apply to a training setting, preparing the trainees to transfer their training to their jobs. Additional information about the training workshop might also help training participants learn better and therefore be more ready to apply what they learned to their job or other situations. Participants might
see the relevance of certain training topics and transfer problems in advance and may pay more attention during the training to factors that impinge on transfer.

In the present study, it was hypothesized that the realistic training preview group that received both positive and negative information about the training and its transferability would score higher on the following dependent variables: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training, than the optimistic training preview group that received only positive information about the training and its transferability.

Finally, two psychological processes, an ability to cope and a realistic expectation (based on the studies of Dugoni and Ilgen, 1981; Porter and Steers, 1973; Reilly et al., 1981; and Wanous, 1980), might further account for the outcomes of training in the present study. An ability to cope refers to an ability to prepare and cope with situations that could be expected, after being informed or warned about them. On the other hand, a realistic expectation refers to a "realistic" level of expectation, versus expectations that are too high or too low, regarding performing a new behavior. If the results of the present study show that realistic training previews do have a positive impact on learning and transfer, then future research should examine these underlying processes. The conceptual framework of these two psychological processes is more completely discussed in Chapter II.

The dependent variables of the present study were expanded over the previous studies to include three training outcomes: (1) reactions to training, (2) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (3) transfer of training. Furthermore, two mediating variables, self-efficacy and motivation, were included. Based on previous related studies by the following researchers: Baldwin and Ford (1988), Bandura (1977, 1981, 1982, 1986), Huczynski and Lewis (1980), Noe and Schmitt (1986), and Schunk
(1985), these two variables, among others, were shown to have positive impact on outcomes of training. All of the variables in the present study were measured by using self-report questionnaires distributed to training participants in three different time periods: (1) immediately after the training preview session, (2) immediately after the training workshop, and (3) two to three weeks after the training workshop.

Importance of the Study

Findings from the present study could be useful in a number of ways. If a training preview is shown to have a promising impact on learning and transfer, then a training preview intervention might be designed and incorporated as a part of all training programs.

A training preview can function as a management tool for screening prospective participants prior to their training in two ways. First, when information on who should attend the particular training program, who would benefit most from it, and what would be the prerequisites for attending the training program is provided during the training preview, prospective participants will learn if the particular training program meets their needs and if they can benefit from it. That is, the preview could help prospective trainees decide whether a training session would be worth attending. Second, a well-designed training preview might help a training department achieve a greater return on training expenses by increasing the rate of learning and transfer of training.

As was discussed by Wanous (1978) with regard to a realistic job preview, a training preview, like a job preview, can help provide training participants with important information about the training program and, as a consequence, may help reduce uncertainty toward the training program that participants may have. Training
participants with a clearer understanding of the nature of the training program are more likely to benefit from what was learned.

The present study will add to the findings of prior studies (Hicks, 1983; Hicks & Klimoski, 1987; Huczynski & Lewis, 1980; Wanous, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1980; Wexley & Baldwin, 1986) by being the first study to assess the impact of a realistic training preview on subsequent transfer of training, particularly in terms of on the job uses or application of what has been learned.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Training is a commonly used term, though the definition varies according to different people and areas of concern. McGeehee and Thayer (1961) defined training in industry as "the formal procedures which a company uses to facilitate employees' learning so that their resultant behavior contributes to the attainment of the company's goals and objectives" (p. 3). Nadler (1984) defined learning activities as serving three primary purposes. These purposes are: (1) learning to enhance an individual's current job performance, (2) learning to prepare an individual for some job in the future, and (3) learning for the growth of an individual or an organization, which might not relate to either current or future job performance. Nadler (1984) labeled these as: (1) training: "learning related to present job," (2) education: "learning to prepare the individual for a different but identified job," and (3) development: "learning for growth of the individual but not related to a specific present or future job" (p. 1.16).

Camp et al. (1986), on the other hand, argued that training should not be conducted without regard to a job-related deficiency. According to these authors, personal growth training programs may allow trainees to grow and develop, but there is no evidence that these programs (which were labeled by Nadler (1984) as "development") result in either higher employee recruitment or higher retention of quality employees. They argued that training programs should have a dual goal of improving organizational effectiveness and improving the work experience for the job incumbent. In other words, if both parties, the organization and its employees, do not benefit, training should not be provided.
Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) defined training as "a planned learning experience designed to bring about permanent change in an individual's knowledge, attitudes, or skills" (quoted in Noe, p. 736, 1986). Based on the above definitions, training consists of a formal procedure aimed at employee learning which will result in a change in job-related knowledge, skills, and attitudes. In turn, the consequence of the acquisition of more job-related knowledge, skills, and attitudes is positive outcomes for the organization.

Horrigan (1979), and Leifer and Newstrom (1980) have emphasized that a major effort of practitioners in training and development in the 1980s and 1990s is to prove that training has value and make a positive contribution to an organization, either in terms of dollar amount or employee development. According to Brinkerhoff (1990), a predominant way that training produces value is through changed job performance. To prove value to the organization, an essential task is to evaluate the extent to which what is learned in training is used or transferred to the workplace. The following section will discuss the transfer issue — its importance, measurement problems, and factors that facilitate transfer of training.

Transfer of Training

Transfer of training is defined as "the degree to which an individual uses the knowledge and skills learned in the classroom on the job in an effective and continuous manner" (Georgenson, 1982, p. 75). This definition is similar to those of other researchers that defined transfer of training (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Newstrom, 1984; Wexley & Latham, 1981). In the present study, transfer of training is defined as "the extent to which an individual uses or applies what was learned from the training workshop in a workplace or other situations."
Many researchers and practitioners, such as Brinkerhoff (1987, 1989), Huczynski and Lewis (1980), Leifer and Newstrom (1980), McGeehee and Thayer (1961), and Wexley and Baldwin (1986), have stressed the importance of transfer of training. These researchers highlight the fact that the existence and survival of training and development, both in educational and corporate settings, depends essentially on whether what was learned from training is used or transferred to the job. Training professionals cannot afford to leave the transfer issue to chance, but must aggressively pursue usage of training acquired learning. According to Brinkerhoff (1989), "unless leaders in training engage in far greater usage of evaluation and other quality improvement efforts than they now pursue, the training profession faces serious threats to its survival" (p. 5).

The problem of transfer of training has been recognized as a crucial mission for the training profession. Nevertheless, there has been a lack of both empirical research and practical application on transfer of training. In addition, training practitioners often are busy with their immediate tasks such as organizing and delivering training and as a consequence, they pay less attention to the crucial task of assessing and supporting the usage of learning on the job.

Another transfer problem is that it is difficult to measure behavioral change objectively. A number of methods in measuring employees' new behaviors on the job have been used. These methods are, for example: (a) achievement tests; (b) standards of performance measurement, amount, quality, and cost of work done; and (c) interviews and questionnaire methods. When training focuses on easily measured behaviors, such as physical skills, transfer measurement is easier. On the other hand, some management skills such as decision making, performance reviews, and
interpersonal communications, are more complicated to measure objectively. Moreover, the behavioral changes for these latter skills are difficult to operationalize.

**Strategies to Enhance Transfer of Training**

A number of strategies have been implemented to enhance transfer of training. These strategies implemented by Baldwin and Ford (1988), Baumgartel and Jeanpierre (1972), and Noe (1986) focused on (a) designing more effective training programs, (b) increasing trainees' satisfaction with the training, and (c) improving the work environment.

Baldwin and Ford (1988) developed a model of the transfer process. They described the process of learning and transferring in terms of training input factors, training output factors, and conditions of transfer. The training input factors consisted of: (a) training design, (b) trainee characteristics, and (c) work environment. Outcomes of these inputs would be the amount of learning and the retention of the learned material after the training. The researchers further indicated in their model that for transfer to occur, two conditions were necessary: (1) learned behavior must be generalized to the job context, and (2) learned behavior must be maintained on the job over a period of time.

Another factor identified by many training theorists and researchers (e.g., Brinkerhoff, 1987; Mager & Pipe, 1970; Goldstein et al., 1989) which could facilitate transfer of training is methods to assure that training is aimed at real and important needs. Training needs analysis involves determining whether there is a sufficient need for training and deciding what the goals of the training program should be. The purpose of a needs analysis is to forge a strong connection between organization needs for training and training objectives. Questions to be asked when conducting
needs analyses are, for example, whether training is needed in the first place, who will be trained, and what criteria can be used to determine whether training has been successful.

Other methods to enhance new behavior were described by Martin and Pear (1978) and Warren (1979). These methods are, for example, managing consequences of performance both during the training program and on the job after the training program, and designing and controlling feedback. The first method of consequence management can be implemented by providing positive reinforcements to ensure that the desired behavior is maintained. The latter method, on the other hand, can be implemented by letting performers know how well they are doing on their job in relation to expectations.

Three traditional approaches for maximizing transfer of training described by McGeehee and Thayer (1961) are: (1) identical elements, (2) concepts, and (3) overlearning. These studies were based on learning principles and transfer of training that can be dated back to the 1900s. Thorndike and Woodworth (1901), cited in McGeehee and Thayer (1961), developed a classical learning principle called "identical elements." This principle suggests that a trained individual will become more skillful than an untrained individual when the responses and stimuli of the learned task are identical to those of the transferred task. In other words, the more similar the stimuli and responses of the two tasks, the more likely an individual will be in transferring what is learned. The second principle, "concepts," explains the speed of learning and the amount of the transfer of training. McGeehee and Thayer (1961) proposed that when the trainee understands the concepts, rules, and principles involved in a given task, the amount of transfer is enhanced. Furthermore, they suggested that the trainees must not only know the concepts, but they must also learn...
to apply them under different conditions. The third principle of learning and transfer is overlearning. Under this approach, it is assumed that it is extremely important for an individual to continue his or her acquired behavior until the specific stimulus-response conditions are well learned. Extinction of the learned skills and behavior may occur if there is a lack of continued practice and continued reinforcement. Only when the specific stimulus-response conditions are well learned, practice can be discontinued.

In summary, according to the identical element principle, in order to maximize transfer from one task to another, the first task should be identical or similar to the second task. According to the concept principle, transfer can be enhanced if the concepts or principles of the material to be learned are provided and emphasized during training. According to the third principle, overlearning, continued practice after performing the task correctly once or twice is extremely important for learning and transfer of learning. All three of these learning principles focus on training design that maximize learning and enhance transfer of learned behavior from the training site to the work place.

Although these transfer of training approaches have some value when applied to appropriate training situations, several authors (e.g., Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Leifer & Newstrom, 1980) reported that these approaches were not sufficient for facilitating positive transfer of training. For example, according to Leifer and Newstrom (1980), the identical element principle is insufficient. Even when training is carefully designed for a particular learner group, it is still difficult to arrange the learning environment and the job environment to be identical. This is partially due to the fact that the training participants are aware that they are learning new knowledge and skills in an artificial environment, and that they will not suffer the adverse conditions.
consequences that they might have, had they been in the real work environment. With regard to the concept principle, Leifer and Newstrom (1980) pointed out that the additional skills, concepts, and principles provided to learners are not always perceived to be useful to job performance.

In summary, the major limitations of the research in learning principles are that they were studied mainly under controlled experimental settings and based on tasks that required simple motor and memory skills. Baldwin and Ford (1988) explained that with more complex tasks such as management skills, problem solving skills, and interpersonal communication skills, these learning principles are problematic.

More recently, different approaches to facilitate positive transfer of training have been proposed by a number of researchers and practitioners. Leifer and Newstrom (1980) recommended a three time frame process to induce significant new behavior on the job. The three time frame process consisted of steps taken: (1) before, (2) during, and (3) after training. According to Leifer and Newstrom (1980), the step taken prior to training would help create positive expectation, the step taken during training would help create performance opportunity, and the step taken after training would create a mechanism to reinforce positive behavior.

Similar to the three time frame process, Brinkerhoff (1989) proposed three "zones" as comprising the overall training process. The three "zones" are Zone 1: before training, Zone 2: during training, and Zone 3: after training. Zone 1 represents the "get ready" stage which involves a needs analysis, management support, objectives, and an identification of obstacles. Zone 2 involves conducting training and measuring learning. Finally, Zone 3 is comprised of transfer of training,
incentives and interaction with supervisors, and overcoming other barriers to training utilization.

In terms of factors facilitating positive transfer of training, Leifer and Newstrom (1980) proposed that "Successful transfer technology requires integration of all elements which could impact the participants' performance" (p. 43). On the other hand, Brinkerhoff (1989) proposed that, "The greatest return on the training investment will come not from intervening in Zone 2 (during training), but will come from making activities in Zone 1 (before training) and Zone 3 (after training) more effective" (p. 14).

The focus of the present study is to develop and test a method for "before training" intervention that may impact transfer of training. To be more specific, a pre-training intervention is introduced to subjects in the study as a means to provide them with additional information about the training workshop. It is hypothesized that with the additional information about the training workshop which the subjects are about to attend, they might see the relevance of certain training topics and some of the transfer problems in advance and pay more attention to these during the training workshop and when they go back to the job. The training previews to be implemented prior to the training workshop will help the subjects "prepare" or "get ready" and thereby increase the benefit from the training workshop, and enhance transfer of training.

A Need for Pre-training Strategies

There have not been many studies that focus on pre-training strategies as a means to facilitate transfer of training. The need for more studies on pre-training strategies has been emphasized by a number of researchers, for example, Hicks and Klimoski (1987), Leifer and Newstrom (1980), McGeehee and Thayer (1961),
Michalak (1981), and Wexley and Baldwin (1986). For the studies that emphasized pre-intervention strategy as a means to enhance learning and transfer of what was learned, several limitations were identified.

Leifer and Newstrom (1980) suggested in their review article of the three time frame process that prior to training, any of the three concepts could be applied: (1) advance letter, (2) involvement of superior, and (3) prescribed tasks. They also discussed other methods to be implemented both during and after the training program.

According to Leifer and Newstrom (1980), an advance letter should be sent to participants prior to the training to better prepare them for the training program. This is done to inform participants of the nature of training and its intended on-the-job benefits. Details to be included in the advance letter are, for example, statement of objectives, training process to be used, expectations of participants and examples of skill applications. Involvement of superior (a trainee's boss, for example) should be added to increase participants' positive expectations. Letters should also be sent to supervisors both prior and after training asking for the supervisor's involvement and support in the participant's training program. The last technique these researchers suggested to be used prior to training is prescribed tasks. Prescribed tasks is an active method in which some tasks such as readings and case analysis are assigned to participants in advance, prior to the training session. Participants may also be asked in advance to provide and identify a work problem which is related to the new skills to be learned during training.

Although the techniques presented by Leifer and Newstrom (1980) seem practical and promising, there is a lack of data to support their recommendations. For example, the means of delivering prior information and details about the training such
as objectives, process, and expectations of the training program that participants were
to receive would be delivered to participants in a written form (the advance letter).
Because there is a little control over whether participants read the advance letter
thoroughly, the effectiveness of the advance letter is probably very limited.

Basis for the Present Study

The present study involves a pre-training intervention called a "realistic
training preview." This concept is based on an approach used, not in training but in
job selection and hiring, called a "realistic job preview." The present study extends
the realistic preview notion to training, in the belief that it might impact transfer in a
positive and effective manner.

Realistic Job Preview

In the past three decades, a number of researchers (Breaugh, 1983; Colarelli,
1984; Dugoni & Ilgen, 1981; Meglino et al., 1988; Miceli, 1983; Noe, 1986; Wanous,
1973, 1975, 1976, 1977) have studied realistic job previews and their effectiveness in
job retention and satisfaction. Despite a large number of studies, the term "realistic
job preview" has not been precisely and consistently defined. Meglino et al. (1988)
described a realistic job preview as, "A method that has proven useful in reducing
employee turnover" (p. 259). Similarly, Miceli (1983) defined a realistic job preview
as, "an employee recruiting technique alleged to reduce turnover" (p. 282). Wanous
(1975) who first used the term "realistic job preview" (RJP) explained it as, "an
atypical, untraditional approach that stresses efforts to communicate--before an
applicant's acceptance of a job offer--what organizational life will actually be like on
the job" (p. 51). Hicks (1983) and Hicks and Klimoski (1987) whose studies related
partly to the issue of realistic job previews, described a realistic job preview as "a preview that provides a number of neutral statements or statements with unfavorable ratings" as opposed to a traditional preview which "contains a number of favorable statements" (Hicks, 1983, p. 10).

Although the explanations from the above researchers provide some understanding of the term "realistic job preview," these explanations tend to be broad and general. Breaugh and Billings (1986) carefully reviewed research on realistic job previews (RJP) and concluded that, "rather than viewing an RJP as a theoretical construct it makes more sense to conceive of an RJP as a label for a recruitment-oriented intervention that has certain essential properties" (p. 241). They proposed five key attributes of a realistic job preview: (1) accuracy, (2) specificity, (3) breadth, (4) credibility, and (5) importance. They suggested that the impact of a realistic job preview will be optimized when it reflects all of these five key elements.

As for the content of a realistic job preview, there have not been specific guidelines as to what should be included. It varies from one study to the other. For example, some realistic job previews provide general information about organizational policy, supervision, and work unit, while others address details about specific job expectations. In most studies (e.g., Ilgen & Seely, 1974; Meglino et al., 1988; Wanous, 1975), realistic job previews have consisted of both positive and negative aspects of the job offered, while traditional job previews consisted of only positive aspects of the job offered. Presentations or delivery methods also tend to vary from study to study. For example, realistic job previews have been delivered in many different ways such as videotapes, films, job descriptions, booklets, brochures, manuals and guidelines of rules and policy, and direct verbal communication.
Several studies (e.g., Ilgen & Seely, 1974; Wanous, 1977, 1980) have indicated that a realistic job preview can successfully reduce employee voluntary turnover rate. According to these studies, it is suggested that realistic job previews be provided to new employees after the recruitment and selection process. Breaugh (1983) reviewed the literature on realistic job previews and stated that researchers who report the effectiveness of realistic job previews in increasing job survival rates have claimed that, "by providing job applicants with an accurate description of the job, those who accept the job will be more satisfied with it and thus less likely to leave it voluntarily" (p. 612). A number of researchers (Colarelli, 1984; Reilly et al., 1981; Wanous, 1973), on the other hand, has found no statistically significant effects of realistic job previews on employee turnover rate. Results from these studies showed no significant differences among any of the dependent variables among the groups that received different types of previews and the comparison groups.

Colarelli (1984) conducted a field experiment to investigate the effects of two methods of presenting realistic job previews to job applicants. The two methods of presenting realistic job previews were by job incumbent or by brochure. A sample of 164 new bank tellers in a large metropolitan bank was used. Results showed no significant differences between the two training preview groups on job satisfaction and intention to quit the job.

Dugoni and Ilgen (1981) investigated three possible psychological processes underlying the use of realistic job previews. Subjects in their study were 119 individuals who had been offered a part-time job as either checkers or baggers at two retail food outlets. One group of subjects received a thirty-minute verbal presentation on five areas of concerns: (1) customer relations, (2) co-workers, (3) supervision, (4) duties and policies, and (5) work hours. The other group, on the other hand, did not
receive this presentation. Results showed that realistic job previews had only a marginal effect on employee turnover, and had no effect on employee satisfaction. In their study, none of the three psychological variables: (1) ability to cope, (2) met expectations, and (3) air of honesty, was demonstrated to have any effects on employee turnover.

Ilgen and Seely (1974) conducted a study using new cadets entering the United States Military Academy as their subjects. Out of the total of 486 cadets, half of them received a booklet by mail, describing the training period and the daily routine during the academic year. The other half did not receive such information. When the number of resignations during the training period of the two groups were compared, the authors reported that the group that received a booklet of information showed a significantly lower turnover rate than the control group. The authors concluded that, "aid in coping is sufficient to reduce turnover in the absence of self-selection and increased commitment to the decision" (p. 453).

Reilly et al. (1981) studied the effects of realistic job previews by using a sample of 842 candidates for telephone service representatives. Two types of realistic job previews, a film and job visit, were used. Results showed no statistically significant differences between the groups that received realistic training previews and the control groups, with respect to their job acceptance, perceptions of whether expectations were met, job commitment, and turnover. Nevertheless, when the authors used a statistical procedure for "pooling" subjects over 11 studies (a total of 4,513 subjects), they found that the turnover rate of subjects who received realistic job previews was 6% lower than those who did not receive realistic job previews. Reilly et al. (1981) also discussed several difficulties in interpreting effects of realistic job previews. These difficulties were, for example, insufficient statistical power,
differences in organizational roles, and the lack of a clear operational definition of realistic job previews.

Several reasons for these inconsistent findings were: (a) research methodology, (b) the type of jobs chosen in each study, and (c) other extraneous variables that could not be controlled. First, the research design of the studies on realistic job previews varied, particularly in the number of subjects. Small sample sizes might not be sufficient to detect marginal differences. Nevertheless, in the study of Reilly et al. (1981), that included a sample of 842 subjects, no significant differences between the group that received a realistic job preview and the comparison group were found. Second, different job positions or characteristics might result in different effects. Dugoni and Ilgen (1981) determined that this was one of the limitations of their study. Permanent part-time employees in their study might respond differently to realistic job previews than full-time employees. Likewise, Reilly et al. (1981) discussed how the job characteristics interacted with realistic job previews such that job candidates who had a complex job were affected more than those who had a simple and easy job, because complex jobs required more learning. That is, the amount of information was more valuable for those who had a complex job, compared to those who had simple ones. Finally, other extraneous variables might account for inconsistencies in results. Some uncontrollable variables identified by Breaugh (1983) were, for example, the family of job candidates, financial status, and some "boundary conditions." The boundary conditions that must be met for the realistic job preview to show its effectiveness were, for example, the selection ratio for the job, the unemployment rate, and the job level.

Although several researchers and authors (see, for example, Breaugh, 1983; Schwab, 1981) have questioned the effects of realistic job previews on employee
turnover, Premack and Wanous (1985) explained that most previous reviews of realistic job previews have not considered the possibility that the variance among studies may be due to methodological factors, such as sampling error and measurement unreliability. To reduce the impact of such factors, Premack and Wanous (1985) reviewed 21 realistic job preview studies, employing a meta-analytic procedure. It was concluded that realistic job previews tend to lower initial expectation about a job and the organization, while they tend to increase self-selection, initial levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction, performance, and job survival.

Assuming that realistic job previews can successfully affect the reduction in employee turnover rate, the question of "how realistic job previews work" merits further investigation. Ilgen and Seely (1974) and Dugoni and Ilgen (1981) were among the first researchers (Porter & Steers, 1973; Reilly et al., 1981; Wanous, 1973, 1977, 1978, 1980) who presented three explanations that seemed plausible for the reduction of employee turnover rate. These three psychological processes that might possibly account for the outcomes of realistic job previews were: (1) the decision to join the organization after having received accurate information about the organization (self-selection), (2) the level of responsibility and commitment an individual felt toward the decision to join the organization after having received accurate information about the organization (air of honesty), and (3) the ability to prepare and cope with situations that could be expected or were informed prior to the acceptance of the job (ability to cope).

Another explanation to add to the above three psychological processes was proposed by Porter and Steers (1973) and Wanous (1973, 1977, 1980). Realistic job previews might help lower a job applicant's initial expectations, and, as a
consequence, increase the job applicant's satisfaction with the job. Porter and Steers (1973) termed this explanation, "met expectation." This concept was similarly explained by Dugoni and Ilgen (1981), who called it the "reality shock." Reality shock was caused by unrealistically high expectations toward the job. When the expectations were not met, a job applicant experienced reality shock. Reality shock had a positive correlation with job dissatisfaction and turnover rate. In other words, when reality shock was high, both job dissatisfaction and turnover rate were high and when reality shock was low, both job dissatisfaction and turnover rate were low.

While these explanations have intuitive appeal, the findings from studies on the psychological processes hypothesized to mediate the effects of realistic job previews on employee turnover rate have been inconsistent. The studies of Colarelli (1984), and Dugoni and Ilgen (1981) that investigated these psychological processes did not show significant differences to support the hypothesis that realistic job previews influence employee turnover rate through: (a) lowering expectations and increasing job satisfaction, (b) increasing ability to cope with problems on the job, or (c) increasing commitment to stay with the company. On the other hand, Ilgen and Seely's study (1974) showed a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in subjects' voluntary resignations. They concluded that ability to cope with situations has an impact on reducing turnover.

In summary, a realistic job preview (RJP) is specific information about the organization that is provided to job applicants prior to their job acceptance. While results have been varied, the realistic job preview has been shown to have some effect on reducing employee turnover rates (Premack & Wanous, 1985).
Realistic Training Preview

The concept of a realistic training preview is closely tied to that of a realistic job preview. The realistic training preview is provision of "realistic" information about training before the training itself is conducted.

Hicks and Klimoski (1987) conducted a field experiment to examine two pre-training variables that could affect training outcomes: (1) the type of prior information about the training a trainee received, and (2) the amount of freedom a trainee had to choose to participate in the training program. The major dependent variable in their study was the mastery of training material which was assessed by a self-report questionnaire and a behavioral measure. The two types of training previews in their study were: (1) a "realistic" preview which included a number of neutral and unfavorable written statements about the training program, and (2) a "traditional" preview which included brief and overly positive written statements about the training program.

A two-day workshop on performance review and interviewing was conducted in a large nonprofit organization. Data were collected from 101 managers and supervisors working at the site. Subjects were randomly assigned to four treatment conditions with a combination of the two independent variables: types of prior information about the training program and degree of choice to participate in the training program.

In Hicks and Klimoski's study (1987), both the quality and amount of information provided to a trainee were different between the realistic and the traditional training preview groups. The "realistic" announcement contained five sections, consisting of: (1) expected outcomes from the training program, (2) the topics and content of the training program to be discussed, (3) the circumstances
under which an employee would benefit from the training program, (4) evaluation of
the workshop, and (5) information on leaders, dates, times, and location of each of the
training programs. The "traditional" announcement, on the other hand, consisted of
brief information describing the major features of the training program. These major
features were: (a) expected outcomes from the training program (very brief and
positive), (b) its content, and (c) information on dates, times, and locations of each of
the training programs.

The findings showed that managers who received either the realistic training
preview or had a high degree of choice were more motivated to learn the training
material than managers who received the traditional training preview or had a low
degree of choice. However, it was reported that the types of prior information did not
have an effect on any of the learning measures, while the degree of choice had a main
effect on two out of the three learning measures. Managers who had a high degree of
choice earned higher achievement test scores and reported that they learned more
from the training, compared to those who had a low degree of choice.

In summary, the Hicks and Klimoski study (1987) failed to demonstrate that a
training preview alone had significant impact on training results. This study
employed, however, a relatively weak (written) training preview technique.

Mediating Variables

While the main focus of the present study was to examine the impact of a
training preview on training transfer, the study also examined two possible mediators
of the relationship between a training preview and training outcomes: (1) self-
efficacy, and (2) motivation. Previous reviews by Baldwin and Ford (1988), and
Bandura (1982), and studies by Bandura (1977, 1981, 1986), Huczynski and Lewis
(1980), Noe and Schmitt (1986) and Schunk (1985) have shown that these two variables are positively related to training outcomes.

**Self-efficacy**

The concept of self-efficacy has been studied as a mechanism that affects behavioral change, and is particularly recognized in the field of health practices and therapeutic treatment. Self-efficacy is defined as "a cognitive mechanism based on expectations or beliefs about one's ability to perform actions necessary to produce a given effect" (Thesaurus of Psychological Index Terms, 1984, p. 178). Bandura (1977) in his Social Learning Theory, referred to self-efficacy as "personal judgments of performance capabilities in a given domain of activity that may contain novel, unpredictable, and possibly stressful features" (quoted in Schunk, p. 208, 1985).

According to Bandura's paradigm of behavior, behavioral change and maintenance are based on: (a) the outcome that people hope to receive as a result of their behavior, and (b) the ability that people perceive they have in order to perform the behavior. According to Bandura (1977), people's knowledge of their self-efficacy is based on four major sources: (1) performance accomplishment, (2) vicarious experience, (3) verbal persuasion, and (4) emotional arousal. In the present study, the type of training preview that training workshop participants received prior to the training workshop was similar to the "verbal persuasion" source. Bandura (1977) reported that verbal persuasion leads people to believe that they can cope with difficult situations. In the present study, it is possible that training previews may have an impact on self-efficacy.

The results of a number of studies on the effect of self-efficacy showed that higher self-efficacy led to higher training performance. For example, Gist,
Schwoerer, and Rosen (1989), who studied the effects of alternative training methods on self-efficacy and performance in computer software training, reported that participants in the study who scored high in self-efficacy performed significantly better than those with low computer self-efficacy scores. Lee and Gillen (1989) studied self-efficacy perceptions on sales performance. Data were collected from the sales division of a large manufacturing corporation. The conclusion was that self-efficacy perceptions, regarding how well subjects could meet certain performance criteria (such as overall sales quotas) specified in performance rating forms were significantly and positively related to the subjects' performance quality as rated by supervisors of subjects on all of the dimensions of their performance appraisal forms.

Motivation

The concepts of motivation and expectancy have been widely studied in organizational behavior and training and development. Steers and Porter (1975) explained that motivation is composed of three components: (1) energizing, (2) directing, and (3) maintenance. As was quoted from Noe and Schmitt (1986):

In a training situation, motivation can be seen as a force that influences enthusiasm about the program (energizer), a stimulus that directs participants to learn and attempt to master the content of the program (director), and a force that influences the use of newly acquired knowledge and skills, even in the presence of criticism and lack of reinforcement for use of the training content (maintenance) (p. 498).

Hicks and Klimoski (1987) predicted that a realistic training preview should increase trainee motivation by clarifying expectations and by matching training programs to individual needs. In the present study, both self-efficacy and motivation are predicted to be mediating variables and are hypothesized to have a relationship with three training outcome variables: (1) reactions to training, (2) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (3) transfer of training. It is hypothesized that there will be
a relationship between the type of training preview received by the subjects prior to the training workshop and their self-efficacy and motivation levels. In addition, there will be a relationship among trainee motivation and self-efficacy and the outcomes of training.

Anticipated Effects

In this section, the conceptual framework for the research questions is discussed. The effect linkages in the figure below are discussed in order to define and clarify the specific research questions.

![Figure 1. Anticipated Effects.](image)

The major research question of the present study is to investigate whether the type of training preview presented has a differential impact on training outcomes (Linkage 1). These training outcomes are divided into three levels based on Kirkpatrick's hierarchical model of training outcomes (1967).
Hypothesis 1:

For Linkage 1, the conceptual hypotheses are:

(1) Subjects who received a realistic training preview prior to the training workshop would have more positive reactions to the training workshop than subjects who received an optimistic training preview.

(2) Subjects who received a realistic training preview prior to the training workshop would acquire more knowledge from the training workshop than subjects who received an optimistic training preview.

(3) Subjects who received a realistic training preview prior to the training workshop would use or apply what they learned from the training workshop to their job or other situations more than subjects who received an optimistic training preview.

The operational hypothesis for the above three hypotheses is: The mean of the scores on the reaction to training measure, the learning measure, and the transfer of training measure of the subjects in the realistic training preview group would be higher than those scores of the subjects in the optimistic training preview group.

The theoretical framework for this hypothesis is based on: (a) the studies of Wanous (1973, 1977, 1978, 1980) and his assumptions of how realistic job previews work, and (b) two psychological processes: realistic expectations and ability to cope.

Wanous (1977) concluded that giving job candidates a realistic preview about the job was preferable to giving merely positive or no information at all. The rationale was that realistic information could help job applicants: (a) see in what ways
the job could meet their career goal or plan, and (b) understand the job demands and thereby reduce their unrealistic expectations of the job. In a similar review, Wexley and Latham (1981) reported that trainees should have a higher desire to learn when the training is a good match with the perceived needs of the trainees.

Another explanation for the effects of the realistic training preview is based on the four psychological processes proposed to mediate the effectiveness of realistic job previews on employee turnover rate: (1) met expectation, (2) ability to cope, (3) air of honesty, and (4) self-selection (Dugoni and Ilgen, 1981; Reilly et al., 1981; and Wanous, 1980). Of these four processes, two ("met expectation" and "ability to cope") are especially relevant to the concept of a realistic training preview.

For the "met expectation" process, it was assumed that a realistic job preview would lower a job applicant's expectation from an unrealistically high to a "realistic" expectation level. After job candidates entered the job, their realistic expectation would be more congruent with the actual job situation that they would be working in. Thus, it was more likely that they would stay on the job longer.

In the present study, it is assumed that subjects who receive a realistic training preview will have a more "realistic" expectation level about the training workshop and its transferability, than those who receive an optimistic training preview. Problems and issues of both learning in a training situation and transferring what was learned were discussed in the realistic training preview. This realistic and accurate information might lower the expectations of the subjects from a high level to a more "realistic" level. Conversely, it might increase the expectations of the subjects to a more realistic level if they initially had very low expectations for the training workshop. The subjects who receive an optimistic training preview, on the other hand, might be more likely to have "unrealistic" expectations toward the training
workshop since the training preview they receive is delivered very positively to promote the training workshop.

The second psychological process, ability to cope, assumes that if employees are informed prior to accepting the job about the unpleasant situations or job demands that might occur, they will be less disturbed and more prepared when facing the problems. That is, they will be more capable of handling the problems encountered on the job. Likewise, it is hypothesized in the present study that the subjects who receive a realistic training preview will be better able to transfer what they learned than those who receive an optimistic training preview when they go back to their work. The forewarning information about the difficulties and obstacles in applying the techniques and skills learned in the training might mediate the effectiveness of the realistic training preview by increasing the "ability to cope" with problems of transfer.

Hypothesis 2

For Linkage 2, the conceptual hypothesis to be tested is: There would be a relationship between the type of training preview received by the subjects prior to the training workshop and their self-efficacy level.

\[
\text{TYPE OF TRAINING} \quad \rightarrow \quad (2) \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{SELF-EFFICACY PREVIEW}
\]

The operational hypothesis for hypothesis 2 is: The difference between means of the scores on the self-efficacy measures of the subjects in the realistic training preview group and the optimistic training preview group would be greater than zero.
Hypothesis 3

For Linkage 3, the conceptual hypothesis to be tested is: There would be a relationship between the type of training preview received by the subjects prior to the training workshop and their motivation level.

\[ \text{TYPE OF TRAINING} \rightarrow \text{MOTIVATION} \]

The operational hypothesis for hypothesis 3 is: The difference between means of the scores on the motivation measure of the subjects in the realistic training preview group and the optimistic training preview group would be greater than zero.

Hypothesis 4

For Linkage 4, the conceptual hypotheses to be tested are:

1. Subjects who had a high level of motivation would react more positively to the training workshop than subjects who had a low level of motivation.
2. Subjects who had a high level of motivation would acquire more knowledge from the training workshop than subjects who had a low level of motivation.
3. Subjects who had a high level of motivation would use or apply what they learned from the training workshop to their job or other situations more than subjects who had a low level of motivation.

\[ \text{MOTIVATION} \rightarrow \text{(A) REACTIONS (B) LEARNING (C) TRANSFER OF TRAINING} \]
The operational hypothesis for hypothesis 4 is: The Pearson product-moment correlation between the scores on the motivation measure of the subjects in the two training preview groups and their: (a) reaction to training measure, (b) mastery of learning measure, and (c) transfer of training measure would be greater than zero.

Hypothesis 5

For Linkage 5, the conceptual hypotheses to be tested are:

1. Subjects who had high self-efficacy would react more positively to the training workshop than subjects who had low self-efficacy.

2. Subjects who had high self-efficacy would acquire more knowledge from the training workshop than subjects who had low self-efficacy.

3. Subjects who had high self-efficacy would use or apply what they learned from the training workshop to their job or other situations more than subjects who had low self-efficacy.

(5) SELF-EFFICACY ———> (A) REACTIONS (B) LEARNING (C) TRANSFER OF TRAINING

The operational hypothesis for hypothesis 5 is: The Pearson product-moment correlation between the scores on the self-efficacy measures of the subjects in the two training preview groups and their: (a) reaction to training measure, (b) mastery of learning measure, and (c) transfer of training measure would be greater than zero.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Overview

Ninety-one people attended a training workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way." Prior to the workshop, these people were assigned to one of two groups; one group received a "realistic" training preview, while the other received an "optimistic" training preview. The dependent variables were: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training. Mediating variables were self-efficacy and motivation. Measurement was implemented by means of three self-report questionnaires administered: (a) after the training preview session, and prior to the training workshop; (b) after the training workshop; and (c) two to three weeks after the training workshop.

Setting

The training workshop was conducted in a large lecture room located at 2302 Sangren Hall, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo. The two training preview sessions, a realistic training preview and an optimistic training preview, were conducted in two rooms, 2302 and 2303 Sangren Hall, respectively. These two lecture rooms were located across the hall from each other. They were virtually identical in terms of seating capacity and setting. Seating capacity for the lecture rooms 2302 and 2303 are 187 and 191, respectively. Both lecture rooms had a large screen in the front for the use of films or slides. A video camera and a cassette tape
recorder were set up in each of the lecture rooms to record the training preview presenters for later documentation of detailed scripts.

Recruitment of Subjects

Three methods for recruiting subjects were used. First, a written announcement about the training workshop (its topic, instructor, date, time, and location) was: (a) posted in different buildings, and (b) distributed to a number of classes at Western Michigan University. Second, information about the training workshop was advertised in the Western Herald (student newspaper) and Western News (weekly paper for faculty and staff members). Finally, the researcher asked permission from instructors or professors of different classes which were scheduled on the same date and time of the training workshop to allow students in their classes to attend the training workshop. These instructors and professors were asked to dismiss their classes earlier so that students could attend the training workshop. All students, however, participated on a voluntary basis. Letters sent to instructors of potential classes to ask for their permission to allow students in their classes to attend the training workshop are presented in Appendix P. The criteria for choosing the potential Western Michigan University classes to serve as subjects in the present study were based on the nature of classes, i.e., topics of the classes and areas of emphasis that related to the topic of the training workshop such that potential subjects could benefit from the training workshop. For example, classes in the areas of management, communications, counseling psychology, and educational leadership were chosen.

After the researcher received permission from instructors or professors of potential classes to include their students as subjects in the present study, she went to
each class and introduced herself, her study, and the training workshop to the students. These classes were: Human Resource Development, Introduction to Research, Research Design and Data Analysis I, Training Skills Development, Educational Leadership, and Community Agency Counseling and Administration. In addition to these classes, other subjects were recruited from other classes such as Group Communication Theory, Theory of Interpersonal Communication, Leadership, and Command and Staff. In the latter case, instructors of each class made announcements about the training workshop: its date, time, and location.

A written announcement of the training workshop with its title, instructor, date, time, and location and a sign-up form were distributed to each student in class. To counter the possibility that subjects might know they were included in a study and thus might guess how the researcher expected them to behave, the announcement (Appendix G) to potential subjects was carefully constructed to reduce bias that could be caused by "hypothesis-guessing" (Cook & Campbell, 1979). Students, staff, and other people who wanted to attend the training workshop were asked to sign up in advance to reserve their seats. The entire recruiting process was conducted three weeks prior to the training workshop.

Subjects

There were 91 people included as subjects in the present study. Out of these 91 people, a total of 83 completed the informed consent and the questionnaires after the training workshop. These people included both undergraduate (25.3%, n= 21) and graduate students (74.7%, n= 62) enrolled in Fall classes offered by Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Of these 83 people, 34 were males (40.96%), and 49 were females (59.04%). Sixty-four of these people (77.11%) were
employed. The types of jobs varied, but were mostly mid-career professionals in training and development, finance, research, teaching, personnel, school administration, and health care.

Participants were asked to sign a consent form for their agreement to participate in the study prior to their participation in the training workshop. Assignment of subjects to one of the two training preview groups was accomplished at the time of the training workshop. As participants arrived at the training session, they were greeted by the researcher and were told to go to one of the two training rooms as they desired.

Training Preview Presenters

Two professional trainers were selected to deliver the training previews and were randomly assigned to one of the two groups to deliver either a realistic training preview or an optimistic training preview. Both of the training preview presenters chosen for the present study are currently and actively working in the area of training and development and management consulting. Both are also highly skilled and extensively experienced training session presenters.

Approximately three weeks prior to the training preview session, each of these two people worked with the researcher and her research advisor on how to deliver the training preview. The agenda and outlined script of the training preview were given to each of them (Appendices C and E). They were informed about the study only to the extent that it would not affect the nature of the study. This was to reduce any possible bias of experimenter expectancies (Cook & Campbell, 1979) since expectations of the training preview presenters who delivered the training previews to subjects could affect the results obtained.
Training Preview Sessions

When potential subjects came into the lecture room area, they were told by the researcher that first they would hear a brief discussion about the training workshop that they were about to receive. They were also told that, because there were many people who signed up for the training workshop, they would be divided into two groups. One group would go to lecture room 2302 and the other would go to lecture room 2303. Early arrivals were allowed to choose the room they went to, while the researcher directed later arrivals to balance attendance. The two lecture rooms were identical in terms of seating capacity and arrangements. The number of people in each of the lecture rooms were counted by the number of questionnaires distributed to them when they entered the lecture room to ensure that both groups had about the same number of people. After the brief discussion, all subjects would rejoin together in lecture room 2302 for the training workshop. The nature and title of either an "optimistic training preview" or a "realistic training preview" group were kept confidential so that subjects would not know that others would receive a different type of training preview. Subjects were all identically instructed that they would "participate in a discussion" prior to the beginning of the training workshop.

In each lecture room, a research assistant distributed an envelope of questionnaires to participants when they entered the room. Shortly after all of the people were seated, the training preview sessions began. For the people who came late, their arrival time was marked by the research assistant who distributed the questionnaire envelopes so that the researcher would know who received only a partial training preview. Data from those who arrived later than five minutes after the training preview started (or received less than 75% of the training preview) were not included in further analysis.
In each of the training preview groups, the training preview presenter introduced himself to the people who served as subjects in the present study. Then, each training preview presenter asked people in his group to sign the consent form for their agreement to participate in the study. The consent form was paper-clipped to the envelope containing other instruments. After that, each training preview presenter began his session.

The content of the realistic training preview included information about (further detail on realistic training preview can be found in Appendices C and D): (a) the purpose of the training workshop and the small group discussion, (b) conditions and issues that pertain to the "before" and "after" of training sessions, (c) common issues with general group training and more specific issues with the particular training workshop chosen for the present study, (d) strengths and weaknesses of group learning, (e) common issues with transfer of training and with transfer of the particular training workshop chosen for the present study, and (f) obstacles to learning and transfer of training and some recommendations to deal with these obstacles.

The content of the optimistic training preview, on the other hand, included information about (further detail on optimistic training preview can be found in Appendices E and F): (a) the purpose of the training workshop and the small group discussion, (b) a brief introduction of training workshop participants, (c) a brief explanation of the importance of communication, (d) a brief explanation of the importance of feedback, (e) an overview of the workshop: its instructor, objectives, and content, and (f) a summary.

The realistic training preview included both positive and negative statements about the training and its transferability, while the optimistic training preview included solely positive statements.
Construction of these two training previews is explained in this chapter in the "development of training previews" section. The agendas and script outlines for the realistic training preview and the optimistic training preview group are in Appendices C and E. The detailed scripts for each group are in Appendices D and F and were transcribed from recorded tapes of both the realistic training preview and the optimistic training preview.

Both of the training preview sessions lasted twenty minutes. After the sessions were finished, each training preview presenter asked the subjects to complete the questionnaires which were enclosed in the envelope they received when they entered the lecture room. Also, the subjects were informed that the training workshop would begin within ten minutes in lecture room 2302. Subjects were told to hold on to the questionnaires that they completed because there would be another set of questionnaires to be completed after the training workshop. Subjects then left the training preview room and convened in room 2302 (a large lecture room) for the training workshop.

Training Workshop

The training workshop on "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" lasted one and a half hours, commencing immediately upon completion of the preview session. The training workshop included both live lecture and videotaped role-plays.

The instructor of the training workshop is currently a faculty member in the Department of Management at Western Michigan University where she teaches a number of undergraduate courses such as employee relations, personnel management, principles of management, and management analysis and behavior. She has
conducted many training workshops on how to give negative feedback and is the author of several articles.

Research Instruments

After the training workshop, the subjects were asked to evaluate the training workshop and to complete a brief quiz asking them to list the specific points of the training workshop that they felt they had learned. After they finished, they were asked to put all of the questionnaires into the envelope and give it back to the researcher at the door before they left.

Two to three weeks after the training workshop, a self-report follow-up questionnaire was sent to each subject. This was done through two methods: (1) distributing follow-up questionnaires in classes where subjects were recruited, and (2) mailing. Self-addressed and stamped return envelopes were provided.

Variables on these instruments consisted of three categories: (1) general variables: demographic data and general information and manipulation checks, (2) major dependent variables: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training, and (3) mediating variables: self-efficacy and motivation.

General Variables

Demographic Data

The demographic data and general information included employment status, academic level (undergraduate or graduate), reasons for attending the training workshop, prior experience in giving negative feedback, and the level of expectation
to use what was learned. This questionnaire included both short answers and multiple choices (Appendix I).

**Manipulation Check Measure**

The purpose of the manipulation check measure was to assess whether the two training previews functioned in the way they were intended to. Subjects in the realistic training preview group were expected to have more knowledge about the training workshop (its objectives, content, and opportunity to apply what was learned to the job) than subjects in the optimistic training preview group. The optimistic training preview was expected to promote the training workshop in a more positive way than the realistic training preview group.

The manipulation checks consisted of two parts (Appendix J). The first part assessed knowledge about the training workshop by asking if the subject knew that the events listed in each of four items would occur in the training workshop. Events asked about were, for example, "A list of DO's and DON'T will be given to you," "A role-played videotape will be shown," and "I will have an optional reading assignment." The scale ranged from 1 to 3 (1= I know this event will occur in this workshop, 2= I know this event will not occur in this workshop, and 3= Don't know). The second part of this manipulation check assessed: (a) the subjects' attitudes toward the training preview session they received, and (b) the difference between subjects' pre-preview knowledge and post-preview knowledge (i.e., knowledge about the training workshop: its objectives, content, and opportunity to apply what was learned to their job). Seven items were asked. For example, "The person who gave the preview session was very enthusiastic about the training workshop," "The information I received during the small group discussion was important to know
before attending the training workshop," and "The information I received during the small group discussion promoted the training workshop in a very positive way." The scale ranged from 1 to 5 (1= Not at all, 2= Very Little, 3= Some, 4= A Fairly Amount, and 5= A Great Deal). The content of this manipulation check was based partly on Hicks' study (1983).

**Dependent Variables**

Three dependent variables based on Kirkpatrick's hierarchical model of training outcomes (1967) were measured. They were: (1) reactions to training, (2) acquisition of more knowledge (learning), and (3) transfer of training.

**Reaction to Training Measure**

Reactions to training included subjects' reactions toward: (a) the workshop design, i.e., content, organization, whether objectives were met, pace, and an overall rating; (b) the workshop instructor, i.e., communication of information, knowledge of material, response to questions, preparation and organization, and an overall rating; and (c) an overall rating of what was learned (Appendix M). The scale on these three items ranged from 1 to 5 (1= Unacceptable, 2= Poor, 3= Average, 4= Good, and 5= Excellent). In addition, the reaction to training measure included items to assess subject attitudes toward what they learned. Items asked were, for example, "I feel that I learned many new things from this training workshop," "I was satisfied with this training workshop," and "I plan to use the techniques I learned from this training workshop to help me better apply my skills." The scale ranged from 1 to 5 (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree).
Acquisition of Knowledge (Learning) Measure

A brief quiz asked the subjects to list the learning points they remembered. This measure was to assess the subjects' mastery of learned material of the training workshop (Appendix N).

Transfer of Training Measure

A follow-up questionnaire was sent to each participant two to three weeks after the training workshop (Appendix O). Five areas were assessed on the transfer of training measure: (1) nature and extent of use, (2) attitudes toward utility (attempt to transfer), (3) opportunity to use, (4) reasons for not using, and (5) outcomes of efforts at application.

Questions in the first category, nature and extent of use, asked how frequently job, family, or professional situations required the respondents to give critical feedback, and to what extent respondents were familiar with the workshop content before they attended the training workshop. Attitudes toward utility, a second category, were to assess participants attitudes toward transfer of what was learned even though they might not have had a chance to use or apply what was learned yet. Items were, for example, "I feel that what I learned from the workshop is not practical to use in the "real" world," "The workshop has helped me learn skills and techniques that are very applicable in my current life," and "Being able to give feedback constructively is very important."

The third category assessed opportunity to use what was learned. It included items to report on situations when participants: (a) had an opportunity to use what was learned but did not use it, (b) had not had an opportunity to use and did not think they would use it, (c) had tried and had already quit, and (d) had used and would use again.
In addition, the questions asked the extent to which participants had actually tried the techniques learned from the training workshop. Fourteen usage instances and dimensions were stated. These included, for example, "During the feedback session, I am aware of my nonverbal behavior," "I explained the problem to the person whom I criticized without hostility," "I demonstrated that I understood the person’s feeling," and "I used the 'we' approach when discussing the person's problem." The scale of the extent of use measure ranged from 1 to 4 (1= Never, 2= Once, 3= A Few Times, and 4= A Great Number of Times).

Regarding obstacles to use, ten reasons preventing or limiting the participants from using what was learned from the training workshop were listed as choices on the instrument. These reasons were, for example, "work load," "lack of feedback from others," "lack of immediate incentives," "lack of support from others," and so forth. Respondents were to check as many reasons which applied to them. These ten reasons were developed based on a number of previous studies in transfer of training (i.e., Baumgartel & Jeanpierre, 1972; Broad, 1982; Georgenson, 1982; Leifer & Newstrom, 1980; Michalak, 1981) and responses from questionnaires sent to fifty students during a pilot test (see p. 48).

Finally, six-item statements focused on outcomes of efforts at application. Items were, for example, "My interpersonal relationships with my co-workers, friends, or family members have not changed as a result of using the skills or techniques I learned in the workshop," and "My interpersonal relationships with my co-workers, friends, or family members have become worse as a result of using the skills or techniques I learned in the workshop." The scale ranged from 1 to 5 (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree). The
final category in this transfer measure was based partly on Baumgartel and Jeanpierre's study (1972).

**Mediating Variables**

***Self-efficacy Measures***

The self-efficacy measures consisted of two parts (Appendix K). The first part was based on Bandura's conceptualization of self-efficacy (1982). It consisted of five scenario items. For each scenario, subjects were asked to check if they could provide effective performance feedback (strength; either 0 = no, or 1 = yes) and indicate how certain they were to give effective performance feedback (magnitude, the scale ranged from 0 = not certain at all to 100 = absolutely certain). For this first part of the self-efficacy measure (the five scenario items and the five magnitude items), means and standard deviations for all ten items for the entire group of 81 subjects (three subjects were eliminated as their responses were incomplete) were calculated. Based on these means and standard deviations, z-scores were calculated for each of the first five items, and each of the second five items, for each subject; z-scores were calculated in order to form a single part one efficacy score, and these two groups of items in part one employed a different response format. A composite part one efficacy score (as per Taylor, Locke, Lee, & Gist, 1984) was calculated for each of the 81 subjects by summing the ten z-scores across the five scenario items and the five magnitude items. Appendix R contains the z-scores for each subject.

The second part of this self-efficacy measures consisted of seven Likert-type items; for example, "I am confident in my ability to give effective negative performance feedback to others," "I feel certain that when I tell others what they are doing wrong, they feel motivated to improve," and "I think that my skill in giving
effective negative feedback could be improved substantially." The scale for this second part ranged from 1 to 5 (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree). This second part was adapted from Hollenbeck and Brief's study (1987).

**Motivation Measure**

The motivation measure consisted of six items and responses (Appendix L). The scale ranged from 1 to 5 (1= Strongly Agree, 2= Agree, 3= Neutral, 4= Disagree, and 5= Strongly Disagree). This scale was a reversed scale where 1 represented strongly agree and 5 represented strongly disagree. This measure was developed by Baldwin and Karl (1987) from previous motivation research (Noe, 1986; Ryman & Biesner, 1982, cited in Baldwin & Karl, 1987). Baldwin and Karl (1987) reported an internal consistency reliability of .83 (p=<.001).

Subjects were to complete these self-report questionnaires in three different time periods. First, a set of questionnaires including: (a) demographic data and general information, (b) manipulation check measure, (c) self-efficacy measures, parts one and two, and (d) motivation measure, were to be completed after the training preview and prior to the training workshop. Second, a workshop evaluation (reaction to training measure) and a brief quiz (learning measure) were to be completed after the training workshop. Finally, a follow-up questionnaire to assess subjects' transfer of training was sent to subjects two to three weeks following the training workshop. A deadline for returning the follow-up questionnaire was specified.
Development of Training Previews

The construction of the independent variable, the type of training preview, was based in part on a pilot study (Appendices A and B). Fifty questionnaires, with five items which asked about previous experiences in participating in training workshop(s), were sent to both undergraduate and graduate students. Thirty-four responses were from undergraduate students in the management department who attended a similar training workshop, "How to give constructive negative feedback." The rest were from other undergraduate and graduate students who had attended other but similar training sessions.

The questionnaire asked the respondents to list: (a) some difficulties they encountered in trying to learn the content of training, (b) some difficulties they encountered in trying to transfer what they learned in training to their jobs, (c) some strengths of the training they received, (d) some weaknesses of the training they received, and (e) things they wish they would have known about the training before they actually attended it.

Responses from these pilot tests were assessed and used in developing the realistic and optimistic training previews. Several revisions and changes were made based on comments and feedback from experts in organizational behavior, and training and development. In addition to the pilot test and comments from experts, both of the training previews in the present study were developed based on the "realistic" and "traditional" training preview of Hicks' (1983) and Hicks and Klimoski's (1987) studies on which the present study was based (see Chapter II for discussion of the realistic preview framework).
Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected in three different time periods: (1) after the training preview session and prior to the training workshop, (2) after the training workshop, and (3) two to three weeks after the training workshop. Incomplete questionnaires were discarded from data analysis. Subjects' names and information were kept confidential, as numbers and codes were used throughout the study in referring to them.

Scale reliabilities were assessed using Cronbach's alpha (1951). The manipulation check measure was assessed using t-tests for independent means. For hypotheses 1 to 5, t-tests for independent means and Pearson product-moment correlations were used.

Hypothesis 1 stated that the mean of the scores on the reaction to training measure, the mastery of learning measure, and the transfer of training measure of the subjects in the realistic training preview group would be greater than mean scores of the subjects in the optimistic training preview group. t-tests for independent means were employed to test for differences on: (1) reactions to training, (2) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (3) transfer of what was learned. Means and standard deviations for each variable were analyzed using a one-tailed test at an alpha level of .05.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 stated that the difference between means of the scores on the self-efficacy measures (for hypothesis 2) and the motivation measure (for hypothesis 3) of the subjects in the realistic training preview group and those scores of the subjects in the optimistic training preview group would be greater than zero. t-tests for independent means were performed for self-efficacy level scores (for hypothesis 2) and motivation level scores (for hypothesis 3), of both of the training
preview groups. Means and standard deviations for each variable were analyzed using a two-tailed test at an alpha level of .05.

Finally, hypotheses 4 and 5 stated that the Pearson product-moment correlations between the scores on the motivation measure (for hypothesis 4) and the self-efficacy measures (for hypothesis 5) of the subjects in both of the training preview groups and their: (a) reaction to training measure, (b) mastery of learning measure, and (c) transfer of training measure would be greater than zero. Pearson product-moment correlations were computed using motivation level scores (for hypothesis 4) and self-efficacy level scores (for hypothesis 5) and the three training outcome measure scores: (1) reactions to training, (2) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (3) transfer of what was learned. Significant tests used an alpha level of .05.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, findings of the study are described as follows: (a) the number of questionnaires returned, both immediately after the training workshop and two to three weeks after the training workshop, (b) scale reliabilities of variables, (c) manipulation checks for independent variables, and (d) testing of hypotheses. For hypotheses 1 to 3, tables of means and standard deviations of each variable, and tables of results from t-tests for independent means are presented. For hypotheses 4 and 5, tables of results from Pearson product-moment correlations are presented accordingly.

Questionnaire Return

Ninety-one people attended the training workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way." Of these 91 people, five did not complete either the informed consent or the questionnaires, and three people received only a partial training preview due to late arrival (more than five minutes after the training preview session began). Thus a total of 83 people completed the informed consent and the questionnaires after the training workshop. Of these 83 people, 41 (49.4%) were in the optimistic training preview group, and 42 (50.6%) were in the realistic training preview group.

Follow-up questionnaires were sent to the subjects who attended both the training preview and the training workshop, and completed the questionnaires of both sessions. A total of 73 questionnaires (87.95%) were returned. Of these returned questionnaires, 69 questionnaires (83.13%) were completed and were included in
further analysis. Of the completed questionnaires, 37 (53.62%) were from the subjects who were in the optimistic training preview group while the remaining 32 questionnaires (46.38%) were from the subjects in the realistic training preview group. Four of the subjects who did not return the follow-up questionnaires were from the optimistic training preview group and ten were from the realistic training preview group. For subjects in the optimistic training preview group who neither returned nor completed the follow-up questionnaires, two out of four had a job in the area of teaching. The remaining two subjects were not employed. On the other hand, for subjects in the realistic training preview group, five out of ten had a job in the following areas, teaching, training and development, food services, and finance. The remaining five subjects were not employed. Distribution of the number of questionnaires returned is portrayed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed both questionnaires, after the training preview and the training workshop</td>
<td>n = 41 (49.40%)</td>
<td>n = 42 (50.60%)</td>
<td>N = 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed the follow-up questionnaires</td>
<td>n = 37 (53.62%)</td>
<td>n = 32 (46.38%)</td>
<td>N = 69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scale Reliabilities

Reliability in this study was assessed using an "internal consistency" measure which calculates a reliability coefficient based on the average correlation among items within a test (Nunnally, 1978). The basic formula for estimating reliability based on internal consistency is coefficient alpha. A high internal consistency coefficient means that all items included in the measure share common variance, such that respondents tend to respond to one item similarly to the way they responded to another.

General Variables

The internal consistency coefficients for the manipulation check measure were as follows: .67, .88, and .75 for (a) knowledge about the training workshop prior to the training preview (item 5: a, b, and c), (b) knowledge about the training workshop after receiving the training preview (item 6: a, b, and c), and (c) change in knowledge (difference between items 5 and 6) respectively. The internal consistency coefficient for the subjects' expectation to learn and to increase feedback skills (items 7 and 8) was .80. Finally, the internal consistency coefficient for subjects' reactions to the training preview (items 9, 10 and 11) was .79. In summary, the internal consistency coefficients for general variables were relatively high, indicating a relatively high level of reliability.

Dependent Variables

Internal consistency coefficients for the reaction measure were calculated for three categories, (1) reactions to the training workshop design (item 1: a, b, c, d, and e), (2) reactions to the training workshop instructor (item 2: a, b, c, d, and e), and (3)
reactions to what was learned (items 6, 7, and 9). These coefficients were: .89, .91, and .84, respectively. The internal consistency coefficient for the learning measure was .54. This indicates that items on this measure were somewhat independent, which may indicate that different respondents learned different parts of the content, but few respondents reported learning it all. Internal consistency coefficients for the transfer of training measure, were assessed in four areas, (1) attitude toward utility (items 3 to 9), (2) opportunity to use what was learned (items 13 and 15), (3) techniques used (items 17.1 to 17.14), and (4) outcomes of the effort at application (items 19 to 24). The coefficients were: .74, .70, .78, and .74, respectively.

**Mediating Variables**

Since the items relating to the strength and magnitude dimensions of self-efficacy (Part One) were highly correlated (r= .64, p<.001), all ten items were standardized to eliminate differences in response format and summed to form a single measure of self-efficacy. Cronbach's alpha for the 7-item Likert-type measure of self-efficacy, Part two, was .83. The internal consistency coefficient for the motivation measure (items 1 to 6) was .94.

**Manipulation Checks for the Training Previews**

The purpose of the manipulation checks was to assess whether the manipulations (the training previews) functioned in the way they were intended. It was expected that: (a) subjects in one of the training preview groups would acquire more knowledge about the events that would occur during the training workshop than subjects in the other training preview group, (b) subjects in the realistic training preview group would have more knowledge about the training workshop (i.e.,
knowledge about its objectives, content, and opportunity to apply what was learned to their job) than subjects in the optimistic training preview group, and (c) the optimistic training preview would promote the training workshop in a more positive way than the realistic training preview.

The manipulation check measure (Appendix J) contained two parts. Part one consisted of four statements (items 1 to 4) which asked whether the subjects knew that the events listed in each item would occur in the training workshop. The scale ranged from 1 to 3 (1= I know this event will occur in this workshop, 2= I know this event will not occur in this workshop, and 3=Don't know). Part two consisted of seven Likert-type statements (items 5 to 11) which assessed: (a) the subjects' attitudes toward the training preview session they received, and (b) the difference between the subjects' pre-preview knowledge and post-preview knowledge (i.e., knowledge about the training workshop: its objectives, content, and opportunity to apply what was learned to the job).

To calculate the first part of the manipulation check score (subjects' knowledge about the events that would occur during the training workshop), two points were awarded for each correct answer, one point was awarded for a "don't know," and zero points were awarded for an incorrect answer.

A t-test for independent means was performed using the means of total scores of the first part of the manipulation check measure of the two training preview groups as the dependent variable. This part of the manipulation check measure focused on whether subjects knew about events that would occur during the training workshop. (See Table 2). A statistically significant difference was found between the scores of the subjects in the optimistic training preview group and those in the realistic training preview group concerning their knowledge about the events that would occur (p=
the optimistic training preview group scored higher than the realistic training preview group (means = 6.537 and 5.738, respectively).

With regard to whether the subjects in the realistic training preview group had more knowledge about the objectives, content, and opportunity to apply what was learned to their job than subjects in the optimistic training preview group, a statistically significant difference was not found (p = .404, alpha = .05). (See Table 2). In other words, there was no difference between the extent to which subjects in one group knew more about the training workshop after receiving the training preview than subjects in the other group.

With regard to whether the training previews promoted the training workshop in a positive way, a difference was not found (p = .085, alpha = .05). The optimistic training preview group scored slightly higher than the realistic training preview group (means of 3.854 and 3.405, respectively).

Additionally, there was a high correlation between the last two item statements (items 10 and 11) of the manipulation check measure: the importance of the information received during the training preview, and whether the training preview promoted the training workshop in a positive way (r = .724, p < .05). Item 10 asked “The information I received during the small group discussion was important to know before attending the training workshop,” and item 11 asked “The information I received during the small group discussion promoted the training workshop in a very positive way.” This finding indicates that subjects who felt that the information from the training preview was important to know before attending the training workshop also felt that the training preview promoted the training workshop in a positive way. Means and standard deviations for each item of the manipulation check measure are portrayed in Table 2.
Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Manipulation Check Measure for Each Training Preview Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manipulation Checks</th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview (n= 41)</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview (n= 42)</th>
<th>Prob. (2-tail) (N= 83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total scores of correct answers of 4 items on event occurrence</td>
<td>Mean= 6.537 (SD)= 1.206</td>
<td>Mean= 5.738 (SD)= 1.014</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0 to 8 range, where 8 was a perfect score)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge about the workshop prior to the training preview</td>
<td>Mean= 7.927 (SD)= 2.381</td>
<td>Mean= 8.333 (SD)= 2.103</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 to 15 range, where 15 was a perfect score)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowledge about the workshop after the training preview</td>
<td>Mean= 10.512 (SD)= 3.034</td>
<td>Mean= 9.976 (SD)= 2.780</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 to 15 range, where 15 was a perfect score)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enthusiasm of the training preview leader about the training workshop</td>
<td>Mean= 4.220 (SD)= 1.013</td>
<td>Mean= 4.024 (SD)= .950</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Not at all, 5= A Great Deal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Importance of the information during the training preview session</td>
<td>Mean= 3.317 (SD)= 1.254</td>
<td>Mean= 3.238 (SD)= 1.100</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Not at all, 5= A Great Deal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Training preview promoted the training workshop in a positive way</td>
<td>Mean= 3.854 (SD)= 1.131</td>
<td>Mean= 3.405 (SD)= 1.211</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1= Not at all, 5= A Great Deal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, analysis of the manipulation check measure showed that both the optimistic training preview and realistic training preview were only partially successful in achieving the desired outcomes. First, a significant difference was found between the subjects in the optimistic training preview group and those in the realistic training preview group concerning their knowledge about the events that would occur during the training workshop. Subjects in the optimistic training preview...
group had more accurate knowledge about the events that would occur during the training workshop than those in the realistic training preview group. This finding, of course, was the opposite of that predicted. Second, no significant difference in knowledge was found between the two training preview groups (i.e., knowledge about the training workshop: its objectives, content, and opportunity to apply what was learned to their job both before and after the training preview session). Finally, no differences were found between the subjects in the optimistic training preview group and the subjects in the realistic training preview group with respect to how they felt that the training preview they received promoted the training workshop. However, the optimistic training preview group tended to view the preview slightly more positive than the realistic training preview group which was the expected direction.

It was hypothesized (as discussed in Chapter II) that a realistic training preview would have a positive impact on the following variables: (a) subjects' reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training. This hypothesis was based, of course, on the assumption that the training previews could function as expected and designed. However, analysis of the manipulation check measure indicated that the training preview treatments did not appear to function as planned, indicating the reverse of the effects expected. The only way in which the training previews can be construed to have functioned as planned is to note that the optimistic training preview group tended to report a slightly more favorable attitude toward the training workshop, though this difference (see item 6, Table 2) was not significant. And, subjects in the optimistic training preview group reported more knowledge about the training workshop than those in the realistic training preview. Speculation about why this may have happened, and its possible
impact on failure to discover expected results on other hypotheses, are discussed in Chapter V.

Testing of Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 predicted that subjects who received a realistic training preview prior to the training workshop would have more positive reactions to the training workshop, would acquire more knowledge from the training workshop, and would use or apply what they learned from the training workshop more than subjects who received an optimistic training preview. To test this hypothesis, the mean scores for each of the training preview groups on measures of: (a) reactions to training workshop, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training were compared, using a t-test for independent means.

**Reactions to Training Workshop**

Subjects' reactions to the training workshop (Appendix M) were assessed on seven items: (1) workshop design (item 1), (2) instructor evaluation (item 2), (3) overall rating of what was learned (item 3), (4) new things learned (item 6), (5) useful things learned (item 7), (6) satisfaction with the training workshop (item 9), and (7) plan to use what was learned (item 10).

No statistically significant differences were found between the two training preview groups on any of the seven items of the reaction to training measure. The probabilities, means, and standard deviations for each item of the reaction to training measure of all subjects are portrayed in Table 3.
Table 3
Probabilities, Means, and Standard Deviations for Type of Training Preview and Reaction to Training Measure of All Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions to Training</th>
<th>Prob. (1-tail)</th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>(n= 83)</td>
<td>(n= 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshop Design</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>Mean= 20.415 (SD)= 3.016</td>
<td>Mean= 18.595 (SD)= 3.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>Mean= 21.488 (SD)= 3.075</td>
<td>Mean= 18.595 (SD)= 3.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall Rating</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>Mean= 3.488 (SD)= 1.434</td>
<td>Mean= 3.643 (SD)= .958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Things Learned</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>Mean= 3.415 (SD)= 1.117</td>
<td>Mean= 3.214 (SD)= 1.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Useful Things Learned</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>Mean= 3.878 (SD)= .812</td>
<td>Mean= 3.738 (SD)= 1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfaction With the Training Workshop</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>Mean= 3.854 (SD)= .760</td>
<td>Mean= 3.571 (SD)= 1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Plan to Use What Was Learned</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>Mean= 4.244 (SD)= .767</td>
<td>Mean= 3.905 (SD)= .878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the graduate students in the study population, being older and employed might be more representative of a typical business training populations, data for just the graduate students were analyzed separately. When the data for only graduate student subjects (N= 62) were compared (by disregarding the data of undergraduate student subjects) using a t-test for independent means, no statistically significant difference was found between the two training preview groups in any of the individual seven items. Again, no support for the hypothesis was found. As can be seen in Table 4, all differences tended to be in the opposite direction from what was predicted. The probabilities, means, and standard deviations for each item of the
reaction to training measure of only graduate student subjects are portrayed in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to Training Measure</th>
<th>Prob. (1-tail)</th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview (N= 62)</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview (n= 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshop Design</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Mean= 20.450 (SD)= 3.046</td>
<td>Mean= 16.909 (SD)= 3.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>Mean= 21.400 (SD)= 3.062</td>
<td>Mean= 19.727 (SD)= 4.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall Rating</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>Mean= 3.500 (SD)= 1.450</td>
<td>Mean= 3.273 (SD)= 1.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Things Learned</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>Mean= 3.450 (SD)= 1.108</td>
<td>Mean= 2.864 (SD)= 1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Useful Things Learned</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>Mean= 3.900 (SD)= .810</td>
<td>Mean= 3.364 (SD)= 1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfaction With the</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>Mean= 3.850 (SD)= .770</td>
<td>Mean= 3.136 (SD)= 1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Plan to Use What Was</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>Mean= 4.275 (SD)= .751</td>
<td>Mean= 3.727 (SD)= .985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis that the mean of the scores on the reaction to training measure of the subjects in the realistic training preview group would be higher than those scores of the subjects in the optimistic training preview group was not supported. In summary, no statistically significant difference was found between the two training preview groups on any of the seven items of the reaction to training measure.
**Acquisition of Knowledge (Learning)**

For the acquisition of knowledge (learning) measure, a quiz asking the subjects to list as many of the learning points (the Do's and Don'ts) that they could remember was given to the subjects immediately after the training workshop (Appendix N). One point was awarded for each correct response. The highest possible total score for all correct answers was 17 points.

A t-test for independent means was performed comparing mean scores on the learning quiz of the two training preview groups. No statistically significant difference was found ($p= .858$). The hypothesis stating that the subjects who received a realistic training preview prior to the training workshop would acquire more knowledge from the training workshop than the subjects who received an optimistic training preview prior to the training workshop was not supported. Subjects in both of the training preview groups scored almost the same on the learning measure. Probability, means, and standard deviations of the learning measure are portrayed in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probability, Means, and Standard Deviations of Learning Measure of Each Training Preview Group</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Measure</th>
<th>Prob. (1-tail) ($N= 83$)</th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview ($n= 41$)</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview ($n= 42$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiz of Learning Points</td>
<td>$p= .858$</td>
<td>Mean= 8.951 (SD)= 2.792</td>
<td>Mean= 8.595 (SD)= 2.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transfer of Training

The last dependent variable for hypothesis 1 was transfer of training, which was assessed on four dimensions in the transfer of training measure (Appendix O). These four dimensions were: (1) attitude toward utility or attempt to transfer (items 3 to 9), (2) opportunity to use what was learned (items 10 to 16), (3) techniques actually used (items 17.1 to 17.14), and (4) outcomes of the effort at application (items 19 to 24). For the "opportunity to use what was learned," the internal consistency coefficient was low (alpha = .36). This low internal consistency coefficient may be due to the fact that some items in this area might have been unclear to the subjects, particularly those items that contained two conditions in one item statement. For example, "I have had an opportunity to use what I learned from the workshop, but I didn't use it (item 10)," and "I have not had an opportunity to use what I learned from the training workshop, and I don't think I will use it (item 12)." Because of this low coefficient, the researcher eliminated five probably unclear items from the "opportunity to use what was learned" section during analysis. Out of the seven items in this section, only two items were analyzed further: "I have already tried some techniques I learned from the workshop (item 13)," and "I have used what I learned from the workshop once, and I will try to use it again (item 15)." The internal consistency coefficient of these two items was .70.

No statistically significant differences were found between the two training preview groups in any of the four areas. The hypothesis stating that the subjects who received a realistic training preview prior to the training workshop would use or apply what they learned from the training workshop to their job or other situations more than the subjects who received an optimistic training preview was not supported.
Probabilities, means, and standard deviations of the transfer of training measure are portrayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Probabilities, Means, and Standard Deviations of Transfer of Training Measure of Each Training Preview Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer of Training Measure</th>
<th>Prob. (1-tail)</th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview (n= 35 to 37)</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview (n= 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude Toward Utility</td>
<td>p=.982</td>
<td>Mean= 28.135 (SD)= 3.155</td>
<td>Mean= 26.531 (SD)= 3.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opportunity to Use</td>
<td>p=.974</td>
<td>Mean= 7.216 (SD)= 1.493</td>
<td>Mean= 6.469 (SD)= 1.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Techniques Used</td>
<td>p=.193</td>
<td>Mean= 43.429 (SD)= 6.976</td>
<td>Mean= 44.812 (SD)= 5.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outcomes of the Effort</td>
<td>p=.767</td>
<td>Mean= 20.917 (SD)= 2.882</td>
<td>Mean= 20.375 (SD)= 3.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that there would be a relationship between the type of training preview received by the subjects prior to the training workshop and their self-efficacy level. To test this hypothesis, the mean scores for each of the training preview groups on measures of self-efficacy were compared, using $t$-tests for independent means.

For the first self-efficacy measure, all ten items were changed to $z$-scores to eliminate differences in response format and summed to form a single measure of
self-efficacy. The sum of the z-scores for all ten items ranged from -20.4 to +7.79 (See Appendix R).

No significant difference was found between the two training preview groups for either one of the two self-efficacy measures ($p = .81$ and $p = .809$ for part one and two, respectively). The hypothesis that there would be a relationship between the type of training preview received by the subjects prior to the training workshop and their self-efficacy was not supported. In other words, subjects in both groups scored about the same in both parts of the self-efficacy measures. Probabilities, means, and standard deviations of the type of training preview and self-efficacy measures are portrayed in Table 7.

Table 7

Probabilities, Means, and Standard Deviations of Self-efficacy Measures of Each Training Preview Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-efficacy Measures</th>
<th>Prob. (2-tail)</th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N= 81 to 83)</td>
<td>(n= 40 to 41)</td>
<td>(n= 41 to 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-efficacy, Part One</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Mean= -0.15 (SD)= 6.64</td>
<td>Mean= 0.15 (SD)= 4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-efficacy, Part Two</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>Mean= 20.049 (SD)= 4.868</td>
<td>Mean= 20.286 (SD)= 3.996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that there would be a relationship between the type of training preview received by the subjects prior to the training workshop and their motivation level. To test this hypothesis, the mean scores for each of the training
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preview groups on measure of motivation level were compared, using a t-test for independent means.

A statistically significant difference was found between the motivation measure of the two training preview groups ($p = .0002$). The optimistic training preview group scored higher on the motivation measure than the realistic training preview group. The hypothesis that the difference between means of the scores on the motivation measure of the subjects in the realistic training preview group and the mean scores of subjects in the optimistic training preview groups would be greater than zero was supported. Probability, means, and standard deviations of the type of training preview and the motivation measure are portrayed in Table 8.

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview ($n=41$)</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview ($n=42$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation Measure</strong></td>
<td>$p = .0002^*$</td>
<td>$\text{Mean} = 20.829$ (SD) = 6.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant at $p &lt; .05$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4 predicted that there would be a positive relationship between motivation to learn and training outcomes. This hypothesis had three sub-parts. Subjects who had a high level of motivation would: (a) react more positively to the training workshop, (b) would acquire more knowledge from the training workshop,
and (c) would use or apply what was learned from the training workshop to their job or other situations than subjects who had a low level of motivation.

To test this hypothesis, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed using motivation level and three training outcome variables: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training. Each dependent variable was divided into several areas (Table 9) in a fashion similar to the training workshop outcomes analyzed in hypothesis 1.

The correlation between the subjects' level of motivation and the "workshop design" item of the reaction to training measure was significant \((r = .276, p < .05)\). The data showed that the subjects who had high motivation tended to rate the "workshop design" item high and those who had low motivation tended to rate the "workshop design" item low. Correlations found in other variables of the training outcome measure were weak. The hypothesis that subjects who had a high level of motivation would react more positively to the training workshop, would acquire more knowledge from the training workshop, and would use or apply more of what they learned to their job or other situations than subjects who had a low level of motivation was not supported, except for the one item noted above. The data showed no correlations between the subjects' motivation level and their reactions to training, acquisition of knowledge, and transfer of training. Correlations between and probabilities of motivation level and each of the training outcome measures are portrayed in Table 9.
Table 9
Correlations Between and Probabilities of Motivation Level and Training Outcome Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Prob. (1-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaction to Training Measure (N= 83)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshop Design</td>
<td>$r= .276^*$</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td>$r= .137$</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall Rating</td>
<td>$r= -.017$</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Things Learned</td>
<td>$r= .069$</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Useful Things Learned</td>
<td>$r= .138$</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfaction With the Training Workshop</td>
<td>$r= .104$</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Plan to Use What Was Learned</td>
<td>$r= .128$</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Measure (N= 81)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz of Learning Points</td>
<td>$r= -.112$</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer of Training Measure (N= 67 to 69)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude Toward Utility</td>
<td>$r= .107$</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opportunity to Use</td>
<td>$r= -.042$</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Techniques Used</td>
<td>$r= -.108$</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outcomes of the Effort</td>
<td>$r= .090$</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p < .05$
Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 predicted that subjects who had high self-efficacy would react more positively to the training workshop, would acquire more knowledge from the training workshop, and would use or apply more of what they learned from the training workshop to their job or other situations than subjects who had low self-efficacy.

Similar to hypothesis 4, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed using self-efficacy and three training outcome variables: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training.

All correlations were very weak. Thus hypothesis 5 was not supported. In other words, there were no significant correlations between the subjects' self-efficacy level and the three training outcomes, except for items 3 "technique used" in the transfer of training measure. (See Table 10). Correlations between and probabilities of self-efficacy level and each of the training outcome measures are portrayed in Table 10.
Table 10
Correlations Between and Probabilities of Self-efficacy Level and Training Outcome Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Self-efficacy Measures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One (1-tail)</td>
<td>Two (1-tail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to Training Measure (N= 81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshop Design</td>
<td>$r = .042$</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>$r = -.150$</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td>$r = .021$</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>$r = -.176$</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall Rating</td>
<td>$r = .012$</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>$r = -.057$</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Things Learned</td>
<td>$r = -.211$</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>$r = -.266$</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Useful Things Learned</td>
<td>$r = -.131$</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>$r = -.163$</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfaction With the Training Workshop</td>
<td>$r = .060$</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>$r = -.168$</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Plan to Use What Was Learned</td>
<td>$r = .126$</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>$r = -.184$</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Measure (N= 81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz of Learning Points</td>
<td>$r = .051$</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>$r = .059$</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Training Measure (N= 67 to 69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude toward Utility</td>
<td>$r = .009$</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>$r = .051$</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Opportunity to Use</td>
<td>$r = .056$</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>$r = .008$</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Techniques Used</td>
<td>$r = .209^*$</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>$r = .045$</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outcomes of the Effort</td>
<td>$r = -.005$</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>$r = .013$</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p < .05$
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Reasons Preventing or Limiting the Subjects From Applying What Was Learned

This section asked respondents to indicate which, if any, factors had prevented them from using what they learned after the training workshop. In this section, the subjects could check as many items that applied to them. Out of 68 subjects who completed the follow-up questionnaire, 41 subjects (60.3%) reported that nothing had prevented them from applying what was learned. Two items that were rated the highest among the reasons preventing or limiting the subjects from applying what was learned were "work load" and "no opportunity to use" (25%, n= 17, and 19.12% n= 13, respectively). Subjects in the optimistic training preview group rated higher than those in the realistic training preview group in two items, "nothing has prevented the subjects from applying" (item 1), and "lack of feedback from others" (item 3). On the other hand, subjects in the realistic training preview group rated higher than those in the optimistic training preview group in two items, "work load" (item 2), and "a little too afraid to try" (item 10). No differences were found between the two groups for the remaining items (items 4 to 9) of this measure. Percentages of reasons preventing or limiting the subjects from applying what was learned are portrayed in Table 11.
Table 11
Percentages of Reasons Preventing or Limiting the Subjects From Applying What Was Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Optimistic Training Preview (n=36)</th>
<th>Realistic Training Preview (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nothing has prevented the subjects from applying</td>
<td>60.30 (N=41)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work load</td>
<td>25.00 (N=17)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of feedback from others</td>
<td>8.82 (N=6)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of immediate incentives</td>
<td>8.82 (N=6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No opportunity to use</td>
<td>19.12 (N=13)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not feel can do it yet</td>
<td>2.94 (N=2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Received negative consequences</td>
<td>2.94 (N=2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of support from others</td>
<td>5.88 (N=4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Waiting for a less threatening opportunity</td>
<td>8.82 (N=6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A little too afraid to try</td>
<td>8.82 (N=6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The skills are too difficult to use</td>
<td>0.00 (N=0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

In conclusion, no difference was found in the expected direction between the two training preview groups with respect to the three training outcomes: (a) positive reactions to the training workshop, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of what was learned to the job or other situations (hypothesis 1). A relationship between the type of training preview presented and the subjects' self-
efficacy was not found (hypothesis 2). A difference was found between the type of training preview and subjects' motivation level (hypothesis 3). The data showed that subjects in the optimistic training preview group reported a higher motivation level than those in the realistic training preview group. Finally, no relationship was found between the subjects' motivation or self-efficacy and the three training outcomes: (1) reactions to training, (2) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (3) transfer of training (hypotheses 4 and 5).
The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of a "realistic" training preview on subsequent transfer of training. The primary objective was to assess the impact of a realistic training preview on: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training. A secondary objective was to investigate the relationship between a realistic training preview and self-efficacy and motivation. Another secondary objective was to investigate the extent to which self-efficacy and motivation were related to training outcomes: (a) reactions to training, (b) acquisition of knowledge (learning), and (c) transfer of training. This chapter includes a discussion of the results of the study, its limitations, and suggestions for further research.

Overall, because of the lack of support for the hypotheses in this study, it is not possible to draw reliable conclusions about differences between the training previews or their impact.

There are two general explanations or directions for interpretation that could be pursued. First, it could be possible that the training previews both functioned fully as intended, but that some inexplicable errors in measurement masked differences that were really there. Given the scope of measures taken, this explanation is unlikely.

It is more likely that the training previews themselves, for a variety of reasons to be discussed in this chapter, simply did not work as expected. Analyses of the transcripts of the two training previews indicate that (a) the realistic training preview was probably more negative than intended, and (b) that the optimistic training
preview did not contain all of the information that it should have. These differences will, likewise, be further discussed.

Immediate Results of the Training Previews

The study included a brief assessment of the immediate impact of the training previews. This "manipulation check" measure consisted of several questionnaire items that were completed by respondents at the end of the training preview session and prior to the training workshop. Both the realistic and optimistic training previews were shown to be moderately successful in providing additional information about the training workshop to subjects.

Comparisons were made between the two training preview groups on the amount of knowledge acquired about the training workshop: its objectives, content, and opportunity to apply what was learned to the job. As was seen in the previous chapter, there was no support for the hypothesis that the realistic training preview impacted the subjects' knowledge about the objectives, content, or opportunity to apply what was learned to the job. When the transcripts of the training previews were compared (Appendices D and F), the optimistic training preview consisted of less information than the realistic training preview. Although the length of time of both of the training preview sessions was equal, twenty minutes, the time was allocated differently within each of the training previews.

In the optimistic training preview group, about ten minutes were spent in having subjects introduce each other. The remaining ten minutes were spent in discussing the training workshop and explaining the questionnaires to be completed by subjects before they left the room to attend the training workshop in the lecture room across the hall from the training preview room. In the realistic training preview,
on the other hand, fully twenty minutes were spent in discussion about the training workshop and its transferability.

Despite the fact that the realistic training preview included much more information than the optimistic training preview, subjects in the optimistic training preview group reported higher acquisition of knowledge of descriptive information about the training workshop than subjects in the realistic training preview group. This, of course, was not expected. Further, subjects in the optimistic training preview group reported they felt that the training preview they received promoted the training workshop in a more positive way than was reported by subjects in the realistic training preview group. A statistically significant difference was found in the mean score of the item "training preview promoted the training workshop in a positive way" (means= 3.854 and 3.405, respectively).

The finding that subjects in the optimistic training preview group had a higher mean score on knowledge about "events that would occur in the training workshop" (the first part of the manipulation check measure) than subjects in the realistic training preview might be due to the fact that the presentation provided to subjects in the realistic training preview group was comparatively long and complex. Thus, subjects in the realistic training preview group might more easily forget or become confused about the information they received during the training preview session. Further, the focus of the realistic training preview was on transfer and learning issues, versus descriptive content about the session. This finding, and the content of the transcripts, supports the contention that the "optimistic" training preview delivered was probably not the optimistic preview that was intended.

In summary, the manipulation check measure (assessing what participants "learned" about what was going to occur during the training workshop) indicated that
the optimistic training preview group knew more about what was going to happen during the training workshop, and might have been slightly more favorably disposed toward it than the realistic training preview group. However, these differences were slight. Immediately prior to receiving the training workshop itself, it appears that the two training preview groups were not substantially different in their disposition toward the training workshop. If the training previews had operated as expected, the realistic training preview group should have felt more informed about what sorts of activities, issues, and results the training workshop would deliver.

Impact of the Training Previews

A number of statistical comparisons were made between the dependent variables of the two training preview groups. These comparisons generally failed to indicate that providing a realistic training preview resulted in: (a) more positive reactions to training, (b) acquisition of more knowledge (learning), or (c) greater transfer of what was learned from the training workshop to their job or other situations than providing an optimistic training preview. In fact, a slight trend was evident in favor of the optimistic training preview.

With regard to reactions to training, the optimistic training preview group had slightly higher means on six out of seven items from the reaction to training measure than the realistic training preview group. In addition, when means of only graduate student subjects were examined, the optimistic training preview group scores produced higher means in all of the seven items of the reaction to training measure than the means for the realistic training preview group. Both these analyses of the reaction measure data suggest that the optimistic training preview resulted in slightly more favorable dispositions to training. Because the research design was seeking
evidence to test the efficacy of the realistic training preview (not the optimistic), these tentative conclusions are very speculative.

Thus, immediately after the training session, it appears that the optimistic training preview group was slightly more favorably disposed toward the training session they received. However, as noted earlier, prior to the training workshop, but immediately after the training preview session, the two groups were almost equally favorably disposed. While the two reaction measures (after the training preview session but before the training workshop, and after the training workshop) were not identical, and thus cannot be exactly compared, it is possible that the optimistic training preview, when combined with the training workshop, had some impact, creating slightly more favorable reactions to the training workshop. This result, of course, is not what was predicted, and is highly speculative.

With regard to acquisition of knowledge (learning), the data showed no statistically significant difference between the two training preview groups in learning quiz scores. With regard to transfer of training, again, no differences were found.

Hicks and Klimoski (1987) predicted that employees who received a realistic training preview, including a number of both neutral and unfavorable statements instead of a brief overly positive traditional announcement, should have gained more from a training experience. Nevertheless, both the results of their study and the present study failed to produce these results. In Hicks and Klimoski's study (1987), the data showed no differences between the types of previews given on any of the learning measures: (a) achievement test, (b) role-play measure of learning, and (c) self-report ratings of what was learned. Similarly, in the present study, differences between the realistic training preview and subjects' reactions to training, acquisition of knowledge (learning), and subsequent transfer of training were not found.
Possible Reasons for Lack of Impact

Failures to find differences between the realistic training preview presented and the three training outcomes might be due to several reasons. The three most likely reasons are: (1) lack of meaningful consequences for learned behavior, (2) lack of a need for the training, and (3) the nature of the training preview and the training workshop. These potential reasons for lack of predicted results will be discussed in some detail. First, however, it is useful to consider some inherent limitations in the research methodology, to review the precautions that were taken in this study to avoid biases.

The problem of hypothesis guessing (Cook & Campbell, 1979) that occurs when subjects know that they are part of a research study and may respond to questionnaires in a way to please the researcher was partially ruled out by limited knowledge of subjects about the training preview session. Prior to coming to the training workshop, the subjects did not know that there would be a training preview session. When the subjects arrived at the training workshop site, they were told only that there would be a small group discussion about the training workshop prior to the training workshop that they were about to receive. They were told that, because there were many people who signed up to attend the training workshop, they would be divided into two small groups. After the small group discussion, they would come to a specified lecture room for the training workshop. This step was designed to limit the amount of discussion by the subjects about the study and the content of the training preview which was different in each group. While steps were taken to reduce hypothesis guessing (Cook & Campbell, 1979) of the subjects, it was possible that during the two to three weeks before the follow-up questionnaires were sent to the subjects, they might have discussed the content of the training preview with subjects.
in the other group. As a consequence, some of them might learn that the content of the training preview they received was different from that of the subjects in the other group and this could affect the results of the study. Given, however, that the subjects in the study are not together frequently, and because much of the measurement occurred immediately after the training workshop, hypothesis-guessing is probably not a significant factor.

Self-report questionnaires were the only means of measurement in the present study. Although surveys or self-report questionnaires are the most widely used techniques in education and behavioral sciences for data collection (Isaac & Michael, 1989), there are many limitations to this type of measurement. For example, there is a tendency for respondents to respond differently from reality; some respondents might over-rate or under-rate the questions asked, and some respondents might not fully understand the questions asked.

The self-report questionnaires in this study, however, were relatively simple and straightforward, and respondents were well educated and familiar with such instruments. Further, there were no apparent reasons for respondents to not respond truthfully. Thus, it is unlikely that inherent problems with self-report measures was a factor in the failure to observe predicted differences between the training preview groups.

The failure to observe predicted differences is most likely due to more basic problems and conditions in this particular study. As noted earlier, there are three major issues to be considered. First, there was no support system in place to nurture and reward transfer (usage) of training. Secondly, subjects had no pressing need to use the training. Finally, both the training previews, and especially the training
workshop itself, were relatively weak and marginal interventions. Each of these will be discussed in further detail.

Conditions that trainees encounter after training are known to have a major impact in whether training outcomes endure, or are used. These conditions are, for example, support and involvement from supervisors, reinforcement for behavior change, and feedback on specific performance. In the present study, none of these conditions were available to subjects. In other words, there were no meaningful consequences for how well the subjects did on the mastery of learning measure or for their usage when they returned to their jobs.

In the present study, there was no training needs analysis to assess whether the subjects really needed or could benefit from the training workshop. A training needs assessment is one of the most important tasks to be conducted prior to the development of any training program (Brinkerhoff, 1987; Goldstein, 1986; McGeehee & Thayer, 1961; Wexley & Latham, 1981). Without a training needs assessment to ensure that the particular training workshop was needed for the subjects who attended the training workshop, it is difficult to conclude that the type of training preview provided failed to have an impact on the subjects' reactions to training, acquisition of knowledge (learning), and transfer of training. That is, if trainees do not need to use a skill in the first place, there is little that can be done during or before training that will influence transfer.

The subjects who attended the training workshop might have attended the training workshop for any number of reasons, such as to learn new knowledge that might be useful to them, to have something to do when their regular classes dismissed early, or to be a part of the research. Or, the subjects might have attended the training workshop mainly for their longer range self development, not having any intention to
use what they learned in the near future. The "real" needs for participation, and transferability of what was learned were not identified. However, it is likely that a pressing need for the training workshop was not the major reason for the subjects' attendance.

Further, the follow-up period that questionnaires were sent to subjects was relatively short. According to Warren (1979), "Ideally, sufficient time should have elapsed between the completion of training and performance evaluation to have established the trained behaviors as a normal part of the trainee's on-the-job behavior" (p.147). There is some possibility that subjects might have actually used what they learned from the training workshop, had the follow-up questionnaires been sent to them in a later time period. However, the more likely explanation of why subjects did not report much usage is that they neither felt it a real need to use the content, nor received any support or reward for using it.

The third issue has to do with the strength of both the training preview sessions and the training workshop itself. The two training previews were probably too marginal to actually "prepare" subjects in learning and transfer of the workshop content. Each of the training previews lasted only twenty minutes. Further, in the optimistic training preview, ten minutes were spent in having subjects introduce each other, and the remaining time was spent in discussion about the training workshop and explanation of research questionnaires to be completed by subjects. The review of the detailed transcript of the optimistic training preview showed that the information included in the optimistic training preview was much more brief than was intended. When compared with the optimistic training preview, the realistic training preview was relatively longer and more complex. Neither training preview, however,
was probably long enough, nor did either permit the sort of interaction and discussion that could truly impact attitudes toward usage of the training content.

The training workshop itself was also marginal. The schedule and length of training workshop could limit the amount of content learned. The training workshop was conducted in the evening, from 7:30 PM to 9:00 PM. This time period, when people are tired from a full day's work, is not optimal for learning. More significantly, the period of time of the training workshop was very brief, one and a half hours. There was much information to be included in a brief time period. Without much opportunity to practice what was learned, it is unlikely that subjects would be able to perform the skills covered in the training workshop. By providing more time during the training workshop for subjects to practice and master the training workshop content, it is more likely that they would have eventually used what they learned.

Further Limitations of the Study

Both the characteristics of subjects and the setting were limited to what would normally be found on a college campus, versus a typical work setting. Subjects in the study were mostly students recruited from different classes in different departments at Western Michigan University, and the training workshop was conducted in a lecture room on this campus. Although the subjects were students recruited from different classes in different departments, of the total of 83 subjects, 64 (77.11%) had a job. Though the types of jobs reported by subjects varied considerably, most were professional positions (for example, training and development, finance, research, teaching, personnel, school administrator, and health care), requiring much interaction with others. In addition, the questions which asked about the extent to which they...
used what they learned were not limited only to their job, but asked about transferring what was learned to other situations as well.

For the motivation variable, Hicks (1983) found only a slight degree of association between motivation to learn and the three overall measures of learning used in that study: achievement test, role-play measure of learning, and self-report of what was learned. In the present study, failure to find a relationship between subjects' motivation level and training outcomes might be due to a limitation of the motivation measure which only measured motivation to learn and not motivation to transfer (Appendix L). Moreover, the scale used in the motivation measure of the present study was a reversed scale. The degrees of agreement or disagreement of respondents and the number that corresponded with the specified degrees were opposite to those used in the other items of the previous questionnaires. In earlier questionnaires that the subjects had to complete, the scale of those questionnaires ranged from 1 to 5, where 1 represented "Strongly Disagree," and 5 represented "Strongly Agree." In the motivation measure, however, 1 represented "Strongly Agree," and 5 represented "Strongly Disagree." It was possible that some subjects misunderstood the scale by overlooking the instructions for the motivation measure, and thus that motivation scores were not reliable.

**Future Research**

The present study failed to demonstrate that a realistic training preview has an impact on the subjects' reactions to training, acquisition of knowledge (learning), and transfer of training. However, several problems with the research setting, and the nature of the training previews and the training workshop were identified and discussed. Given that there were problems (as noted) that limited both the potential
efficacy of the realistic training preview and the training workshop itself, this study cannot be considered a definitive nor conclusive test as to whether a realistic training preview has promise as an intervention that can impact training transfer. Further research should probably be conducted, and should seek to establish the following conditions: (a) a more realistic and potent training workshop, (b) a more thorough training preview, (c) evidence of a need for training, (d) more thorough research instruments, and (e) alternative sequences of training previews.

The training workshop to be used in future research should include clear and specific objectives in order to bring about new skills, knowledge, or attitudes. The new behavior or changes must be observable and measurable, and should be directly related to job requirements. In other words, the training workshop should provide sufficient instruction and feedback to ensure that a truly needed skill can be demonstrably mastered by trainees.

Methods to make the training preview more worthwhile and more potent are encouraged. Different lengths and formats for training previews should be tested in different contexts. It may be, for example, that a training "preview" should be delivered after training, to focus especially on transfer issues. Or, as noted earlier, more opportunity for interaction and discussion might make a preview a more powerful intervention.

The training session (or programs) for which training previews are provided should be directed at clear and demonstrable needs. Even when needs are evident, training is often not successfully transferred. When there is no clear need in the first place, it is unrealistic to expect impact from a training session. Thus, future research should assure that training is truly needed.
The measurement method used to assess whether the immediate learning objectives of the training session have been achieved should be behavioral, versus a self-report. As is discussed by Wexley (1984), "Studies examining the notion that self-evaluation of ability tends to be prone to errors of overestimation of ability also yielded inconsistent results" (p. 526). In other words, it is likely that subjects evaluated their ability to perform a task higher than their actual ability. A more accurate and trustworthy measure of whether skill is, in fact, mastered will help interpret the findings related to transfer. That is, when transfer does not occur, it is important to be sure that the reason is not because trainees never learned the skills in the first place.

The effectiveness of the realistic training preview has yet to be demonstrated. In order to more definitively investigate whether the realistic training preview has potential to impact on outcomes and transfer of training, more robust and thorough research is needed.

The major research question in the present study was to assess whether the realistic training preview had an impact on subjects' reactions to training, acquisition of knowledge (learning), and subsequent transfer of what was learned to the job or other situations. Although this major result was not achieved, the researcher continues to believe that the notion of a training preview is promising, based on the theoretical framework of the training preview described earlier in the study.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Pilot Study for Preliminary Information to Construct Training Previews
Date: July 12, 1990
To: Students and Friends
From: Duangkaew (Tim) Ungerthong
Graduate student, Educational Leadership Department

Subjects: Inputs regarding training experiences

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership here at Western Michigan University. As part of my research, I would like to ask you to give me some input about your experiences in participating in training workshops.

To answer the attached questions, please imagine yourself as a trainee who participates in a training workshop. Your jobs as a trainee are to learn the workshop content and to transfer what you have learned to your job.

I greatly appreciated your time and responses. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 387-3887.

NOTE: Please return this questionnaire to Ms. Karl by Thursday, July 19.
QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTION: To answer the attached questions, please imagine yourself as a trainee who participates in a training workshop. Your jobs as a trainee are to learn the workshop content and to transfer what you have learned on to your job.

1. What are some of the difficulties you encountered in trying to learn the content of the workshop?
   A. ______________________________________________________________________
   B. _________________________________________________________________________
   C. ______________________________________________________________________
   D. ______________________________________________________________
   E. ______________________________________________________________________
   F. ______________________________________________________________

2. What are some of the difficulties you encountered in trying to transfer what you have learned to your job?
   A. __________________________________________________________
   B. __________________________________________________________
   C. __________________________________________________________
   D. __________________________________________________________
   E. __________________________________________________________
   F. __________________________________________________________

3. Please list some strengths (as many as possible) of the workshop you attended. In other words, what did you like about it? Please be as specific as possible.
   A. ___________________________________________________________
   B. ___________________________________________________________
   C. • ___________________________________________________________
   D. ___________________________________________________________
   E. ___________________________________________________________
   F. ___________________________________________________________
4. Please list some weaknesses (as many as possible) of the workshop you attended. In other words, what didn’t you like about it? Please be as specific as possible.

A. 

B. 

C. 

D. 

E. 

F. 

5. Do you think you would have learned more if someone had given you some information about the workshop before you attended it?

YES ____ NO ____ NOT SURE ____

If YES, what do you wish you would have known about the workshop before you actually attend it?

A. 

B. 

C. 

D. 

E. 

F. 

G. 

H. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix B

Pilot Work for Training Previews
A TRAINING WORKSHOP
HOW TO GIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK
IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY

BY
MS. KATHERINE KARL

JULY 19, 1990
1:00 PM - 3:30 PM
PREVIEW SESSION

"HOW TO GIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY"

1. Detailed information about the instructor of the training workshop

Ms. Katherine Karl is a faculty member in the Department of Management at Western Michigan University where she teaches undergraduate courses in employee relations, personnel management, principles of management and management analysis and behavior. She has also taught several courses at Michigan State University and the University of Michigan-Flint on leadership and organizational behavior.

She has conducted numerous training workshops on how to give negative feedback and is the author of several articles in leading professional journals. She holds a Bachelors of Science degree in psychology from the University of Michigan-Flint, a Masters of Business Administration in personnel management from Michigan State University and plans to complete her Ph.D. in organizational behavior and human resource management from Michigan State University in Fall of 1990.

2. Objectives of this training workshop

- To help you to become aware of negative consequences of providing poor or inadequate feedback.

- To give you a list of DO's and DON'T that should help you turn feedback sessions into positive rather than negative experiences.

- To demonstrate some techniques that will help you communicate effectively and give negative feedback in a constructive way.

- To help you improve your own feedback skills.

3. Contents of the training workshop

In this training workshop, the importance and the obstacles to providing effective feedback will be pointed out to you. Benefits you can gain from being able to provide accurate feedback will be shown. Also, you will learn about the four purposes of feedback.

A list of DO's and DON'T that will help you turn feedback sessions into positive rather than negative experiences will be emphasized.
4. **Advantages from this training workshop**
   - You will be able to use the skills learned from the training workshop: in your work, your family, and friends.
   - To help you improve and increase your skills in giving feedback.
   - To be able to motivate your employees, co-workers, or family members.

5. **Obstacles or limitations to apply what you learned from this training workshop to on the job**
   - Giving constructive feedback requires a lot of practice.
   - You may be uncomfortable giving this feedback the first time, but it should get progressively easier.
   - You may have varied levels of success depending on whom you use these skills.
   - You may feel you need to do more reading on this topic on your own following this training workshop.
   - Giving quality feedback takes time. When you are so busy on your job, you may neglect to give constructive feedback to your subordinates, friends, or family members.
   - Giving feedback is not easy. If you do not do it right, it may bring you negative consequences.
   - The training workshop does not guarantee results.
OPTIMISTIC TRAINING PREVIEW

SCRIPT
A TRAINING WORKSHOP
HOW TO GIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK
IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY

BY

MS. KATHERINE KARL

JULY 19, 1990
1:00 PM - 3:30 PM
PREVIEW SESSION

"HOW TO GIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY"

1. Detailed information about the instructor of the training workshop

Ms. Katherine Karl is a faculty member in the Department of Management at Western Michigan University where she teaches undergraduate courses in employee relations, personnel management, principles of management and management analysis and behavior. She has also taught several courses at Michigan State University and the University of Michigan-Flint on leadership and organizational behavior.

She has conducted numerous training workshops on how to give negative feedback and is the author of several articles in leading professional journals. She holds a Bachelors of Science degree in psychology from the University of Michigan-Flint, a Masters of Business Administration in personnel management from Michigan State University and plans to complete her Ph.D. in organizational behavior and human resource management from Michigan State University in Fall of 1990.

2. Objectives of this training workshop

* To help you to become aware of negative consequences of providing poor or inadequate feedback.
* To give you a list of DO's and DON'T that should help you turn feedback sessions into positive rather than negative experiences.
* To demonstrate some techniques that will help you communicate effectively and give negative feedback in a constructive way.
* To help you improve your own feedback skills.

3. Contents of the training workshop

In this training workshop, the importance and the obstacles to providing effective feedback will be pointed out to you. Benefits you can gain from being able to provide accurate feedback will be shown. Also, you will learn about the four purposes of feedback.

A list of DO's and DON'T that will help you turn feedback sessions into positive rather than negative experiences will be emphasized.
4. **Advantages from this training workshop**
   
   * You will be able to use the skills learned from the training workshop: in your work, your family, and friends.
   
   * You will improve and increase your skills in giving feedback.
   
   * You will be able to motivate your employees, co-workers, or family members to change their undesired behaviors.
   
   * You will be able to tell a person something negative and feel comfortable doing it.
   
   * Others will be impressed by your skills learned from this training.
   
   * If you are a manager or are in the position of supervising subordinates, by knowing how to give negative feedback in a constructive way, you will be able to increase employee job satisfaction, performance and organizational commitment.
   
   * If you are not in a supervising position, you will be able to use what you learned from this training workshop with your co-workers, friends, and family members.
   
   * Providing accurate feedback will help employees from worrying about their performance.
   
   * Your employees will have a clear understanding of how you think they are doing.
   
   * You will be able to build trust and confidence between you and your employees or between you and your co-workers, friends, and family members.
Appendix C

Agenda and Outlined Script for the Realistic Training Preview Session
HOW TO GIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY
MS. KATHERINE KARL
AGENDA FOR SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION
Dennis Dressler

DATE: SEPTEMBER 25, 1990
TIME: 6:45 PM-7:05 PM.
PLACE: SANGREN HALL, WMU

* WELCOME to the workshop
* PURPOSE of the training workshop and the small group discussion
* DISCUSSION

1. TRAINING EXPERIENCES IN GENERAL:
   - Two major training elements; during-training and post-training

2. TRAINING EXPERIENCES DURING TRAINING SESSION:
   A. Common issues with general group training
   B. Common issues with this particular training
   C. Reactions:
      - Questions
      - Answers

3. TRAINING EXPERIENCES AFTER TRAINING SESSION:
   A. Common issues with transfer of general training
      - possibilities
      - difficulties
   B. Common issues with transfer of this particular training
      - possibilities
      - difficulties
   C. Reactions:
      - Questions
      - Answers

4. Summary:
   A. Obstacles of learning and transfer of learning
   B. Recommendations

7:10 PM-7:20 PM Complete some questionnaires
7:20 PM-7:30 PM Break
7:30 PM-9:00 PM TRAINING WORKSHOP BEGINS
OUTLINED SCRIPT

*Welcome to the workshop

*Purpose of the training workshop: -To help communicate effectively
-To improve performance feedback skills
-To help turn feedback sessions into positive rather than negative experiences

*Purpose of the small group discussion: -To prepare the participants for the training workshop so that they can get the most out of the workshop

*Discussion:

1. Training in general: -Two major elements; during training and after training

2. Training experience during training session:

   With general group training
   Positives: -Meet with people
   -Learn new skills
   -Expand knowledge and viewpoints
   Negatives: -Unable to get attention from the presenter
   -Become too tired to learn
   -Become bored and lose interest

   With this particular training
   Positives: -Gain knowledge and practical skills in communicating
   -Helpful and informative
   Negatives: -Too much to learn
   -Not enough time for questions and answers
   -Unable to give feedback to each individual
   -Learn at group pace
   -Not enough time for individual assistance
3. **Training experience after training session:**

*With general group training*

Positives:  
- More emphasis in transfer of training  
- Training programs meet the needs of the organization  
- Design to help learners use what they learn

Negatives:  
- No change

*With this particular group training*

Positives:  
- Design to best benefit you on your job  
- Will learn and become aware of the Do's and Don'ts

Negatives:  
- Find it hard to do  
- May not do it right in the beginning  
- Require a lot of practice

4. **Summary**

Recommendations:  
Start with easier situations

7:10 PM  
Hand out questionnaires to participants to complete

Have the participants put the last four digits of their social security numbers on the upper right hand corner of these questionnaires. This is for the purpose of scoring and mailing a follow-up questionnaire.
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION: 6:45 PM-7:05 PM

MR. DENNIS DRESSLER

DISCUSSION

TRAINING IN GENERAL
- Two major elements
- Pros and Cons

DURING TRAINING SESSION
- General group training
  - Negatives and positives
- This particular training
  - Negatives and positives

AFTER TRAINING SESSION
- Transfer of training in general
  - Possibilities and difficulties
- Transfer of training for this particular training
  - Possibilities and difficulties

SUMMARY
Appendix D

Detailed Information about the Realistic Training Preview
REALISTIC TRAINING PREVIEW

My name is Dennis Dressler. I am at a company called Training Strategies here in Kalamazoo and I also have some connection to the university having been a graduate student at this university sometime back and spend a number of hours in the same seats that you folks are in tonight.

Let me just briefly indicate that you are at an introductory session to a workshop entitled "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Hope that is where you expected that you will be tonight because that is where you are.

I am going to be taking just a few minutes of setting up that training. This is not the actual training session that will be led by Katherine Karl, a management professor here at the university.

Let me just talk briefly about the session you are going to have from Katherine later. Katherine is going to be talking about how to give negative feedback in a constructive way. And I don't know about any of the rest of you but as I work in organization, this is probably one of the most difficult skills that people have to master and have to use and in fact stay away from. It is also a skills that probably goes more to either positively or negatively impact the work relationships and probably any other single skills that a person has. Even though it goes further than that. I mean I think about how I give my teenaged daughters negative feedback when I think of their clothes is a little strange. I also think about how my wife give me negative feedback when I "forgot the wrong time." So, this concept of telling people something that might not be positive really impacts many avenues of our lives. So, I think the workshop itself that you are going to get really does have some potential for impacting a number of the relationships that you have whether it is work, home, family, or whatever the case may be.

Specifically during the workshop you are going to learn how to communicate negative feedback effectively. You are going to learn how to give performance feedback and develop some skills to do that. And, you are going to learn specifically how to turn a feedback situation into a positive rather than a negative experience. Now, that is going to happen starting about 7:30.

We are just going to take a few moments to sort of set the scene here. And, I am going to spend a few minutes to just talk about training in general. And, basically what we are going to try to do is to help you prepare for what is going to happen at 7:30.

Let's talk about two specific portions of training. Those two portions of the training itself, what you are going to experience at 7:30 that body or activity of learning.
There is another component of training which is real critical to those of us who are in the training industry and that's what happens to people back in the real world after they are out of training. So, we have two large components, the real session and also what happens afterward. And we want to talk about some of the experiences of those two components of training. And, let me make clear the differences of training and education. When we think of the word "training", we think of something specifically that you are going to learn that will affect your day to day behavior now, your performance. Education tends to be something that you may or may not use and may in fact even prepare you for a next job or for enrichment. But, it may or may not directly transfer to on the job. The specific communication skills that you need today that is training.

First of all, let's talk about general group training which you are going to have here tonight. And, let's talk about some of the positive things that are going to happen. During the training session, my guess is that you are going to get a chance to work with each other a little bit. You are probably going to have to pair up or group together and spend some time together. And, one of the neat things about that is that you are probably going to meet somebody you did not know before. So, one of the positive things about training is that it is a great opportunity in network. And, those of you who are changing careers, don't underestimate who you are meeting here tonight. Somehow that person is going to show up again in your world. So, don't underestimate the value of just networking during training, a very positive experience. You are going to learn new skills. Some of you may already routinely give negative feedback and feel you do it very well. I will guess most of you are going to learn something a little bit new that might help you be more effective in doing that. For other of you who never been in a supervisory position, or haven't been in the position where you have been a leader of a group of people in anyway, this concept of giving a negative feedback may be very new, and you certainly are going to learn some new skills. It simply is going to expand who you are as a person. You are going to have some new knowledge. You are going to be introduced to some new skills. So, it is going to expand who you are as a human being.

But there are also some negatives about general group training. And, let me talk a little bit about those. In general group training, one of the things you are going to experience tonight is that it is going to be very difficult for anyone of you to get the attention of the instructor. And, here is the scary thing. It is not just going to be those of you who are in this room now because we are going to double the size of the group for the 7:30 session. So, if you are sitting here during the training tonight you are going to have these questions or concerns about "Oh, but that wouldn't work where I am, because there is going to be eighty of you here, it might be real. "But, wait! help me" Tough to say, and
you are saying but may be that's not a concern of the other eighty. And, you feel a little embarress. Am I the only one that feel that way? And, you are just sort of get lost in a big group. That is one of the problems of the general group training.

The second thing is general group training often time tends to be fairly concentrated in large block of time, a day, two days, in this case you are going to have a relatively short period of time but there is going to be a lot of information that you are going to get in a very short period of time. My guess is some of you are going to be, or feel at least somewhat tighter with all the information that you are going to get into. We are also at the end of the day. Most of you have probably work the full day. You have been in school all day. You are going to be tired tonight. And one of the real challenge that you are going have is hanging in there with that training that you are going to happen at 7:30 to get anything out of it. Because you are going to be tired. That is a reality of this kind of training.

Obviously you folk are here may be sort of by hook or crook or a little arm twisting or persuasion or for what reason or another. Some of you may be here because the topic does seem interesting to you or you really like to get some value of it but may be the presenter or the trainer really is not going to hit right on target of what you are looking for and so what is the challenge. It is real easy to become bored, lose interest. You will sort of say, "Ah, I picked the wrong session." That is another challenge of this kind of training.

Specifically about the training you are going to get tonight you should end up with a very positive helpful communication skills. That should be the positive outcomes with the training you get tonight. You should also hopefully find the information very helpful and informative. Something you can use in your everyday world. This is not going to be theoretical training. It is going to be practical kind of thing. At the same time, let's be realistic about what is going to be a challenge about tonight's training. There is going to be some real negatives. You are going to get in an hour and a half or in an hour an forty five minutes, whatever this training session is at 7:30. You are going to get training that probably might best fit in a full day. You are going to get a lot of information, a lot of training in a very short period of time. That is going to be a challenge for you. There is probably not going to be enough time to answer all your questions. My guess is even if the topic is very interesting and you have some burning questions. When you are done here at 9 o'clock it is going to be very tempting to get out of that door and home to your family or your house or dinner or the other thing that you need to take care of. So the questions that you have you may choose not to even get answered. That is going to be a challenge tonight.

A real challenge with the kind of training that you are also going to have tonight is we are making an assumption that all of you will learn at the same rate. We all know that in
this group there are all sort of learning rates. That can be affected by whether you have
dinner or not already tonight, how tired you are. You are just basic native ability to process
data. May be your mother is very sick and you thoughts are moving in a lot of different
areas. And, so your learning pace might be forward than a person that is right next to you.
And, we can't adjust for that tonight. We are just going to have to live with that. That is a
problem with this training.

We just pause for a moment to see if you have some questions or concerns about
general group training that any of you like to comment or raise a question on. Anything
that comes to your mind about positive and or negative about general group training.

Let's go to the second component. The second component is when you folks leave
here at 9 o'clock tonight, we are expecting that because of this training, something is going
to happen to you. That is hopefully you are going to be better equipped to give negative
feedback. That's called transfer of training. And transfer of training is an incredible
nightmare in the training industry because there are many many dollars and I bet all of you
have had plenty of experiences of attending trainings that may be you thought it was even
fairly good training. But you have never ever use that skills. There is no transfer of
training. And, we will talk about that.

First of all, with general group training, because this was advertised as giving you
the skills to give negative feedback in positive ways, if you were the general public instead
of sort of being in captive audience here, students at Western. If you are general public
choosing to come to this session, well, at least the training is going to address your need.
You are not going to come here if you have no interest in. Somebody either your manager
or you or your organization has said this is probably be a skill that will be helpful. And, so
you are coming here because it addresses your needs. Obviously because the training
address your needs there should be a better chance of a transfer. Because you say it is
what I need, what I want to do better, I want to go trained. So, I should be able to do it
back on the job. So, what we are saying is that training addresses the needs and also helps
with the transfer issue.

The other thing that it does is because it is a very focused topic. Because you just
don't go to a class called training. It has a topic and an identity. The trainer has
specifically designed that training to address the skills in this case you giving negative
feedback in a positive way. So, the whole design is addressed to give you that skills. So,
again, we should get better transfer. Because we are going to sort of have to talk about
some generic "nothing" training, it is a target. And, so it should help you with that skill.
So, one of the advantages again with the general group training.
There are some negatives. The negative is simply the fact that in a lot of general group training, people read the training, they might even fill out a sheet at the end of training which we in industry call it a smile sheet. We test how happy our people are at the end of the session. And usually the food was good, the room was comfortable and the presenter told a few jokes, the smile sheet turns out pretty well. But a smile sheet in terms of evaluating training is a very small portion because what we are really looking for is the change and in this case if I were your supervisor and I have asked you to attend this session tonight, tomorrow, and next week and next month, I want to observe how you give negative feedback to other people. And, I am going to see if it makes any differences. And, will be very candid with you. Much of general group training have little impact. There is no transfer. Another words, it does not change anything you do. If you give feedback poorly before the training, you still give it poorly a month after, three months after, and two years after. Even though you might have filled out a smile sheet, and said the room was comfortable, the food was good and the guy was pretty entertaining, it changes no behavior. And, that is a problem with general group training.

Let's talk specifically about what is going to happen tonight. What we know is that with tonight's training, your presenter is a pro and has designed the training right on target for the topic that is advertised. We know you are going to get the skill that will help you back in your everyday work. It is going to be real directive, direct one to one correspondence. That should help transfer. That should help the transfer issue. You are not only going to learn some very effective techniques but you are also going to learn some basic do's and don'ts. And, that in itself is probably going to be helpful. In fact you are going to go away with a number of handouts that are going to provide you with some interesting techniques and tips and guidelines of do's and don'ts. And, that should help you with the transfer issue. Even if you don't remember everything you hear tonight you are going to have something to take back with you. That the next time you have to give some negative feedback, you could pull out and say, "OK, how do I do this again, and here are some ideas to help guide me through that". And, that will help you with the transfer issue.

Let's talk about the negatives. What are going to be the negatives in terms of transferring this specific training that you are going to get tonight to your real world tomorrow. My best guess is that because giving negative feedback is a rather difficult skills to do. One which many people shy away from. In fact, one of the main reasons supervisors often times drop in and solve the problem themselves. Is it help them avoid giving negative feedback? I would bet you this skills most of you will find hard to practice. It is a difficult skill. It's one which we are not all comfortable with. Especially
now that we read all the things about positive management and giving positive feedback, it is difficult for us to say, "Well, how do I do this corrective feedback thing."

The second thing that is going to block transfer is I envision this scenario tomorrow. Some of you are going to learn new skills tonight. And, may be some of you are school teacher and you have decided to try this on your seventh graders tomorrow. And, the first seventh grader who gets out of line, you are going to try to give them some corrective feedback in a positive way. Here is the scenario and you are going to try it and you know what is going to happen. You are going to fall flat on your face. You are going to say, "Oh, my God, that kid laughing in my face." Now you know what is going to happen to that skill. Guess how many more times you are going to try that. Probably not too many. Because non of us feel like putting ourselves in a situation we are going to make a fool of. So, what is going to happen is some of your first efforts might be little awkward with a new skills. And, because it is going to be awkward, it is going to be difficult to continue fighting yourself of to practice it to get good. It is sort of like the first time you play tennis, did you hit the ball perfectly, takes a few hours and a few weeks and a few months before you consistently get it over that. It is going to be no different with this skills. But it is going to be real easy to give up because you don't want to be embarrassed. Just like the tennis example, this skill is going to require a lot of practice. And, it is going to be very easy to go back to old behaviors. One of the things we knew about adults is we as adults change our behavior in a much more difficult fashion than young people do. Young people will change their behaviors relatively easy if given the right environment. For us as an adult, it is very difficult to change our behavior because we have fixed pattern of the way we interact with other people and we feel comfortable with those patterns and one of the things you are going to be asked to do tonight is look at that pattern and see if that does not need some adjustment. You are going to find that this is going to take practice to change your old patterns. It is going to be really easy to go back to your real world after this training and just go back and give feedback, especially negative feedback the same way you did it before.

Let me pause again and see if you have any questions about the issue of transfer of training when you are in the training session may be some of the experiences that you have with the problems of transfer of training. First of all let me ask you how many of you know you have been to training that you might have rated it very good but never change your behavior in the least. Any of you experience that? Ok. You all know what I mean by transfer that it sometimes in training does not happen. I mean the training occurs but it really did not change behavior.
Any of you have any other experiences with transfer of training that might be germane to the topic right now?

Question and answer

There are all sorts of barriers of transfer as well. One of the things that we often refer to is that when we get a group of people from a company in a training session for a day or two, you know who is the most immediate barrier of the transfer of training as in that environment. They go back to their real world after not having two days of work sitting on their desk. And, now you also ask them to change the way they perform. Give me a break. They feel snowed under buried. It's a catch up time. And what you are doing is you are hurrying to catch up. And you are saying, "Practice new behaviors? Give me a break". That's a reality for many of us in training as well.

Other issue of transfer of training that any of you experience in a training courses or sessions that you attended?

Question and answer

The organization said we are going to fix you and what really needs fixing is the organization. So that could be a barrier of transfer. Very real example. Often times it is the wrong party in the training. Now is the training bad? It might have been very good training. But there are so many barriers that transfer really make it worth the stuff. So, it is hard for you to exhibit the new behavior. Good example. That is going to occur tonight. You know you will have some kind of things. You are going back to your world tomorrow and say, "Gee that stuff sound good tonight. I think I'm going to try that." And now comes the situation tomorrow when you got an opportunity to try it. But you are also going to have five other things come crashing down at you the same time and what is going to be the easiest things to do. Go back to your old behavior. Other issues of transfer that anybody has experienced along the line.

Question and answer

Ok. Well, you are in for a treat tonight. The session that you are about to experience. I think you are going to enjoy. It is going to be interactive. It is going to give you chance to learn some new skills, practice some skills that I think are going to be useful to you.

I am going to close my portion of the session by asking you to turn in the envelope, the package that you got when you walk in.
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Agenda and Outlined Script for the Optimistic Training Preview Session
HOW TO GIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY
MS. KATHERINE KARL
AGENDA FOR SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION
Dr. Lawrence A. Pfaff

DATE: SEPTEMBER 25, 1990
TIME: 6:45 PM-7:05 PM.
PLACE: SANGREN HALL, WMU

* WELCOME to the workshop
* PURPOSE of the training workshop and the small group discussion
* GROUP INTRODUCTION
* DISCUSSION
  1. IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNICATION:
  2. IMPORTANCE OF FEEDBACK:
  3. OVERVIEW OF THE WORKSHOP:

* SUMMARY

7:10 PM-7:20 PM Complete some questionnaires
7:20 PM-7:30 PM Break
7:30 PM-9:00 PM TRAINING WORKSHOP BEGINS
OUTLINED SCRIPT

Welcome to the workshop

Purpose of the training workshop:
- To help communicate effectively
- To improve performance feedback skills
- To help turn feedback sessions into positive rather than negative experiences

Purpose of the small group discussion:
- To provide information or overview about the training workshop
- To give the participants a chance to meet each other before the workshop begins

Group introduction: (Spend about 8-10 minutes)

Discussion:

1. Importance of communication:

2. Importance of feedback:

3. Overview of the workshop:
   Instructor:
   Ms. Katherine Karl is a faculty member in the Department of Management at Western Michigan University. She teaches a number of graduate courses such as employee relations, personnel management, principles of management, and management analysis of behavior.

   Besides teaching at Western Michigan University, Ms. Karl has also taught several courses at Michigan State University and the University of Michigan at Flint on leadership and organizational behavior.

   Ms. Karl has conducted numerous training workshops on how to give negative feedback. She is also an author of several articles in leading professional journals.
Ms. Karl holds a Bachelors of Science degree in psychology from the University of Michigan at Flint, a Master of Business Administration in personnel management from Michigan State University and plans to complete her Ph.D. in organizational behavior and human resource management this semester.

Objectives:
The objectives of Ms. Karl's workshop is to help participants:
- become aware of the negative consequences of providing poor or inadequate feedback
- turn feedback sessions into positive rather than negative experiences
- communicate effectively and improve performance feedback skills

Content:
A list of Do's and Don'ts which will be useful in turning feedback sessions into positive rather than negative experiences will be given during the training. A brief video tape of good and poor performance feedback sessions will be shown.
The workshop will begin at 7:30 and will last about one hour and thirty minutes.

Summary
Participants will learn many useful techniques in providing negative feedback in a constructive way. The workshop is designed to give the participants knowledge and practical skills in communicating in a more constructive way. And, it will be helpful and informative. It is designed to suit everyone here, and a lot of information will be given. A list of Do's and Don'ts will be handed out during the training. Ms. Karl will be willing to answer questions after the workshop.

Reactions: Questions and answers

7:10 PM Hand out questionnaires to participants to complete

Have the participants put the last four digits of their social security numbers on the upper right hand corner of these questionnaires. This is for the purpose of scoring and mailing a follow-up questionnaire.
HOW TO GIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY
MS. KATHERINE KARL

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION
6:45 PM-7:05 PM

COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRES
7:10 PM-7:20 PM

COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRES
8:50 PM-9:00 PM

TRAINING WORKSHOP
7:30 PM-8:50 PM

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION: 6:45 PM-7:05 PM

DR. LAWRENCE A. PFAFF

WELCOME

PURPOSE
*Training workshop
*Small group discussion

GROUP INTRODUCTION

DISCUSSION
*Importance of communication
*Importance of feedback
*Content of the workshop

SUMMARY

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix F

Detailed Information about the Optimistic Training Preview
OPTIMISTIC TRAINING PREVIEW

Let me begin introducing myself, my name is Larry Pfaff. I will be conducting this pre-workshop session which will be about 20 minutes long. I will give you some information about myself. I am partly educated through W.M.U. I have a bachelor degree in Physics and Mathematics and my doctorate and master degrees are from the Counselor Education Counselling Psychology Program here. I finished about ten years ago. Currently and for the last ten years I have been running my own business, training and consulting type work in a given resource field. I was asked to conduct this session as a pre-session for the research that has been done and you people have volunteered to do.

Let me tell you a little about what this pre-session is about. The purpose of the training workshop has three goals.

1. Communicate. That is, the workshop is set to try and help you learn to communicate more effectively.
2. To help you to improve your feedback skills.
3. To help you to turn feedback sessions that you conduct with people from negative into positive feedback sessions.

So, it is not just feedback. It's making sure the feedback sessions are positive for the persons on the receiving end of the feedback. That sums up the workshop session for you.

Now let me reiterate on the 20 minutes session and its goals. Firstly it is to give you some overview information for the whole workshop and to give you the chance to meet each other before you enter the workshop.

Before I walked in here, I only knew one person and I do not have any idea where the majority of you are from. Would somebody like to start off by telling me their reasons for being here?
Participant 1) Tim asked us to participate. She came into our class 602, and asked us to be a part of this project for her doctoral research. Like the good students we are, we thought it would be a great idea. We are from the Ed. Leadership department, Foundation class.
Participant 2) I am from CECP class 627 Community Agency Counselling Admission and I am here because I want to learn how to communicate effectively. My class professor is Ron Crafton.
Participant 3) I am from Training Skills Development and Ed. Leadership.
Participant 4) I am from Ed. Leadership 640, with Professor Cowden.
Participant 5) I am from 645, Research with Professor Uldis Smidchens.

Participant 6) My name is Steve Zimmerman from department of military science 440.

Anyone else that we have missed? We cover about five or six different classes. Do you know the other people that are in your class very much at all? Do you interact with each other very much?

What I want you to do right now (I'll give you 2 minutes to do it and I will time it closely) is to look around the room, spot someone you do not know and go and introduce yourself to them. Ready, -Go!

Now you have become acquainted with at least one other person in the room.

The instructor for the workshop is Katherine Karl. She is a professor of management and teaches certain graduate courses in the management department. For example, employee relations, personnel management and principles of management and management of behavior. In addition to that, she has taught courses from time to time at Michigan State University and University of Michigan, Flint campus, in Leadership and Organizational Behavior. She also conducts a large number of workshops on how to give negative feedback to people.

Her bachelor degree is actually in Psychology from Michigan and she has an MBA from Michigan State and is working on her Ph.D. in organizational behavior. I assume that is also from Michigan State.

Her objectives are to get across to you how to communicate more effectively, how to give negative feedback more effectively and how to turn negative feedback sessions into positive sessions. That is really important because what you are talking about here are communication skills, which are critical in everyone's day to day work. Although I have my doctorate in Psychology, on a day to day basis I use very very little of the material I learned in the classes I took all the way through my doctorate program. What I use on a constant basis every day with clients and workshops, however, are good old basic communication skills, especially with one to one communications.

This workshop is going to help you to focus on those communication skills, especially the one area of communication skills where most of us have a great deal of fear, giving people negative feedback. Nobody likes to give negative feedback and thus confront those situations.

What you are going to get in your workshop is a list of do's and don'ts, about what will be useful to turn the feedback sessions around. You are going to see a brief video tape of good and bad feedback sessions. That is a short overview of the session. I think it is going to be quite interesting for you, and that you will gain some skills that will be a little
bit different and maybe give you a little more perspective on some of those present skills and how to apply them in your own situation.

Are there any questions on the overview of the session?

You will be asked to fill out a pre-questionnaire in a few minutes, post to this session but pre to the whole workshop and then you will also be asked to fill out a questionnaire after the workshop, to see if the workshop has had any impact on you.

Any more questions?

The consent form on the cover has to be filled out because of the university's requirements for human subject research and that is any research done with humans of any kind at WMU. When people are participating they have to willingly consent to participate in order to avoid any types of negative consequences of individuals. Every piece of research, dissertation, and thesis like this that use people even in a workshop filling out questionnaires has to be approved through the faculty committee prior to conducting it.

I really think it would be an interesting kind of experience for me to go through the workshop. I can't be in the workshop, however, I just find out what is going to be discussed and what is going to happen, maybe I will sit in on part of it.

To walk you through the envelope in front of you, if you are going to participate, sign the consent form on the cover. Open up the package, there should be a questionnaire enclosed. In the upper right hand corner of the questionnaire on the first white page, there is a little line, this is for you to enter the last four digits of your social security number. This is not for identification purposes, however, it enables us to track the pre-questionnaires and post-questionnaires, so we do not mix them up. That is just in case they should become separated. You will need to complete that questionnaire immediately. It should take about 5-10 minutes. When you have done that, put the questionnaire back into the envelope and hang on to it. Other than that, all you need to know is that when you have finished the questionnaire, the training session begins at 7:30 in room 2302, across the hall from where we are now and down to the right.

Thank you very much. You are free to take a break now if you wish. You have 10 minutes.
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Announcement of the Training Workshop to Potential Subjects
ANNOUNCEMENT TO TRAINING WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

My name is Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong. I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my research on factors that influence learning in training situations. Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor.

The purpose of my study is to examine the impact of instructional design on learning and transfer.

I would like to invite you to attend a training workshop on "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" and to ask for your cooperation to participate in my study. Your participation will be on a voluntary basis.

Before attending the workshop on "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way", I would like to ask you:

* To sign a consent form if you agree to participate in this study
* To fill in and complete brief questionnaires attached to this set of handouts

After the training workshop, I would like to ask you:

* To complete a brief evaluation form and questions about the training workshop
* About two weeks after this training, a follow-up questionnaire will be mailed to you. It will take about 3-5 minutes to complete. A self-addressed and stamped envelope will be attached to the questionnaire for your convenience

You will be asked not to discuss this research with others until the follow-up questionnaire has been returned to me.

Data from this research will be kept strictly confidential. Numbers and codes will be used instead of names.

I greatly appreciate your time and cooperation. If you have any questions, please call me at (616) 387-3887.

Thank you very much,

D. Ungsrithong
Graduate Student
Educational Leadership Department
A TRAINING WORKSHOP
by Katherine Karl, Professor of Management

HOW TO GIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK
IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY
A Positive Tool for Improving Communication and Performance Feedback Skills

Tuesday, September 25, 1990
6:45 - 9:00 p.m.
Western Michigan University
Sangren Hall - Room 2302
Appendix H
Consent Form
CONSENT FORM

The purpose of the proposed research is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

Participation in this research project involves:
1) Completing a brief (5 minutes) pre-training questionnaire
2) Attending a one and a half hours training workshop
3) Completing a brief (5-10 minutes) post-training questionnaire , and
4) Completing a brief (3-5 minutes) follow-up questionnaire mailed to you about two weeks after the training

Data will be kept confidential. Only group data and not individual data will be reported in future publications.

You may withdraw your prior consent or discontinue participation at anytime. You may also refuse to sign and not participate in this research, but still participate in the training workshop with no penalty.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong, at (616) 387-3887 anytime. This research is being supervised by Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff, doctoral advisor.

I have read and fully understand the above information, and agree to participate in this study.

_________________________________________  _____________
Signature                      Date

_________________________________________
Print Name

Address:  ____________________________________________
          ____________________________________________

Phone:  __________________________
Appendix I

Demographic Data and General Information Measure
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA AND GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Are you currently employed? NO___ YES ___ Position: __________________________
   Department: __________________________
   Organization: __________________________

2. What class level are you in? (Check One) Undergraduate _____ Graduate _____

3. Your major __________________________ Department __________________________

4. What class(es) are you taking this semester? __________________ Instructor _______
   __________________ Instructor _______
   __________________ Instructor _______

5. Why did you decide to attend the training workshop on “How to give negative feedback in a constructive way”?  
   ____ I thought I could use or apply constructive feedback skills in my work
   ____ It sounded interesting
   ____ My instructor recommended it to me
   ____ Other: (Please explain) ________________________________________________

6. Have you ever given negative feedback to one of your subordinates, co-workers, or friends?  
   YES _____ NO ______

7. Do you expect to use what you will learn from the workshop in the near future (1-4 weeks after the workshop)?  
   YES _____ NO _____ NOT SURE ______

8. How or under what circumstances do you think being able to give negative feedback in a constructive way will be useful to you? Please describe.
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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Manipulation Check Measure
PLEASE USE THE SCALE BELOW TO INDICATE IF IT IS TO YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ACTIVITIES OR EVENTS LISTED BELOW WILL OCCUR OR NOT IN THIS TRAINING WORKSHOP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know this event will occur in this workshop</th>
<th>I know this event will not occur in this workshop</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE: If you know that the workshop instructor will discuss the importance of providing constructive feedback, you will circle "1".

1. I will learn about the advantages of giving constructive feedback. 1 2 3
2. A list of DO's and DON'T will be given to you. 1 2 3
3. A role-played videotape will be shown. 1 2 3
4. I will have an optional reading assignment. 1 2 3

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS USING THE SCALE BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Fairly Amount</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. When you first heard about the workshop, how much did you feel you knew about its:
   *objectives 1 2 3 4 5
   *contents 1 2 3 4 5
   *opportunity to apply to your job 1 2 3 4 5

6. How much do you feel you know now about its:
   *objectives 1 2 3 4 5
   *contents 1 2 3 4 5
   *opportunity to apply to your job 1 2 3 4 5

7. I expect to learn a lot of useful information. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I expect to increase my feedback skills. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The person who gave the preview session was very enthusiastic about the training workshop. 1 2 3 4 5
10. The information I received during the small group discussion was important to know before attending the training workshop. 1 2 3 4 5
11. The information I received during the small group discussion promoted the training workshop in a very positive way. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix K

Self-efficacy Measures, Part One and Two
Listed below are five situations involving performance feedback. Under the column, CAN DO, place a check (x) below the situations in which you feel you could give effective performance feedback. That is, do you feel you could present the feedback described in such a way that it will increase the employee’s motivation and desire to improve without offending the employee?

Next, for the situations you checked under the CAN DO column, indicate in the CERTAINTY column, how certain you are that you could give effective performance feedback (that is, how strong is your belief that you could give the feedback described in such a way that it would increase the employee’s motivation and desire to improve).

Rate your degree of certainty by recording a number from 0 to 100 using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Certain</td>
<td>Slightly Certain</td>
<td>Moderately Certain</td>
<td>Highly Certain</td>
<td>Absolutely Certain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Sue Johnson is an extremely nice, energetic person who is fun to have around. She is always eager to help out and seems to motivate everyone around her. She is also extremely sensitive and has on two occasions broken into tears when told that she was doing something wrong. Recently, you noticed that she has been making an excessive number of personal calls during work hours. How certain are you that you could provide Sue with effective performance feedback?

   CAN DO CERTAINTY
   (yes/no)  (If yes, how certain are you?)

2. James Smith is an exceptionally competent employee. He has been with your company for 1 year. As far as productivity and dependability are concerned he is your top employee. Recently you have received several complaints from his female co-workers that he makes sexist comments to them. You are especially concerned about this because the turnover rate for women in his department is higher than in other departments, and you’re afraid that someone might file a sexual harassment charge. How certain are you that you could provide James with effective performance feedback?

   CAN DO CERTAINTY
   (yes/no)  (If yes, how certain are you?)

3. Karen Black is one of your assistant managers. She is your brightest and most highly skilled employee. Recently you have received several complaints from her employees. It seems that she is very critical of their work and often leaves them feeling inept, confused or stupid. She never tells them when they do something right, only when they do something wrong. How certain are you that you could provide Karen with effective performance feedback?

   CAN DO CERTAINTY
   (yes/no)  (If yes, how certain are you?)
4. Dan Green is a conscientious hard working employee. When it comes to effort, he tries harder than any of your other employees. He is also very meticulous when it comes to details, and always turns in top quality work. Unfortunately, he takes twice as long to finish his work assignments as anyone else. This is costing your department a lot of money in overtime. Furthermore, your other employees have been complaining that Dan doesn't pull his own weight and that they are getting tired of having to do extra work because he is always behind. How certain are you that you could provide Dan with effective performance feedback?

CAN DO CERTAINTY
(yes/no) (If yes, how certain are you?)

5. Your organization prohibits smoking in all public areas, therefore, employees are no lon
allowed to smoke at their desks. Smoking is allowed only in the smoking lounge, which is a v
small out of the way room located two floors up. You have on two occasions caught Tom Wil
smoking at his desk. Yesterday you overheard him telling another co-worker that he didn't g
a *#@$ I what you said, no one could take away his rights. How certain are you that you could
provide Tom with effective performance feedback?

CAN DO CERTAINTY
(yes/no) (If yes, how certain are you?)

Please answer the following items using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am confident in my ability to give effective negative performance feedback to others. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I feel certain that when I tell others what they are doing wrong, they feel motivated to improve. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I think that my skill in giving effective negative feedback could be improved substantially. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I don’t feel that I am very good at giving effective negative performance feedback to others. 1 2 3 4 5
5. My negative feedback skills are not as good as I would like. 1 2 3 4 5
6. My ability to give effective negative feedback is better than most people’s. 1 2 3 4 5
7. It is very difficult for me to give effective negative feedback to others. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix L

Motivation Measure
Please answer the following questions using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I am willing to exert considerable effort in this training workshop.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2) I am trying to learn as much as I can in this training workshop.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3) I have a strong desire to learn the information emphasized in this training workshop.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4) Doing well in this training workshop is very important to me.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5) I wish that I didn't have to take this training workshop.  
   1 2 3 4 5

6) I will get more out of this training workshop than most people.  
   1 2 3 4 5

Please do not turn the page until you are told to do so.
Appendix M

Reaction to Training Measure
TRAINING WORKSHOP EVALUATION

1) Workshop Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop content</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met objectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace of the workshop</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating of workshop</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Instructor Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication of information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of material</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to questions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating of instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Overall rating of what is learned

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

4) Have you ever attended any other workshop(s) similar to this training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" before? In other words, is this workshop new to you?

YES  __  NO  __

5) Do you think that you made a good decision to attend this workshop?

YES __  NO __

Please answer the following questions using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade of Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) I feel that I learned many new things from this training workshop.

1  2  3  4  5

7) I feel that I learned many useful things from this training workshop.

1  2  3  4  5

8) I think that the training preview accurately described what would happen in this training workshop.

1  2  3  4  5

9) I was satisfied with this training workshop.

1  2  3  4  5

10) I plan to use the techniques I learned from this training workshop to help me better apply my skills.

1  2  3  4  5

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION AND FEEDBACK.
Appendix N

Master of Learning Measure and Answer Key
IN THE SPACE BELOW, LIST AS MANY OF THE LEARNING POINTS (THE DO's AND DON'Ts) THAT YOU REMEMBER: 

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
LEARNING POINTS

DON'Ts
1. Use general evaluative statements.
2. Scold or belittle the employee because of their actions.
3. Try to psychoanalyze the employee.
4. Compare the employee to other employees.
5. Rush through the feedback session.

DO's
1. Talk with the employee in a private location.
2. Use eye contact.
3. Be aware of nonverbal behaviors.
4. Explain the problem to the employee without hostility.
5. Criticize the behavior, not the employee.
6. Be specific.
7. Use the "we" approach when discussing the employee's problems.
8. Ask for and listen openly to the employee's reasons for the behavior.
9. Show that you understand the employee's feelings.
10. Ask the employee for his or her ideas on how to solve the problem.
11. Ask the employee if there is anything that you can do to help.
12. Agree to review performance at a later date.
Appendix O

Transfer of Training Measure
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

October 9, 1990
Dear Participant:

About two weeks ago (on September 25, 1990), you attended a training workshop on "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl at Western Michigan University.

As part of my research, I need your help in completing this brief follow-up questionnaire (which will take about 3-5 minutes of your time).

I greatly appreciated your time and complete responses. As I mentioned earlier, my research focuses on factors influenced learning in a training situation. Findings from this study will provide professionals and researchers in the area of training and development and organizational behavior with a new and valuable perspective.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. I can be reached by telephone at (616)387-3887.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
Graduate Student
Educational Leadership Department
Last four digits of your social security number ______

Please answer the following questions as honestly as you can:

Demographic data: Male: _____ Female: _____

1. How frequently does your job, family or professional situation require that you give critical feedback? (Please check one)
   - ☐ frequently and regularly
   - ☐ regularly but infrequently
   - ☐ seldom
   - ☐ never

2. Before you attended the training workshop, to what extent were you familiar with the workshop content? (Please check one)
   - ☐ The content was brand new to me
   - ☐ I knew some of the content before
   - ☐ I was very familiar with most of the content
   - ☐ I consider myself an expert in this area

Please answer the following questions using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I feel that the skills I learned are very useful. SD D N A SA
4. I have tried to use or apply what I learned from the workshop to improve my communication skills. SD D N A SA
5. I feel that what I learned from the workshop is not practical to use in the "real" world. SD D N A SA
6. "Soft skills" learned from the workshop are not very useful for most people. SD D N A SA
7. The workshop has helped me learn skills and techniques that are very applicable in my current life. SD D N A SA
8. Being able to give feedback constructively is very important. SD D N A SA
9. I think the skills I learned are very easy to use. SD D N A SA
10. I have had an opportunity to use what I learned from the workshop, but I didn't use it. SD D N A SA
11. I have not had an opportunity to use what I learned from the workshop, but I would like to try it when I can. SD D N A SA
12. I have not had an opportunity to use what I learned from the workshop, and I don’t think I will use it.  
13. I have already tried some techniques I learned from the workshop.  
14. I have tried to use what I learned from the workshop, but it did not go well, so I have quit trying.  
15. I have used what I learned from the workshop once, and I will try to use it again.  
16. I give negative feedback more often now than I did before I attended the training workshop.

17. To what extent have you tried the techniques listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>17.1</th>
<th>17.2</th>
<th>17.3</th>
<th>17.4</th>
<th>17.5</th>
<th>17.6</th>
<th>17.7</th>
<th>17.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the feedback session, I am aware of my nonverbal behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| □ Never  
| □ Once  
| □ A few times  
| □ A great number of times |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| I am very specific when I give feedback.                                  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| □ Never  
| □ Once  
| □ A few times  
| □ A great number of times |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| I compared the person I criticized to other persons.                      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| □ Never  
| □ Once  
| □ A few times  
| □ A great number of times |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| I rushed through the feedback session.                                    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| □ Never  
| □ Once  
| □ A few times  
| □ A great number of times |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| I asked the person to whom I criticized if there was anything I could do to help. |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| □ Never  
| □ Once  
| □ A few times  
| □ A great number of times |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| I explained the problem to the person whom I criticized without hostility. |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| □ Never  
| □ Once  
| □ A few times  
| □ A great number of times |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| I talked with the person to whom I criticized in a private location.     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| □ Never  
| □ Once  
| □ A few times  
| □ A great number of times |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| I used eye contact.                                                       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| □ Never  
| □ Once  
| □ A few times  
| □ A great number of times |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

Last four digits of your social security number ______
Last four digits of your social security number

17.9 I demonstrated that I understood the person's feelings.

- Never
- Once
- A few times
- A great number of times

17.10 I used the "we" approach when discussing the person's problem.

- Never
- Once
- A few times
- A great number of times

17.11 I asked for and listened openly to the person's reasons for the behavior.

- Never
- Once
- A few times
- A great number of times

17.12 I criticized the behavior, not the person.

- Never
- Once
- A few times
- A great number of times

17.13 I asked the person for his or her ideas on how to solve the problem.

- Never
- Once
- A few times
- A great number of times

17.14 I agreed to review performance at a later date.

- Never
- Once
- A few times
- A great number of times

18. Which of the following are reasons that prevented or limited you from applying what you learned from the workshop: (Check all that apply)

- Nothing has prevented me from applying
- My work load
- Lack of feedback from others
- Lack of immediate incentives
- I have had no opportunity
- I do not feel I can do it yet
- I received negative consequences
- Lack of support from others
- I am waiting for a less threatening opportunity
- I am a little afraid to try it
- The skills are too difficult for me to use
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Please answer the following questions using the scale below:

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
SD D N A SA

19. My interpersonal relationship with my co-workers, friends, or family members have improved as a result of using the skills or techniques I learned in the workshop. SD D N A SA

20. My interpersonal relationships with my co-workers, friends, or family members have not changed as a result of using the skills or techniques I learned in the workshop. SD D N A SA

21. My interpersonal relationships with my co-workers, friends, or family members have become worse as a result of using the skills or techniques I learned in the workshop. SD D N A SA

22. My employees, co-workers, or family members are more motivated as a result of my using the skills or techniques I learned in the workshop. SD D N A SA

23. My employees, co-workers, or family members are more receptive to changing their behavior as a result of my using the skills or techniques I learned in the workshop. SD D N A SA

24. I feel good about the outcomes of the negative feedback I gave to others. SD D N A SA

I greatly appreciated your time and complete responses. Please return this questionnaire by October 16 to:

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
Educational Leadership Department, WMU, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Or, please return it to the instructor who distributed this form to you at the end of class. If you would like to know about the findings, you may contact me at 387-3887 after October 29, 1990.
Appendix P

Letters Sent to Instructors for Subject Recruitment
July 24, 1990

Dear Dr. Cowden:

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my dissertation entitled "The Impact of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training". Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor. The purpose of my study is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

I would like to ask permission from you to include students in your class, EDLD 640 Introduction to Research in my study. The students in your class will be invited to attend a training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Ms. Katherine Karl, faculty member in the Department of Management, Western Michigan University will give this workshop. This content is very compatible with general leadership training.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm. to 9:00 pm. On one hand, I strongly believe that students will benefit a great deal from the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". On the other hand, I am sure that the findings from my study will be worthwhile and valuable to training practitioners.

What I ask from you is:

• Your permission to allow students in your EDLD 640 class to attend the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl on Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm. to 9:00 pm.

• I would appreciate it if you could dismiss your class earlier to let students attend this workshop.

I will contact you soon to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
Graduate student

Robert O. Brinkerhoff
Doctoral Advisor
Dear Dr. Grafton:

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my dissertation entitled "The Impact of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training". Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor. The purpose of my study is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

I would like to ask permission from you to include students in your class, CECP 627, Com/Agen Couns/Admin, in my study. The students in your class will be invited to attend a training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Ms. Katherine Karl, faculty member in the Department of Management, Western Michigan University will give this workshop. This content is very compatible with general leadership training.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm. to 9:00 pm. On one hand, I strongly believe that students will benefit a great deal from the workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". On the other hand, I am sure that the findings from my study will be worthwhile and valuable to training practitioners.

What I ask from you is:

- Your permission to allow students in your CECP 627 class to attend the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl on Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm

- I would appreciate it if you could dismiss your class earlier to let students attend this workshop.

I will contact you soon to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrihong
Graduate student

Robert O. Brinkerhoff
Doctoral Advisor
July 24, 1990

Dear Dr. Dickie:

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my dissertation entitled "The Impact of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training". Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor. The purpose of my study is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

I would like to ask permission from you to include students in your class, EDLD 622 Training Skills Development in my study. The students in your class will be invited to attend a training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Ms. Katherine Karl, faculty member in the Department of Management, Western Michigan University will give this workshop. This content is very compatible with general leadership training.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm. On one hand, I strongly believe that students will benefit a great deal from the workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". On the other hand, I am sure that the findings from my study will be worthwhile and valuable to training practitioners.

What I ask from you is:

* Your permission to allow students in your EDLD 622 class to attend the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl on Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm

* I would appreciate it if you could dismiss your class earlier to let students attend this workshop.

I will contact you soon to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
Graduate student

Robert O. Brinkerhoff
Doctoral Advisor
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Dear Dr. Dobbs:

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my dissertation entitled "The Impact of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training". Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor. The purpose of my study is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

I would like to ask permission from you to include students in your class, EDLD 602, Educational Leadership, in my study. The students in your class will be invited to attend a training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Ms. Katherine Karl, faculty member in the Department of Management, Western Michigan University will give this workshop. This content is very compatible with general leadership training.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm. On one hand, I strongly believe that students will benefit a great deal from the workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". On the other hand, I am sure that the findings from my study will be worthwhile and valuable to training practitioners.

What I ask from you is:

- Your permission to allow students in your EDLD 602 class to attend the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl on Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm
- I would appreciate it if you could dismiss your class earlier to let students attend this workshop.

I will contact you soon to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
Graduate student

Robert O. Brinkerhoff
Doctoral Advisor
Dear Dr. Geisler:

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my dissertation entitled "The Impact of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training". Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor. The purpose of my study is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

I would like to ask permission from you to include students in your class, CECP 601, Research Methods, in my study. The students in your class will be invited to attend a training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Ms. Katherine Karl, faculty member in the Department of Management, Western Michigan University will give this workshop. This content is very compatible with general leadership training.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm. to 9:00 pm. On one hand, I strongly believe that students will benefit a great deal from the workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". On the other hand, I am sure that the findings from my study will be worthwhile and valuable to training practitioners.

What I ask from you is:

* Your permission to allow students in your CECP 601 class to attend the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl on Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm

* I would appreciate it if you could dismiss your class earlier to let students attend this workshop.

I will contact you soon to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
Graduate student

Robert O. Brinkerhoff
Doctoral Advisor
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Dear Dr. Irey:

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my dissertation entitled "The Impact of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training". Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor. The purpose of my study is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

I would like to ask permission from you to include students in your class, CECP 621, Psycho Class & Treat., in my study. The students in your class will be invited to attend a training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Ms. Katherine Karl, faculty member in the Department of Management, Western Michigan University will give this workshop. This content is very compatible with general leadership training.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm. On one hand, I strongly believe that students will benefit a great deal from the workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". On the other hand, I am sure that the findings from my study will be worthwhile and valuable to training practitioners.

What I ask from you is:

* Your permission to allow students in your CECP 621 class to attend the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl on Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm

* I would appreciate it if you could dismiss your class earlier to let students attend this workshop.

I will contact you soon to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
Graduate student

Robert O. Brinkerhoff
Doctoral Advisor
July 24, 1990

Dear Dr. Smidchens:

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my dissertation entitled "The Impact of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training". Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor. The purpose of my study is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

I would like to ask permission from you to include students in your class, EDLD 645, Research Design/Data Analysis 1, in my study. The students in your class will be invited to attend a training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Ms. Katherine Karl, faculty member in the Department of Management, Western Michigan University will give this workshop. This content is very compatible with general leadership training.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm. On one hand, I strongly believe that students will benefit a great deal from the workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". On the other hand, I am sure that the findings from my study will be worthwhile and valuable to training practitioners.

What I ask from you is:

* Your permission to allow students in your EDLD 645 class to attend the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl on Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm

* I would appreciate it if you could dismiss your class earlier to let students attend this workshop.

I will contact you soon to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ugsrithong
Graduate student

Robert O. Brinkerhoff
Doctoral Advisor
Dear Dr. Warnke:

I am a doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership, currently working on my dissertation entitled "The Impact of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training". Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff is my doctoral advisor. The purpose of my study is to investigate factors that influence learning in training situations.

I would like to ask permission from you to include students in your class, CECP 612, Counseling Practicum, in my study. The students in your class will be invited to attend a training workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". Ms. Katherine Karl, faculty member in the Department of Management, Western Michigan University will give this workshop. This content is very compatible with general leadership training.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm. On one hand, I strongly believe that students will benefit a great deal from the workshop, "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way". On the other hand, I am sure that the findings from my study will be worthwhile and valuable to training practitioners.

What I ask from you is:

- Your permission to allow students in your CECP 612 class to attend the workshop "How to give negative feedback in a constructive way" by Ms. Katherine Karl on Tuesday, September 25 from 6:45 pm to 9:00 pm
- I would appreciate it if you could dismiss your class earlier to let students attend this workshop.

I will contact you soon to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsritthong
Graduate student

Robert O. Brinkerhoff
Doctoral Advisor
Appendix Q

Copy of Approved Human Subject Protection Form
Date: June 6, 1990
To: Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "The Impacts of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training", was reviewed as expedited by the Board. The protocol cannot be approved until the following revisions are made:

1. You may not receive class lists from the computer center unless people who have signed-up for these classes have been previously notified that their participation in the workshops would be made public.

2. The Board needs an explanation of how the announcement is given to participants. This must be prior to their receipt of a Consent Form.

3. The Consent Form needs the following changes:
   - the 6th paragraph should not only state that participants may withdraw consent or discontinue participation, but that they may refuse to sign and not participate in the research at all, but still participate in the ACC workshop with no penalty.
   - if there is any person in these workshops who is receiving grades or academic credit, then the protection of their academic rights must clearly be specified in the Consent Form.
   - the starred line must be removed because it appears that this will eventually be separated from the information in the form. This line of separation is illegal.

Please submit the above changes in your protocol to the HSIRB at Research and Sponsored Programs. Approval can be granted after the changes are received by the Board.

xc: R. Brinkerhoff, Educational Leadership
Date: June 13, 1990
To: Duangkaew (Tim) Ungsrithong
From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "The Impacts of a Realistic Training Preview on Subsequent Transfer of Training", has been approved as expedited by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any change in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: R. Brinkerhoff, Educational Leadership

HSIRB Project Number __________ 90-05-10

Approval Termination __________ June 13, 1991
Date: July 10, 1990
To: Duangkaew Ungsarithong, Educational Leadership
From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 90-05-10

We have reviewed the edited announcement and consent form. Although we find them to be slightly less
detailed and therefore of poorer quality than the original set, the essential elements are intact and the
project continues to be approved.

cc: Dr. Robert O. Brinkerhoff, Educational Leadership
Appendix R

Standard Scores of Self-Efficacy Measure, Part One
| SN | CON | z|m1 | z|m2 | z|m3 | z|m4 | z|m5 | z|s1 | z|s2 | z|s3 | z|s4 | z|s5 |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | 1.286 | 0.565 | 0.897 | 1.428 | 0.372 |
| 2  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | 0.32 | 0.56 | 0.955 |
| 3  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | 0.32 | 0.56 | 0.955 |
| 4  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 5  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | 0.32 | 0.56 | 0.955 |
| 6  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | 0.32 | 0.56 | 0.955 |
| 7  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 8  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | 0.32 | 0.56 | 0.955 |
| 9  | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | 0.32 | 0.56 | 0.955 |
| 10 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -3.02 | 0.66 | 0.475 | -0.07 | -0.93 |
| 11 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | 0.32 | 0.56 | 0.955 |
| 12 | -3.53 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.66 | 0.476 | 0.565 | -0.58 | -1.94 |
| 13 | -3.53 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.66 | 0.476 | 0.565 | -0.58 | -1.94 |
| 14 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 15 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 16 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 17 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 18 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 19 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 20 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 21 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 22 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 23 | 0.282 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.09 | -0.32 | -1.28 | 1.63 | -1.00 | -1.66 |
| 24 | -3.53 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.66 | 0.476 | 0.565 | -0.58 | -1.94 |
| 25 | -3.53 | 0.331 | 0.196 | 0.375 | 0.476 | -2.66 | 0.476 | 0.565 | -0.58 | -1.94 |

**Explanation of Headings**

- **SN**: Subject Number
- **CON**: Condition (Group 1 or Group 2)
- **zm1** to **zm5**: z-scores for items 1 to 5 (strength)
- **zs1** to **zs5**: z-scores for items 1 to 5 (magnitude)
| ZMS | 6.19 | 3.88 | .84 | -6.84 | -11.13 | . | 2.94 | 5.17 | 3.24 | -3.34 | -3.00 | -10.65 | -6.85 | -1.83 | 1.17 | 1.57 | 3.88 | -11.80 | 5.02 | 4.82 | -3.80 | 2.63 | 4.77 | 5.50 | 7.79 | 3.62 | 7.69 | 7.05 | 7.49 | 3.96 | 6.71 | -7.05 | 1.89 | -11.09 | -8.25 | 2.82 | -20.40 | .75 | 1.40 | -3.81 | .95 | 4.89 | 5.54 | .11 | -3.02 | 1.97 | -7.51 |

Table of ZMS Scores

ZMS = the sum of the Z-scores for all ten items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ZMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>-6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>-7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>-6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>-3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>-10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>-.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>-9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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