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The purpose of this research project was twofold. First, to determine which, if any, information items, normally known about short duration out-of-house management training programs (seminars, workshops, etc.) prior to attendance, are indicative of educational merit. Second, to utilize this knowledge of educational merit indicators to test for a difference between the educational merit of out-of-house management training programs provided by (a) academic and (b) nonacademic instructional sources.

A total of 20 program characteristics were identified as indicators of educational merit by a review of literature and/or survey of corporate training officers. Six of these 20 indicators produced a difference between the judged educational merit of sampled management training programs offered by academic and nonacademic instructional sources. Five of these six indicators identified programs with nonacademic instructional sources as possessing more educational merit than programs with academic instructional sources.

In line with the two objectives of this study and predicated on the findings, there were two basic conclusions. First, it was concluded that advance information, normally known about a short
duration out-of-house management training program prior to attendance, can provide an indication of the educational merit associated with the training program. Secondly, it was concluded that short duration out-of-house management training programs offered by non-academic sources possess more educational merit than similar programs presented by academic sources.

The results of this study have implications for those individuals involved in the training program selection process. These individuals, armed with information normally available prior to attendance, can make determinations about the educational merit of short duration out-of-house management training programs. Additionally, study findings have significance for planners of management training programs. The training program characteristics identified by corporate training officers as being indicative of educational merit provide a good indication also of what type of management training program corporations are willing to pay for. Training program planners, by applying the findings of this study where feasible, should be able to design more marketable training programs.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of support exists for a takeoff on an old cliché "there's no business like seminar business" coined by Weingarten (1967). Most organizations and their individual members are bombarded daily by a wealth of fliers, pamphlets, and other sources advertising training programs on nearly any subject matter, to be conducted at numerous locations, for varying lengths of time and costs. Although such programs have been a topic of discussion and study for many years, the extent or even existence of their worth is still being debated.

Statement of the Problem

Most research dealing with out-of-house training programs has either attempted to develop an evaluation model or proposed methods of evaluation which require (a) that the training program be actually experienced and/or (b) substantially more information than is normally available to the potential attendee. Trainers are rightfully interested in evaluation since it provides the means for improvement as well as justification for their efforts and required resources. While training directors and potential attendees of out-of-house training programs are also interested in evaluation, they often have a more immediate concern—that of selecting the program that will best fill their needs. This training program selection
decision generally lacks any frame of reference for judging the educational merit of a program based on the information normally available beforehand (usually in the form of fliers and other marketing oriented material).

The purpose of this research project is twofold: First, to determine which, if any, information items, normally known about a training program prior to attendance, are indicative of educational merit. Second, to utilize this knowledge of educational merit indicators to test for a difference between the educational merit of out-of-house management training programs provided by (a) academic and (b) nonacademic organizations. It is hoped that results of this study will provide assistance to those individuals who are required to make training program selection decisions.

Scope of the Study

Before delving into the background and methodology for this study, it is necessary to carve out and define the subject matter--an area easily recognized but not fully identified, categorized, or labeled.

This study centers on training as opposed to education. The difference between these two terms is pointed out by Dunnette and Kirchner (1965),

Personnel training is the process by which individuals learn the skills, knowledges, attitudes and behaviors necessary for carrying out the job responsibilities assigned to them... In contrast, education is designed to fit persons to take part in the many institutions of society rather than only a specific one. Thus, industrial training has specific purposes whereas the
goals of education are multifaceted and not always specifically defined. (p. 57)

This study, therefore, is concerned with that portion of the broad category of learning designed to satisfy a specific need of a given work environment or environments.

This study also centers on those training programs presented by organizations located outside the work environment for which the training is offered (i.e., out-of-house as opposed to in-house). The training is normally provided on a profit-making or break-even basis, generally in the form of short duration one time out-of-house seminars or workshops. Table 1 is provided to help explain what is normally included in the training area under study.

Table 1

Characteristics of Out-of-House Training

Conducted away from the participant's work environment or residence.
Designated for individuals within the work environment.
Designed to provide information to attendees for direct application and utilization in relation to their current employment.
Designed to provide information related to a specific subject area.
Presented in the form of seminars, workshops, clinics, etc.
Enrollment requires little or no prerequisites—open enrollment.

Since the category of training encompasses such a large number of programs, this research project is limited to those programs relating to the general area of management. The number of management training programs is determined to be small enough to allow for a
feasible study yet large enough to provide a sufficient volume of data.

Additionally, it is not the purpose of this study to present or develop an evaluation model or clear decision tool which when applied would result in an exclusive selection of one training program over all others. The prime reason for this limitation is due to the early realization that such a decision tool, in order to be right for an individual decision maker, would require a variety of individualized variable inputs too numerous to incorporate in any decision model.

With the information developed and verified in this study, however, the individual decision maker will hopefully have valid indicators of educational merit to utilize in making a selection between available out-of-house management training programs.

Outline of the Study

Chapter II contains a review of literature relating to out-of-house training programs and the relationship between common program characteristics (e.g., class size, hours of instruction per day, etc.) and the educational merit of the training program. In Chapter III the results of a survey of corporate training officers will be presented and discussed. This survey collected the opinions of corporate training officers as to which management training program characteristics are indicators of educational merit in a program. The information about indicators of educational merit gained in Chapters II and III is utilized in Chapter IV to test for a
difference between the educational merit of sampled training programs provided by academic versus nonacademic instructional sources. Chapter V summarizes results and presents conclusions.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following review of literature will be in two parts. The first will cover the broad topic items generally related to the overall subject matter. The second portion will be structured around those common information items that are generally available for management training programs prior to attendance.

General Related Topics

Reasons for Adult Management Training and Its Growth

Automation is one of the primary reasons behind the need for the growth of management training in industry. This conclusion has been reached by many authors to include McGehee and Thayer (1961, p. 10), Dunnette and Kirchner (1965, p. 58), and Knowles (1977, p. 292). Knowles in addition to automation also included a shortage of broadly educated executive talent, accelerated technical changes, the advent of equal employment opportunity and civil rights legislation, demands of labor unions, and changes in management theory and practice.

Coupled with these forces creating a demand for management training in industry is the advent of available slack resources in one of the prime instructional sources for such training—universities and colleges. According to Hodgkinson (1976, p. 43), colleges
and universities have suddenly become very interested in adult education because of declining enrollments in their traditional source of capital—18-year-old customers.

The reasons provided for adult management training in industry in the preceding discussions, however, are only ancillary to a more basic cause, that of economics. As stated by A. P. Sullivan (1971), "Because industry in a free society is economically motivated, it follows that training in industry is an economically motivated management tool—its ultimate purpose being to improve economic performance of the sponsoring organization" (p. 4). Economics, in addition to explaining the motivation behind the sponsoring organization, also accounts for the reasons behind the instruction source. As already explained, economics is a prime factor in the growing participation of formal academic institutions in industrial training. Likewise, economics also provides the stimulus for participation by nonacademic instructional organizations such as private firms, consultants, and professional associations.

Since economics is the prime cause behind the need and growth of management training programs in industry, it is only appropriate that economic terms be used to summarize these forces. As described by J. F. Sullivan (1977, p. 23), the expanding field of management education can be explained by two economic terms: "demand pull" and "cost push." "Demand pull" is supported by all the reasons provided for adult management education from automation to changes in management theory and practice. In turn, the concept of "cost push" is involved in the reduced demand for undergraduate services provided
by colleges and universities.

According to many, these forces have resulted in an unprecedented growth in training in industry programs. Hinds (1975) stated that, "Outside of the advancement made by minorities in industry, the most striking trend in the industrial complex has been an accelerated appreciation of business for education, particularly management development" (p. 42). Knox (1977, p. 183) reported that during the mid 60's, one out of five U.S. adults engaged in at least one major continuing education activity--by the mid 70's this ratio had risen to one in four and represented 30 to 35 million participants a year. One-third of this activity was determined to be occupational related. Peterfreund (1976, p. 32) found in a 1974/75 study of the training function of 62 large firms that they had experienced more training activity with a greater variety in 1975 than in 1970. Additionally, two-thirds reported that they would be doing even more in 1980. Lundberg, Dunbar, and Bayless (1973, pp. 34-38), based on the results of a training study of large corporations, reported that 93% had management training programs and that 91.3% thought their programs were effective. J. F. Sullivan (1977, p. 23) obtained similar results in a 1976 sample survey of colleges and universities. Two-thirds reported that they expected to produce at least 20% more continuing management education in 1980/81 than they had provided in 1975/76--another 17% reported that they expected to provide 10-20% more.

There is recent evidence, however, that this projected growth has not occurred and in fact has been reversed. Since 1980, when
the seminar business was running at a rate of $350 million per year, two of the four top public seminar offering groups have gone bankrupt and the other two are in trouble. This downturn, attributed to a shaking out of over supply, could result in a seminar business of only about $200 million per year in 1982 ("Making Dollars," 1982). Additionally, according to Medoff (cited in "Making Dollars," 1982), an economist at Harvard, the percentage of employees receiving organizational sponsored training has remained relatively stable since 1969. Any increase in training is because of labor market growth and technological changes which in fact should have resulted in a strong growth in the proportions of training.

Regardless of whether training activity is increasing or decreasing, firms are still faced with numerous decisions concerning the most appropriate training program for them. One of the first decisions to be considered is whether they should conduct the training themselves in-house, send their employees to out-of-house programs, or utilize some combination or variation of these two basic methods.

In-House Versus Out-of-House

**Need.** In order to satisfy their training needs, most firms utilize at least some out-of-house training programs. As Risley (1960) stated:

> Few if any organizations could carry on this total [training] program solely within the organization. Even among the largest firms, geographic decentralization of activities would cause problems even if a complete facility could be obtained. In smaller organizations the number
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of individuals requiring certain educational work at the same time would be so few as to make in-company programs not feasible. As a result of these factors, most organizations utilize some combination of in-company and out-of-company education programs. (p. 199)

**In-house or out-of-house?** According to Kirkpatrick (1978), selective use of outside sources to supplement those available within the organization is beneficial—with the key word being selective. Lusterman (1978) stated that the decision on how much training a firm attempts in-house is based on two factors, necessity and cost benefit. The necessity aspect relates primarily to those portions of a firm's training requirements that address unique products or processes. The cost efficiency factor, although self-evident and undisputable, does not contribute as much to the selection decision as would normally be expected. As determined by Peterfreund (1976) in a 1975 study of education in industry, need, not cost, is the primary factor because it is too difficult to assess a program's value versus cost. There are additional pros and cons that impact an in-house versus out-of-house training program decision. According to Bass and Vaughan (1969, p. 92), the main weakness of off-the-job training programs was the failure to incorporate materials that would facilitate transfer of training once back on the job. The major advantage of off-the-job training, cited by the authors, was that organized training for many positions becomes feasible only when trainees can give their full attention to it. One additional argument favoring in-house training is that it affords companies more control over the learning process. Oberg
(1963), in a study of 147 executives whose companies had used university executive programs, also provided support for off-the-job training. The chief advantages reported by respondents for off-the-job programs were as follows:

1. It lets executives get away from the pressures of the job and work in a climate in which "party-line" thinking is discouraged and self-analysis is stimulated.

2. It provides resource people and material that contribute suggestions and ideas for the executive to "try on for size" as he attempts to change, develop, and grow.

3. It presents a challenge to the executive that, in general, enhances his motivation to develop himself.

Additional support for out-of-house training programs is provided by Adams (1976) who reported that, based on a case study involving first line supervisors in one textile company, that job satisfaction resulting from the "ceremonial side effects" of being selected for a university training program may have been greater if the training site were the university campus rather than at the company location.

In summary, both in-house and out-of-house programs have support and as a result a selective use of each in a combined company training program would appear to be the proper approach. Tosi (1967), while recognizing a legitimate place for off-the-job development techniques, stated that, "Changed behavior [the goal of all training programs] results only when off-the-job methods are used in conjunction with on-the-job methods" (p. 73).
In-house and out-of-house decision results. Based on the previous discussion the question arises—how has industry responded to the in-house versus out-of-house decision?

In a study of management training in large industrial corporations, Sheffleck (1969) reported that less than 14% of the firms utilized in-house instructors exclusively. Peterfruend (1976), in a study of education in industry, reported that of a total sample of 62 large firms only five offered no in-house programs, three utilized no out-of-house, and two had no training programs. Of 118 respondents, in a study of management education and development programs in United States companies by Shafer (1961), 42.0% reported that their programs were written or developed by outside sources, 41.6% reported that their programs were conducted by outside sources, and 55.5% reported that programs were not conducted at a company location. A. P. Sullivan (1971, p. 150) reported that 14% of management training courses were designed by outside sources, based on a study of management training programs in 50 large industrial firms.

In terms of order or progression the next topic for discussion would be factors impacting the selection of an individual program. This topic, however, is the primary concern of the second section in this chapter. The next area discussed will be the effects of management training upon the participant and or the firm.
Effects and Evaluation of Management Training

One of the primary concerns with management training programs is the lack, in most cases, of any real evidence or assurance that the program has had beneficial effects. A continual complaint (Katcher, 1976, p. 45; Weingarten, 1967, p. 37) has been that millions of dollars and hours of valuable executive time are invested in management training each year with no clear indication that the value has been proven in terms of improved performance on the job. Evaluation is very hard to perform in a meaningful fashion due to a variety of measurement and control problems.

This section will deal with two closely related aspects of management training programs. The first item addressed will be the effects of management training. Second will be a discussion of evaluation attempts and problems related to the process of trying to measure and document those effects.

Effects of training. One method of attempting to get answers to the training effects question has been to ask sponsoring firms for their opinions on training programs. Barton-Dobenin and Hodgetts (1975), utilizing information provided by 385 respondents from various industrial groups in the state of Kansas, obtained results pertaining to effects on firms and effects on executives. Most of the firms, 59.4%, reported that training programs had provided new and unique ideas for use in the company. In addition, 32.6% reported an increase in the firms' efficiency. Five and three-tenths percent reported no noticeable effect and another 2.7% felt
that training programs were a needless business expense. In regard to the effect on participants, 41.6% of respondents reported that training programs increased an executive's effectiveness. Another 31.8% reported that training resulted in increased enthusiasm and renewed interest in their jobs on the part of participants. Sixteen percent felt that training had improved an executive's effectiveness for advancement while 8.3% reported that participants were reassured of the effectiveness of their job performance. No visible effect on participants was reported by the remaining 2.3%.

Andrews (1961), in a study of 10,000 participants in 39 formal university development programs, reported an overall favorable response of 82% to the training experience.

Belasco and Trice (1969) reported that all is not lost even if value cannot be proven in terms of improved job performance or efficiency. In a study of 258 supervisors in a large organization they reported that the training program itself produced "ceremonial side effects." These effects, stemming from many of the same factors highlighted in the famous Hawthorne experiments, resulted in increased morale and job satisfaction on the part of training program participants.

On the surface, results such as the preceding seem to provide proof of the beneficial effects of management training programs. The results are not nearly as clear, however, when evaluative techniques are applied.
Evaluation of training. According to Katcher (1976), a student's satisfaction with instruction is hardly a good measure for improved performance. Similarly, Bolar (1970) reported that the opinions of faculty or trainers themselves are likely to be biased, and "in a sense their judgement needs to be discounted even more than that of participating executives" (p. 36). Likewise, as stated by Blumenfeld and Crane (1973), "the quality of the opinion of . . . managers . . . regarding the effectiveness of their training techniques appears to be independent of any kind of quality evidence" (p. 48).

Obviously the consensus is that collecting the opinions of trainers and participants is not the ideal method of evaluating a training program.

As with any evaluation, the true test should focus on how well the results satisfy preestablished objectives of changing behavior on the part of students. Any changes in behavior would ideally be reflected in on-the-job performance once a participant completes training. As Deterline (1977e, p. 26) proclaimed, the consequences of training should be apparent in the "real world" of job performance. The same author in an earlier article (1977a, p. 48) stated that trainers should put their jobs on the line and establish cost/effectiveness or cost/benefit procedures for their training, for without it they risk credibility, professionalism, and relevance.

In still another article, Deterline (1977d) contended that the reverse of this recommended procedure is often true, "evaluation is often considered of little importance or significance in training
and, if it is done at all, it is downplayed, and its results are of little importance—or value—because of the superficial nature of what is evaluated and how" (p. 14).

Campbell (1971), in a study of 73 training and development studies published over a 20-year time span, reported that only four could be considered experimentally sound. Dubin, Mezack, and Neidig (1974), in an update of Campbell's work, studied 16 additional studies published between January 1970 and April 1973. They found that 11 reported significant results—of these, seven used inferential statistics. Concerning study design, six used control groups, 10 did some form of pretesting, and four had longitudinal designs. They also recommended more complete designs be used to evaluate training based on a finding that, "The implementation of a more complete experimental design does not appear to reduce the probability of obtaining significant results. On the contrary, with respect to these 16 studies, better designs produced improved evidence of effective training" (p. 43).

There have been numerous attempts which have met with varying success to establish a procedure or model for more scientific evaluation of training programs. Barrett (1972), for example, developed a step-by-step model for evaluating management development seminars and performed a successful test application of the model on a "real world" training program. No such models or procedures, though usually well thought out and definitely striving to fill a recognized need, have gained any widespread acceptance. There are a wealth of reasons for this situation. Shafer (1961), in a study
utilizing a sample of over 100 members of the American Society of Training Directors who were employed by firms contained in Fortune magazine's top 500 industrials, reported on the greatest deterrents to effective evaluation of management training. The reasons provided in the order of greatest to least mentioned were: (a) evaluation research techniques are difficult to apply in productive or operating situations, (b) lack of time, (c) lack of knowledge of evaluation research techniques, (d) top management does not stress evaluation of management training, (e) lack of interest, (f) lack of finances, and (g) top management is not interested in findings when evaluation is performed.

In a similar report of a field survey, Lippitt, McCune, and Church (1964, p. 17) reported that the obstacles to training evaluation, as given by training directors (again from most to least frequent) were: (a) lack of time, (b) lack of staff, (c) lack of money, (d) need to convince supervisors, (e) lack of effective methods, (f) need for adequate facilities, (g) lack of cooperation with other organizations, (h) magnitude of the job, (i) need for decentralization, and (j) failure of supervisors to determine employee expectations.

Due to these roadblocks sound evaluation, regardless of its need, is not expected by this writer to gain widespread practice in the management training arena. Precourse selection criteria, a sub-category or related element of evaluation, offers more feasibility. Still little effort has taken place in this area. Shafer (1961, p. 77) reported that only 4.7% of the firms he surveyed performed
any evaluation of course material information tests prior to the training program.

Pre and Post Actions to Optimize Training

There are several significant actions that can be taken both prior to as well as following a training program that can contribute to the optimizing of results obtained.

Pretraining actions. The most important pretraining action other than selection of the training program itself is selection of who should attend. According to Weingarten (1967, p. 93), a major portion of the blame for an unsuccessful seminar can often be traced to a bad selection decision as to who should attend. This decision is often based on the wrong reason, such as reward for employees. Worse still it is sometimes presented to selected attendees as a mandatory program they must attend. Ideally, Weingarten held that the "right" candidate will be either one whose knowledge the company seeks to broaden or one who has a problem about which he will not accept intracompany counsel. Katcher (1976) along a similar vein stated that companies should interview prospective participants prior to selection to judge their motivation—students who have no desire to learn, can see no value in the training program, or who feel content with what they are doing should not be selected for training programs. Another factor which should contribute to the student selection decision is the ability of an individual to learn. House (1967) proposed that, "managers should be selected on the
basis of their ability to assimilate and understand the information presented in the learning phase of the development effort" (p. 15). House cited numerous studies in support of this recommendation that show a positive relationship between various measures of learning ability and the effect of management development. Attendees should also be chosen for training programs only if the program has something to offer toward their career development. One of the missing links in contemporary training, according to Scott (1975, p. 12), is a lack of relevant training tied to career path. Similarly, Belasco and Trice (1969) stated that, "one way to improve the probability of change associated with training is through the selection of individuals for training on the basis of the match between their predispositions and the demands of training" (p. 13). To assist in the selection of participants for training programs, Morano (1975, p. 45) recommended the use of a matrix type of arrangement to "evaluate" who gets selected. Suggested parameters for use in the matrix include what product program the employee is working on, the employee's past performance, the supervisor's endorsement plus career goals and values of the employee.

Studies indicate that attendance by employees at training programs is normally initiated by the organization rather than the individual. In a study of participants in university development programs, Andrews (1961, p. 119) reported that 87% of the attendees were approached by their company while another 12% sought out the opportunity on their own. Of those who did not originate the idea themselves, 94% reported that they had reacted favorably to the
suggestion to attend the training program. A. P. Sullivan (1971) obtained similar results in a study of training in large industrial firms, "It was found that by far the most widely applicable and most heavily relied upon method in industry is to direct attendance and expect selectees to attend" (p. 151). According to Sullivan this method was used 57.4% of the time. In another 20.9% participants were invited to attend on a purely voluntary basis. Eighteen and one-tenth percent were nominated by management and then selected from a list of nominees and in 2.2% of the cases employees applied and were selected for a list of applicants.

Kirkpatrick (1978, p. 14) recommended one further action once an employee has been selected—preprogram counseling. Items to be included as discussion topics are program arrangements (planning for absence, travel arrangements, etc.), who pays for expenses, employee's behavior during training (encourage participation during program sessions as well as off hours), and what is expected following his or her return for the training program (reports, summaries, or discussions).

Postprogram actions. There are several steps that can be taken after an employee returns from a training program that will either help optimize the effects of the training just received or contribute toward a more efficient company training program in the future. Kirkpatrick (1978, p. 15) has outlined several of these steps. First, immediately upon returning from a training program an employee should be asked to make a written evaluation of the program.
designed to help an organization determine the benefits to the participant and the firm and whether others should be sent to the same course in the future. To help aid in this process the company should also maintain written records concerning employees; training experiences as well as organizations who have presented such programs to company employees. Second, program participants should summarize principles and techniques learned during the training program in order to discuss and coordinate them with his or her supervisor for possible practical applications. The final step in Kirkpatrick's (1978) postprogram plan is follow-up. Follow-up actions could incorporate such actions as (a) scheduling another related training program for the participant, (b) encouraging further self-development in the area on the part of the participant, (c) encouraging the participant and his supervisor to implement changes as a result of ideas obtained during training, and (d) attempting to determine the effectiveness of changes in the behavior of the participant.

Degree of Educational Merit

A prime concern in the selection of a training program centers around the judged degree of educational merit offered by that training program. It is very difficult to objectively determine the degree of educational merit of any given training program—especially prior to attendance.

According to Deterline (1976, p. 7), "meat and potato" statistics such as cost per trainee, number of trainees, and hours of
instruction do not determine the quality of education offered. This writer is in full agreement with this concept if it is viewed in a cause and effect relationship—e.g., more training hours do not cause the training program to be higher in educational merit. It is believed by this writer, however, that such characteristics do provide some indication of the probable degree of educational merit. Rationale for this belief will be presented for many such training program characteristics in the next section.

The bottom line on educational merit, however, is best determined by how well a training program satisfies the stated objectives of the program. Once again this measurement has no value in terms of selecting a program since the program must be conducted in order for the measure to be applied.

Training Program Characteristics

The objectives of this second section of the literature review are to provide, first, a discussion of characteristics related to management training programs and, second, rationale where available why such characteristics are indicators of educational merit.

Advertised Objectives

According to Mager (1975), "An objective is a description of a performance you want learners to be able to exhibit before you consider them competent. An objective describes an intended result of instruction, rather than the process of instruction itself" (p. 5). Mager, in the same text, presented three reasons for stating
training objectives: (1) first, objectives form the basis for selecting and designing the means, methods, and content of instruction; (2) second, they provide the basis for evaluation; and (3) third, they provide the student with a means to better organize efforts toward accomplishment of those objectives. It is the first of these objectives that industry considers the most important.

Industry, as viewed by Wohlking (1971, p. 2), looks to training as a means of improving on-the-job performance. Similarly, Alden (1978, p. 46) noted the growing efforts in industry to evaluate training from a cost benefit approach. Likewise, Peterfreund (1976) stated that, "corporate motives [as related to training] are short-term, functional and mission-orientated" (p. 31). A. P. Sullivan (1971, p. 33) conducted an analysis of 14 writers on the subject of what industry is seeking from training programs. As listed in the order of importance (judged by frequency of mention) they are as follows: (a) improved dollar performance, (b) building a promotion and expansion reserve, (c) improving morale, and (d) improving customer and public satisfaction. Harwood (1979), from a study of 125 manufacturing facilities in 50 states, found that the most common training objective, contained in 72% of the programs reviewed, was to improve communicative skills and understanding.

Advertised objectives must be specific enough to provide a good indication of what performance factors a training program is attempting to improve before they can be used by firms in the program selection process. According to Dunnette and Kirchner (1965, p. 57), it is the specific goals of training that distinguish it from education.
Training is directed at providing individuals with the opportunity to learn specific skills, knowledges, attitudes, and behaviors necessary to carry out their job responsibilities. In contrast, education is designed to provide individuals with the ability to take part in the many institutions in society rather than a specific job related task. While Andrews (1961, p. 132) claimed that one of the objectives of all management training programs is to broaden the perspective of participants, Nadler (1976) stated that, "[objectives] should be sufficiently specific so that they are easily communicated to the prospective participants" (p. 5). In summary there is support for the use of program objective statements in the training program selection process—specifically stated objectives indicate educational merit in a program.

Before leaving the topic of program objectives, a related observation concerning the use of objective statements for program selection needs to be made. According to Weinberger (1969, p. 23), objectives of a program are matters of policy and as such should not be evaluated. Katcher (1976) disagreed, however, and stated that one must be on the guard against invalid targets. As an example he cited training objectives designed to change the existing management style of participants to the current idealistic view of a manager as represented by McGregor's (1960) Y or Blake and Mouton's (1964) 9,9. Such training programs, according to Katcher, fail to take into account the value of style differences within an organization for optimal functioning. Just as important is the need to insure that the stated objectives of the program are in line with those of the
organization seeking the training. As pointed out by Morano (1975, p. 43), there is a difference between evaluating programs from an educational point of view than from evaluating programs from an organizational view. Educational evaluation centers on how well course objectives are met while organizational evaluation must concern itself with how a training program contributes to the attainment of organizational objectives.

Advertised major topics will be the subject of the next section.

**Advertised Major Topics**

There is a great variation of opinion present in industry concerning the content of training programs which ranges from one of dissatisfaction to apathy to complete approval. Deterline (1977c, p. 9), for example, claimed that in some companies the veneer of training is more important than either the substance or the cost benefit. In a study of 94 past participants of management training programs, Lee and Dean (1971) found that program content, defined in terms of appropriateness of topics presented, was rated as above average. This rating, however, was lower than the ratings given for either program presentation or overall program value. One complaint against training programs is that they are too academic (Weingarten, 1967, p. 37). In the same vein, Hodgkinson (1976, p. 48) reported that the closer the training is to the actual job situation the better it will be as a predictor of job success. University based management training programs may be recognizing this fact. J. F. Sullivan (1977), in a study of continuing management education in 24
universities, found that 58% of respondents reported that their programs were much more practically oriented in 1975-76 than in 1970-71. Barton-Dobenin and Hodgetts (1975), in a study of 385 industrial firms, found that the number one and number two rated deterrents from participating in management training programs were lack of program relevance and too much theoretical material. In the same study respondents reported that future management training programs should concentrate less on personnel and more on marketing-sales.

To utilize advertised major topic descriptions as an input factor in the training program selection process, two elements are required. First, an organization needs to know what it is looking for, and second, it must be able to judge what is offered based on the description provided. According to Dunnette and Kirchner (1965), "specification of organizational goals and the correlated task requirements is absolutely crucial to the determination of the content of training" (p. 59). Once an organization, through such a needs analysis, knows what training topic areas it requires it next must locate them in the market place assuming the decision has been made to go out-of-house. According to the Barton-Dobenin and Hodgetts (1975) study, subject matter was assigned prime importance in the program selection decision. For such use a topic description advertised for a training program must be sufficiently specific to allow for a judgment in regard to need satisfaction.

Based on the previous discussion the degree of match between the program content and the actual job situation would also be a
valid input factor to the program selection process. Again, a specific topic description is necessary.

Level of Management

The previous two sections would seem to indicate that management training programs should be directed at specific levels of management within an organization in order to provide for specific program objectives and topics. Due to additional factors, however, this is not necessarily the case. House (1967) stated that an all too common phenomenon in business and industrial training is "that frequently only lower level managers are trained, while supervisors are not even prepared to accept change" (p. 10). Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt (1955/1967), in a study at the International Harvester Company produced indications that management training programs often result in conflict between a subordinate and his superior when the superior is unwilling to accept principles which the subordinate has been taught during a management training program. Such discussions support training programs for all management levels. A. P. Sullivan (1971), in a study of management training in large corporations, produced support for this view. Thirty out of 46 respondents reported that entire work teams, involving several levels of management, should be trained together because if all levels are trained together they will work better together later on. The remaining 16 respondents felt that only one level of management should be included in any given management training course in order to promote free expression of ideas during class sessions.
One additional factor, the training method utilized, must, however, be considered in some instances. Argyris, according to an article in *Business Week* ("Yourself as Others," 1963, p. 162), stated that T-Group training methods should not be utilized for lower supervisory levels since it would mean stripping a participant of his defenses in areas most critical.

In summary a review of literature presents no clear opinion regarding the educational merit of a program as determined by the targeted management level or levels of a management training program.

The size of a training program participant's organization is the next element discussed.

**Organizations of All Sizes**

Literature provides no preference, in terms of educational merit, for one training program over another based on the size of their targeted organizations. Some research results are available, however, in regard to the relationship between the size of an organization and the degree of participation in management training programs, as well as on the effects of such programs on executives from varying sized organizations. Barton-Dobenin and Hodgetts (1975), in their study of industrial firms in the state of Kansas, reported that,

Smaller firms, on the average, did not participate [in management training programs] to the same degree as did larger ones. In the case of some programs, such as college seminars, there was a direct correlation between the size of the firm and the degree of participation. (p. 38)

In the same study larger firms were,
much more enthusiastic than the smaller ones regarding the effect a management training program had in improving an executive's effectiveness for advancement [and in] . . . the increase or renewing of an executive's enthusiasm for his or her position. On the other hand, the smaller firms were much more vigorous than the larger ones in their belief that these programs reassured a person he or she was performing the job effectively. (p. 39)

A review of literature, however, does not provide any judgments concerning the educational merit of a training program based on the targeted size of the participants organizations.

The next item discussed centers on the tailoring of training programs to prospective audiences.

**Modifying Training Programs for Participants**

Knowles (1969) reported that a theory of adult learning is based on four assumptions that differentiate it from learning associated with youth or children. The four assumptions behind learning by mature persons are presented by Knowles as follows. Mature adult people learn best in education situations where:

1. Students and teacher have a relationship of mutual responsibility for diagnosing learning needs, formulating objectives, and planning, conducting, and evaluating learning experiences.

2. Instructional methods and techniques make use of his/her experience.

3. The curriculum is sequenced to coincide with his developmental tasks.

4. Activities are organized around immediate life development. (p. 29-30)

All of the four preceding assumptions require that the training program be designed around the participants and their work environment—
a factor recognized by many researchers. House (1967), based on a review of 200 social science studies on the effects of development efforts on individuals and organizations, stated that, "such studies clearly demonstrate that if development is to be successful, it must be geared not only to the participant's needs and learning abilities, but also to the particular requirements and practices of the organization in which he manages" (p. 11). Similarly, according to Dubin et al. (1974),

A program must first of all be directed to the needs of the program's participants, or it is doomed to failure from the start. An important and often overlooked aspect of a management training program is that the program content should be based on the needs of the client organization. (p. 44)

Brunnette (1976), reporting on a practical application of this concept in a training program for local government officials, stated that,

Training tailored to meet the needs of local government officials can be successful for all those concerned. Necessary time and resources required to conduct pre-assessment activities and design customized training materials are well worth the investment made. (p. 27)

In summary support exists from both research and practice for a positive relationship between the degree to which a training program is designed for participants and their organizations, and the educational merit of the program.

Class size is the subject of the following section.
Class Size

Various factors, to include instructional methods and subject content, impact the group size participating in a management training program. With some elements it also becomes a trade-off decision between educational and economic aspects—the larger the class size the greater the economic payoff and, conversely, the smaller the class the more individualized the instruction. According to Faltermager (1970, p. 144), this country's educational system has a hang-up on small classes and feels that in many instances class sizes could be increased substantially with the result being a significant reduction in costs with little impact on quality. Conversely, Johnson and Brooks (1979) stated that,

The effect of class size on achievement has always been a subject of controversy, but few would dispute that, other things being equal, a large class poses a more difficult management problem than a small one. Adding ten pupils to a class of twenty increases the number of potential two-pupil interactions from 190 to 435. And, of course, there are half again as many individuals with whom materials must be distributed, among whom equipment must be shared, on whom records must be kept, and by whom movements into, about, and out of the classroom must be made. (p. 21)

Arguments in favor of a smaller class size also favor and permit more individualized instruction. This represents the current thinking according to Peterfuend (1976),

Now, the trend is away from programmatic, stand alone, ad hoc courses and materials. As these programs (usually for a group or class) diminish in number and emphasis, they are being supplanted by customized personnel development processes, in which more focus is on the individual. (pp. 30-31)
Based on this trend plus the previously supported benefits of more specific objectives and subject topics, it is felt that rationale exists for using class size as an indicator of educational merit. More specifically, any class larger than the traditional size of 25-30 would indicate reduced educational merit for a particular training program.

The next section will deal with the characteristics of the target participants of training programs.

Training Program Attendees

A very limited amount of published information is available which addresses the characteristics of training program participants in relation to the training program offered. Participant characteristics considered in this study include: (a) employing organization (private industry, nonprofit organization, armed forces, and local, state, or federal government), (b) highest educational degree (no degree, bachelor's, master's, or doctoral), (c) typical age, and (d) years of experience in their field.

Andrews (1961, p. 33) mentioned a research project by McKay which, if proven valid, would conclude that participants of university executive development training programs finding the program to be of the most value were between 38 and 50 years of age, were non-college graduates, and had previous experience mostly in one specialty.

Despite a general lack of published support for any relationship between participant characteristics and the educational merit
of training programs, some rationale can be formulated. For example, it could be hypothesized that the educational merit of management training programs offered to younger or middle level employees would tend to be greater due to a higher motivation and interest on the part of younger employees seeking to gain required management skills to advance their careers. Similarly, training programs attended by college graduates could be argued to have greater educational merit than those whose participants were non-college graduates due to benefits derived through class discussions or by a learning experience designed for students with more prequisites. Regardless of such suppositions, it must be concluded that no support exists from either research or literature for any relationship between the characteristics of participants and the educational quality of management training programs.

The next general area discussed centers on training program instructors.

Training Program Instructors

This section will be segregated into three basic subsections, the number of instructors conducting a program, the source of those instructors, and their educational background.

Number of instructors. No published material was located in a review of literature that provided any guidance or recommendations concerning the ideal number of instructors for any given training program. It is assumed, therefore, that the ideal number of
instructors for a training program is simply the number required in order to satisfy course objectives and is in no way a direct indicator of the educational merit of a training program.

Source of instructors. There are a variety of sources for training instructors to include university faculty, consultants, or private training firms, professional associations, or a company's own in-house staff.

Schmidt (1979), in a study of New York City area trainers, reported that most respondents felt that outside consultants or other resources from outside the organization receiving the training should be utilized whenever funding was available. Outside sources are the trend in university-based continuing management education programs. Based on the results of a survey of universities offering continuing management education programs, J. F. Sullivan (1977) reported that outside instructors made up 35% of the staff for such programs in 1970-71, and 39% in 1975-76, with an estimated 42% in 1980-81. The author feels that this is an effort on the part of universities, "to secure what they feel to be the most competent faculty for their programs whether or not these faculty are from their own institution" (p. 25). A. P. Sullivan (1971, p. 156), in a survey of training officials from formal in-house management training staffs of large American industrial firms, reported that respondents ranked faculty sources from in-house programs as follows (from most to least effective): in-house training staff instructors, in-house executives, consultants, university teachers, and noted...
scholars and authorities.

No clear position is supported, based on the preceding, that establishes a relationship between the source of instructors for training programs and the educational merit present in those programs.

Degrees of instructors. Schmidt's (1979) study of New York City area trainers reported that the majority of training personnel hold an undergraduate degree or more; 23.1% had Bachelor of Science degrees and 30.8% Master of Arts degrees. Do educational credentials, however, indicate better performance? Livingston (1971) reported that no direct relationship exists in the management field between educational performance and success on the job. Faltermager (1970) stated that, "A pernicious conformism forces huge numbers of high school graduates to flock to campuses to get credentials many of them really shouldn't need" (p. 98). Unfortunately, according to Wilson (1972), "the training profession has not seen fit to fight the credential criteria policy. More often it supports and proliferates this policy through establishing these criteria for its own positions" (p. 12). Hodgkinson (1976, p. 43) stated that it is very difficult to prove that instructors with Ph.D. or master's degrees teach any better than instructors without such credentials.

In fact a common argument is that instructors with advanced credentials are too academic and lack relevance to the real work situation. As Brunnette (1976) stated, participants do not appreciate listening to a trainer who does not personally understand their problems. . . . Thus, even
though the trainer may be very capable, if he is not familiar with the situations facing the officials he is instructing, he will frequently find that his training efforts are futile. (p. 25)

The preceding discussion provides no support for a direct relationship between the educational degree held by training instructors and the educational quality of their training programs. The next topic to be discussed is the length of the management training program.

**Duration of Management Training Programs**

This section addresses two aspects of program duration:

(1) length in workdays and (2) training time per day.

**Length in workdays.** Andrews (1961, p. 119) categorized more than 6,000 respondents, who had participated in university management training programs, into five separate categories based on the duration of the training program they attended. He found that after a few days of training that the degree of favorableness declined more for the longer duration programs than for the shorter programs—by the end of the program, however, all had reached the same approximate degree of favorableness. The ever present factor of economics also enters into the program duration aspect of training. According to Lusterman (1978),

> Since paid time off the job is generally the most expensive aspect of employee education, efforts are made to keep courses as short as possible... The length of company courses tend to be determined by no criterion other than what is needed to convey particular skills or knowledge to specific employees or groups. (p. 478)
This later view is supported by Nadler (1976, p. 6) who reported that the duration of a workshop should be long enough to satisfy the objectives and in cases where duration is circumscribed by other factors it may be necessary to reduce objectives to match the program time available.

No rationale was found, based on educational merit, to distinguish between training programs according to their duration. Rather the deciding factor should be whether or not the duration of the program is matched to the program objectives. The same concept applies to the topic discussed next, the number of classroom hours per day.

**Classroom hours per day.** As Lusterman (1978, p. 478) pointed out, since the objective in many programs is to convey a specific skill or knowledge, courses of just a few hours are common. There is also a related danger to this economic desire on the part of industry trainers to get the most benefit for the time/cost expended. According to Hinds (1975, p. 43), training in business often becomes an endurance contest with classes reaching 2 hours or more. Since an adult attention span of more than 1 hour is not supported by research, Hinds calls for breaks on a regular basis.

There is one other factor that most likely also impacts the number of classroom hours per day. As noted by Thiss (1979), "The 1976 Tax Reform Act specifies . . . that if subsistence costs are to be considered a business expense, six hours of business 'activities' must be scheduled, with the traveler required to attend two-thirds
or four hours" (p. 49)

As was the case with number of workdays in a training program, a review of literature revealed no rationale, based on educational quality, to distinguish between programs in terms of the number of classroom hours of instruction offered each workday. Out-of-class preparation time is the next topic addressed.

Out-of-Class Preparation Time

Precourse or out-of-class preparation requirements can conceivably be justified as contributing to the educational merit of a given program simply by the fact that they represent additional learning activities that must surely possess some benefit. Much along the same line, preparation time, could be viewed from a perspective of the harder the work the greater the good. Belasco and Trice (1969) proposed that training difficulty should be increased in order to increase awareness in the program and in turn the ceremonial side effects,

Furthermore, the existence of these ceremonial effects also suggests that management take steps to increase the probability of their occurrence. ... A good deal of evidence indicates that, within reason, the more difficult something is to attain, the more desirable it is. ... This strongly suggests that other training programs should include long reading lists, lectures, difficult exams and most of all, someone who does not pass. These devices increase the rigor of training, therefore, making it more desirable. At the same time, these devices heighten the ceremonial effects of training and may increase the effectiveness of training. (p. 14)

Preparation and study efforts out-of-class are also supported from an economic point of view. Lusterman (1978, p. 478) proposed that
training programs should make maximum use of self-study materials, which can be pursued during off-hours in order to reduce the amount of paid time off-the-job.

If out-of-class preparation time can contribute to the effectiveness of a program and be economical as well, why don't all training programs include such activities? According to Deterline (1977a), one reason might be an attempt on the part of trainers to manipulate trainee feedback, "An instructor who wants to look good in the trainee evaluations might decide to minimize things that might prove aversive to the trainees; tests, homework, difficult projects or exercises, complex topics" (p. 44).

Based on the previous discussion and rationale, both precourse and out-of-class preparation requirements are judged to be positive indicators of the educational merit associated with a training program.

The next area addressed is the relationship, if any, between the educational merit of training programs and the degree of vacational aspects associated with those programs.

Provisions for Recreation As Well As Training

Writing about university executive development programs over 20 years ago, Bricker (1960) noted that,

Although recreation is still recognized as important, there appears to be less emphasis on the facilities available than was evident earlier in the history of these programs, and there are several in which very little in the way of athletic recreation opportunities is available. (p. 12)
Such nontraining aspects of training programs have far from disappeared, however. Currently, Smith (1980) noted that conference centers, combining all the features of a classy vacation retreat with those of a sophisticated training facility, are the fastest growing segment of the billion dollar meeting market.

There are several explanations for the presence of vocational aspects along with training programs. As Weingarten (1967) stated, "Too often the seminar serves as a reward—a free trip and an escape from the regimentation and monotony of office routine—rather than an expression of genuine thirst for knowledge" (p. 3). If allowances were not made for this type of participant, trainers would soon lose the business provided by trainees with such motivations. Other explanations defend vacation aspects of training from a point of view of contributing to the training experience. Thiss (1979, p. 50), reporting on training programs conducted by the Dr. Pepper Company, proposed that out-of-the-ordinary training locations are good in that they promote the cohesiveness so essential to positive group experiences.

Andrews (1961), in a study of university executive development programs, reported that recreational activities are not a major factor contributing to a participant's satisfaction with a training program (p. 122) and that, "adverse criticism of a program as a whole is associated more often with higher levels of recreational activity" (p. 123).

It is apparent that there are pros and cons associated with providing vocational opportunities along with training programs.
As stated in an article in Training magazine ("Resorts: Training in," 1978), "Many trainers don't consider resorts as acceptable meeting sites for the same reason that others do--the ambience beyond the meeting room walls. Obviously, not every training session is right for a resort setting" (p. 78).

Based on the preceding review of literature the same middle of road view must be upheld when judging the relationship between the amount of vacational aspects of a training program and the educational quality provided by that same program. The presence or absence of vacational aspects cannot be utilized as an indicator of educational merit according to the published information available.

How long a training program has been offered is the next item addressed.

**Age of Management Training Program**

Arguments can be made on either side supporting a relationship between the age of a management training program and the educational merit of that program.

The very fact that a program has existed for some time, perhaps 5 years, gives an indication of educational merit for that program in terms of a proven product supported by a wealth of satisfied participants. Conversely, Deterline (1976) claimed that in training, "Inertia sweeps us along. We do the same things we've done in the past, without questioning the relevance or appropriateness of a method for a new requirement" (p. 3).
Based on this latter concept an argument could be made supporting the educational merit of new programs if they were founded on new and improved instructional methods or presented in order to provide skills and/or knowledge concerning a newly developed management concept.

The final conclusion reached is that the time that a specific management training program has been in existence does not in itself provide an indication of the educational merit of that program.

The next item addressed is offering frequency.

**Offering Frequency of Management Training Programs**

Some management training programs are offered once a year or less while others are presented once a month or even more frequently. No rationale is present relating the frequency of offering to the educational merit of a training program—rather it is suspected that offering frequency is determined once again by economics. A management training program will be offered as frequently as it is economically prudent to do so.

Single or multiple training sites is the next topic discussed.

**Single or Multiple Training Locations**

Some management training programs are offered at one location only while others approach a traveling road show playing in numerous locations throughout the country. Support favoring either single or multiple training locations in regard to the educational merit of a
The training program was not located through a review of literature. The decision again appears to be based on economics, i.e., take the product (training program) to various market locations. An article in Training magazine ("The Outlook for," 1979) would seem to dispute the need for such actions, however, "Despite the energy shortage, the tight hotel space and the higher average cost-per-day to conduct a meeting out of the office, all signs point to continued growth in this billion-dollar business [of off-site training]" (p. 40).

The next discussion will center on in-house versus out-of-house training programs.

**In-House Versus Out-of-House and Educational Merit**

A previous section entitled "In-House Versus Out-of-House" (pp. 9-12) addressed in- and out-of-house decision factors and industry statistics related to each. This section will discuss the two in relation to educational merit.

According to Bass and Vaughan (1969), "Even in those instances in which a company can conduct similar training on the job, off-the-job programs are often superior because they are concerned only with training and thus can pay more attention to the circumstances of learning" (p. 93).

Research results, however, of the opinion survey type, tend to favor in-house programs over out-of-house programs. In a study of large industrial firms, A. P. Sullivan (1971) reported that 38 of the 48 sample firms were satisfied with the quality of their own...
management training courses as compared to those offered by universities or associations. In the same vein, 33 of 48 reported dissatisfaction with canned courses offered by outside specialists. Because of such beliefs, Weingarten (1967) reported "that about half of the country's largest corporations either do not send their people to outside seminars at all or participate to the minimum degree" (p. 98).

No clear cut support for the indicated educational merit of a program based on whether it is in-house or out-of-house was determined from a review of literature.

The subject of expenses will be the next topic addressed.

Cost of Management Training Programs

Funds expended by industry on training is undoubtedly massive but generally unidentified. According to Peterfreund (1976, p. 32), little definitized cost data on training in industry are available, especially if indirect costs such as time off the job, loss in productivity by peers who train newcomers, and the diversion of supervisory time is considered. In a study of 37 industrial companies, Peterfreund determined that an annual average of $161 was spent per employee. This, in turn, was judged to be almost three times below what nonindustrial firms expend per employee. In any case training in industry adds up to a great deal of money. According to Lusterman (1978),

During the single recession year of 1975, the nation's 7,500 or so largest private employers spent over 2 billion dollars on employee education, as much as the annual total
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in recent years of all contributions and grants to all U.S. colleges and universities from all sources. (p. 475)

Lusterman also reported that a breakout of these funds results in eight of every 10 dollars going to internal company training programs with the remaining two dollars split relatively equally between tuition-aid programs and external outside study during working hours (p. 476). Lundberg et al. (1973, p. 38), based on the results of a study of training in large corporations, reported that 82.6% believed their expenditures to be justified in terms of the cost. Deterline (1977c) warned against accepting such beliefs at face value since, "In some climates absolute cost is critical and cost/effectiveness is irrelevant! Similarly in some settings 'face validity' . . . is more important than 'true validity'" (p. 6).

A. P. Sullivan (1971, p. 165), in a study of management training in American industry, reported that justification for training fund requirements are often just as unprofessional. Approximately 46% of the study sample stated that no special justification was required while another nearly 15% said that training funds were established using either last year's profit or sales volume.

Selection of a training program shows a similar lack of financial consideration. Barton-Dobenin and Hodgetts (1975), based on the results of a study of six industrial groups in the state of Kansas, reported that in selecting a management training program that, "Surprisingly, the factor given lowest importance was that of cost. On the average, each of the six industries ranked cost in the lowest half of their list. Furthermore, banks, merchandisers and
insurance firms all rated this factor last" (p. 38). Similarly, Peterfreund (1976), in a study of education in industry, reported that less than one-third of the organizations surveyed felt that cost was the primary factor in deciding to undertake educational activities, in general, and that, "Specific programs are scrutinized only somewhat more, from a cost point of view" (p. 34).

Winston (1969, p. 30) did report one case where program cost entered into the program selection decision. In this case a firm turned down a university sponsored management program since it felt the cost was too low and engaged a management association at four times the cost—although not known at the time the same instructor would have been utilized by the university.

As a related aspect, however, Gruenfeld (1966) has shown that a personnel financial commitment on the part of a training participant tends to increase the perceived program benefits. Based on a study of 99 industrial executives who were participants in a 5-year management training program, Gruenfeld reported that, "Financial investment in the program has resulted in increased benefit; for those individuals who paid part of their own tuition reported that they derived more benefit from the program" (p. 398).

In summary no convincing rationale based either on research or general practice is present that supports a relationship between program cost and program educational merit. Equally no support was found for a relationship between a program's educational merit and other cost related program characteristics such as what items or services are included in the advertised cost of a program (e.g.,
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room, tuition, meals, etc.) or whether financial assistance is available for participants.

The next subject area considered is admission requirements for training programs.

**Admission Requirements for Training Programs**

A logical argument exists relating strict admission requirements with increased educational quality. This argument states that strict admission requirements can only be justified and maintained by increased learning benefits which in turn result in enhanced benefits for participants such as better job offers or increased performance and related advancement on a current job.

Admission requirements for management training programs are seemingly nonexistent. According to J. F. Sullivan (1977),

In the aggregate, approximately two-thirds of the continuing management-education programs offered by major higher educational institutions are offered on an open enrollment basis. This normally entails the preparation and distribution of brochures and the registration of participants on a first come, first served basis. (p. 24) The remaining one-third, while not classified as open enrollment, can also not be considered to entail admission requirements as normally envisioned since it consists of programs developed for single employers or groups of employers.

Although logic would support a relationship between strict admission requirements and educational quality, neither literature nor research identify or support such a relationship in respect to management training programs.
The next topic to be discussed is whether the existence of provisions for evaluation of a training program indicate educational quality.

**Provisions for Evaluation**

A previous discussion beginning on page 13, entitled "Effects and Evaluation of Management Training," covered various methods, purposes, and problems associated with evaluation of training programs. It was concluded that (a) evaluation was a necessary and effective means of determining the worth of the training effort; (b) that evaluation performed by trainers, managers, or participants was not ideal; and (c) to be effective evaluation had to focus on training induced behavior changes on the part of trainees.

For these reasons it is felt that support exists for a positive relationship between the presence of provisions for evaluating a training program and the educational quality of that program. The extent of this relationship is impacted by several factors. First, as reflected previously, by who performs the evaluation. According to Weinberger (1969), "In order to insure objectivity, evaluations should be designed, conducted and reported by an agency that has no stake in the outcome of the findings" (p. 23). Second, evaluation, as stated by Dunnette and Kirchner (1964), "should take the form of an experiment, utilizing 'before' and 'after' proficiency measures on control (untrained) and experimental (trained) groups" (p. 78).

In summation, provisions for evaluation do indicate educational merit while the strength of this indicated merit is impacted by
degree of bias held by the evaluator and contained in the evaluation method.

The following section will cover recognition received by participants of training programs.

**Participant Recognition from Completion of a Training Program**

Reward and/or punishment are recognized as the means of impacting individual behavior—learning is a form of behavior so effected.

Adams (1976) conducted a study to determine if job satisfaction was increased for supervisors by (a) the recognition received upon being selected for a training program and by (b) the satisfactory completion of training. Recognition included a personal letter signed by a high level executive notifying an individual of selection and an attractive certificate upon completion. Subjects consisted of 56 first-line supervisors of a textile company who attended a university sponsored management development training program. Job satisfaction, if increased, was believed to be an indicator of increased productivity. Results indicated that being selected did not result in an increase to job satisfaction.

Punishment, as well as rewards, can be utilized. Belasco and Trice (1969) maintained that training can also produce ceremonial side effects that result in improved morale, increased identification with the organization, and a decrease in organizational tensions. According to the authors,

Enhancing the ceremonial aspects of training may increase the effectiveness of the training program itself. Rather
than making training "easy to participate in" perhaps management should concentrate on making it "hard to pass." Tests, reading lists, outside preparation, some people who do not pass, certificates and formal recognition of success all might add to the ceremonial effects of training. (p. 17)

Grades motivate students through the same reward and punishment concept. As stated by Deterline (1977d), "They [grades] tend ... not to be positive motivators and rewards sought by students, but to function more in the negative sense that lower grades are to be avoided" (p. 15).

Reward via recognition for completing a training program can consist of formal methods ranging from a completion certificate to college credit.

The New York State Board of Regents established a system in 1974 via the Regents External Degree Program for applying college credit for programs and courses sponsored by noncollegiate organizations. One of the purposes of this project was to coordinate adult education programs with business requirements. McGarraghy (1976) presented a detailed account of how this system was applied to a Fellow, Life Management Institute (FLMI) Insurance Education Program sponsored by the Life Office Management Association (LOMA), a professional trade association whose member companies account for 90% of the life insurance industry's total assets.

Another form of recognition, falling somewhere between formal college credit and a completion certificate, is the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) managed by The National Task Force on the Continuing Education Unit. One CEU is defined as, "Ten contact hours of
participation . . . in an organized continuing education experience . . . under responsible sponsorship . . . capable direction . . . and qualified instruction" (The Continuing Education Unit, 1974, p. 3). J. F. Sullivan (1977), based on a study of university-based management training programs, reported that, "the general trend is clearly toward the increased use of CEUs on the part of the university-based continuing management-education programs" (p. 26). Kutler (1975) agreed that the use of CEUs is growing but calls the system an educational rip-off.

Any time that training and development professionals support a system which rewards trainees on the basis of contact hours rather than on the basis of trainee achievement or proficiency, the value of the training and development profession is endangered. (p. 8)

Based on the previous discussion, recognition for completion of a management training program is considered to be an indicator of program benefit. Benefits, if not stemming directly from educational quality, are at least recognized as a result of ceremonial side effects and increased job satisfaction. In addition, it is hypothesized that the type of recognition directly impacts the magnitude of benefits or degree of educational quality. For example, formal college credits would indicate more benefits and educational quality than would CEUs which in turn would indicate more of each than a simple completion certificate.

The next topic discussed in this chapter is the varying instructional methods employed in training programs.
Instructional Methods

Instructional methods utilized in training programs seem only to be limited by the imagination of those involved. As a consequence there seems to be a trend toward some new method or approach at any point in time. This situation is perhaps due to a search for the right way to bring about learning stemming from a general dissatisfaction with conventional methods. According to Wohlking (1971),

One can generalize that, in most management programs where conventional training methodologies were utilized:

- the training resulted only in a limited, if any, attitude change.

- there is almost a total lack of evidence that what little attitude change did take place was of sustained duration.

- there is almost no evidence that management training resulted in on-the-job behavior changes of significant duration. (p. 3)

The instructional method(s) employed and its relationship with the resulting educational merit of the training program is dependent upon a variety of factors to include subject matter, participants, instructors, and course objectives. As a result of these variables it is not possible to relate on an overall across the board basis, the educational merit of a training program to a specific instructional method. The following section will individually address the more common instructional methods utilized in management training programs and discuss advantages and/or disadvantages of each in application to specific training situations. Following this
discussion of individual instructional methods the relationship be-
tween the educational merit of training programs and the instruc-
tional method(s) utilized will be addressed in more detail.

Lecture. J. F. Sullivan (1977), based on a study of trends in
university-based continuing management education, reported, "In the
view of the respondents there is . . . a definite trend away from
relying solely on the lecture-discussion method of teaching" (p. 26).
Regardless, the lecture method of instruction is still widespread.
Schmidt (1979, p. 18), based on a study of New York City area train-
ers, reported the lecture-discussion method as one of the most fre-
quently utilized instructional methods.

Tosi (1967) described the lecture as

a vehicle for the presentation of information to a very
large group of people at one time. . . . Lectures are
more effective for imparting conceptual knowledge rather
than for changing attitudes or behavior. The learning
situation is removed from the job, the learner is essen-
tially passive, and most lectures are not supplemented
with follow-up to insure transfer of the knowledge to the
job. (p. 66)

In summary, lectures, although perhaps declining in popularity,
are still one of the most frequently utilized instructional methods.
They are best suited for providing conceptual type information to
large groups—little evidence exists to support any resulting change
to on-the-job behavior.

Group discussion. McGehee and Thayer (1961) in the following
discussion described the purpose, advantages, and problems of the
group discussion method of instruction.
In informational areas, the free discussion of various facts and points of view is said to lead to acceptance and a better grasp of new information. Support for this position is based on the alleged benefits resulting from active participation of the trainee such as an opportunity for practice, heightened motivation, etc. These factors, on the other hand, must be weighted against increased costs and increased time consumption.

If the usefulness of the conference springs from participation of all trainees, it is obvious that the number of employees who can participate in a conference is severely limited because of the need for free expression. Large groups must frequently be broken down into smaller ones with a discussion leader for each subgroup. Often discussions get off track and consume great amounts of time. Whether the technique is efficient or costly will depend on the personnel participating, the subject matter discussed, the need for discussion, the need for changing behavior or attitudes, the skill of the discussion leader, and similar factors.

The purpose of any conference ... must be clear in the mind of the leader so that he can lead the group to (his) desired ends or (openly) delegate the responsibility for whatever outcome is achieved to the group.

The conference technique is not for the novice trainer. It requires skill, ingenuity, careful preparation, and a clear understanding of the role of the leader. (pp. 199-200)

There are two forms of group discussion as described by Tosi (1967, p. 66). One is instructor-centered which consists primarily of instructor-student interaction sequences. Unless trainees have some knowledge of the subject matter the training session often turns into a lecture. A group discussion can also be student-centered where the major interactions are student to student with the role of the instructor that of a moderator to keep participants on track.

The use and effectiveness of group discussions depends on the subject, learning objectives, background of participants, and
capabilities of the instructor.

Another instructional method, also group related, is the use of group projects.

**Group projects.** Group projects attempt to provide a vehicle for students to apply knowledge in a make believe situation. According to Tosi (1967), attitudes and behavior of trainees are more likely to be changed in a group-decision-making exercise than in instructor-centered methods of instruction. "When a participant has made a commitment to act in a particular way and is able to see his decision as compatible with an emerging attitudinal consensus of the group, his attitudes and behavior are more likely to change" (p. 67).

Another instructional method often employed by trainers is role playing.

**Role playing.** Tosi (1967), in the following discussion of role playing, described some of the uses, problems with, and results associated with the method.

Role playing may be especially useful in developing social skills . . . [nevertheless] some problems are attendant in role playing. Participants must be familiar with the role content before it is attempted. . . . Participants may view role playing as more of a "game" than a learning experience and, therefore, they may not act as they would if faced with the given situation on the job. . . . [In spite of such problems], role playing has succeeded in stimulating changes in both behavior and attitudes. (p. 68)

McGehee and Thayer (1961, p. 203) also supported role playing as a means of effecting on-the-job behavior. The authors stated, however, that these effects appear to vary with the role playing
case and specific role played. In addition, they pointed out that role playing represents a very time consuming and expensive method of instruction.

As with the previous methods discussed, role playing is a valid instructional method assuming it is utilized correctly and in the appropriate situation.

The next method addressed is the case study.

**Case study.** Utilization of the case study as a method of instruction is on an upward trend according to J. F. Sullivan (1977, p. 26); similarly, Schmidt (1979, p. 18) listed it as one of the most frequently used instructional methods. Tosi (1967) stated that, "The basic purpose of a case study is to create a learning environment which will involve the participant in decision-making processes and in developing methods for coping with similar problems in his 'real' world" (p. 67). It is then hoped that this decision-making process and the underlying principles and concepts involved will become part of the participants' behavior when back on the job.

According to McGehee and Thayer (1961),

This is a worthwhile objective, but it is also here that we have seen many case discussions fail. Too often the strong pressures toward solution of a problem arise at the expense of a careful study of all facts, delving for more facts, and discovery of the principles prior to solution. . . . When the pressures are not overcome, a quick solution is achieved with consequent reinforcement of the inadequate methods used in achieving that solution. (pp. 201-202)

In summary the case study is a useful method of instruction for certain management training objectives, but it has potential
application problems that must be known and guarded against by the training instructor.

The next topic to be discussed is the business game or simulation.

**Business game or simulation.** As was the case with case studies, Schmidt (1979, p. 18) identified simulation as one of the most common training methods utilized by New York City area trainers. Similarly, J. F. Sullivan (1977, p. 26) reported that the use of simulation exercises in training programs is on the increase.

As described by Tosi (1967),

A business game is an attempt to simulate a business environment . . . and is intended to illustrate the complexities and interactions of decisions in the real world. . . . The game, however, can be nothing more than over simplification of a real situation. Also, the game's designer builds his own biases into it. A good or bad decision, then, is what the inventor believes it to be. (pp. 71-72)

According to Schriesheim and Schriesheim (1974), business games are generally thought to be effective in management training but this belief is based on very little empirical support; "the benefits of business gaming have become accepted without sufficient scientific support" (p. 16).

Sensitivity training will be the final instructional method addressed.

**Sensitivity training.** Sensitivity training represents perhaps the most controversial instructional method utilized in training programs. It takes on a myriad of forms and names but generally
involves a small group of individuals forced into an intimate association in order to develop an awareness on the part of each of the others' feelings. According to Jerrems (1975, p. 295), a major goal of sensitivity training is to help participants become sensitive to the feelings of others and to acquire effective ways of sharing and understanding them. This goal is listed by Edwards (1975) as the foremost assumed benefit of sensitivity training. A second claimed benefit identified by Edwards is, "its [sensitivity training's] influence in eliminating defenses and setting the individuals free to be himself" (p. 175). Similarly, according to Argyris (cited in "Yourself as Others," 1963, p. 162), a goal of sensitivity training is to develop openness and trust.

According to Blank (1971), "fadism, cultism, and fanaticism seem to be creeping on the scene in relation to sensitivity training" (p. 168). This is especially dangerous for a training method claimed by many to be emotionally damaging. Odiorne (cited in "Yourself as Others," 1963, p. 162) stated that sensitivity training has been known to result in serious mental disturbances. In addition, Odiorne claimed that sensitivity training since, "It's too vague and, since it can't be measured, it can't fit the definition of training" (p. 160). Picking up on the same theme, Wiggins (1970) stated that, "Research points an accusing finger at educators for applying training processes, the results of which are apparently unpredictable" (p. 181).

According to Reimer (1977), "A major objective to the use of sensitivity training as an educational device is its tendency to be irrational. . . . Sensitivity training either ignores critical
thinking as a process or is virtually hostile to it" (p. 186).
Neider (1981, p. 28), based on a survey of experts in the field of training and development, reported that between 1972 and 1981 sensitivity training decreased in perceived effectiveness as an instructional method.

Effectiveness of Instructional Methods

The preceding discussion has not identified any one method or methods as being the most effective as related to other methods. Blumenfeld and Crane (1973) conducted a survey study of members of the American Society of Trainers and Developers (ASTD) in which respondents were asked for their perceptions of the effectiveness of six separate instructional methods. Listed below are the six methods in the order of perceived effectiveness (highest first):

1. Simulation, business game
2. Programmed instruction
3. In-basket
4. Group discussion, conference
5. Role play
6. Case method, incident process

In the same study Blumenfeld and Crane reported that only 6% of the respondents indicated that their perceptions were based on quality of evidence involving an adequate scientific design. The effectiveness of any one instructional method will vary based on the situation in which it is utilized. Deterline (1976, p. 4) indicated that the adequacy of an instructional method is determined by how
appropriate it meets with the objectives and characteristics of the specific training situation.

Many feel that the best learning method is on-the-job practice. Katcher (1976) stated that, "the major learnings of managers seem to come from practice, the opportunity to manage" (p. 47). Similarly, Deterline (1976) proclaimed that, "We learn sometimes from listening and watching, but we learn more by practicing the competencies we are supposed to be learning" (p. 4). From such statements it would appear that the most effective instructional method would be the one that most closely approximated the real job situation.

Again, as has become apparent during discussions on each instructional method, the method must match the situation—no one method is appropriate for all. As stated by Katcher (1976), "different people learn in different ways" (p. 47). From Dunnette and Kirchner (1965),

No single training program would usually be sufficient to assure the prescribed terminal behaviors for all trainees. Instead, trainees should be divided into relatively homogeneous aptitude groups, and training programs individualized to fit their different aptitude requirements. (p. 63)

Similarly, according to Belasco and Trice (1969),

Since no one training technique will match the predispositions of every supervisor [trainee], it is conceivable that the use of the widest possible range of techniques will touch enough different supervisors [trainees] to improve the effectiveness of training. (p. 17).

Based on the discussion presented in this section, it is felt that the instructional method used in a training program can be utilized to indicate educational merit of the training program. This
indication can come in two separate ways. First, provided that
enough information is available concerning the objectives, subject
matter, instructors, and participants of a training program, it is
possible to judge the potential effectiveness of an instructional
method(s) for that particular training program. Secondly, if such
information is not available, the degree of indicated educational
merit could be related directly to the number of instructional meth­
ods employed—the more methods used the more educational merit indi­
cated for the program.

The final topic discussed in this chapter is the organizational
source providing the instruction.

**Instructional Source of Training Program**

There is a great multitude of individuals and organizations in
the management training business. The American Management Associa­
tion's 1978 Directory of Management Education Programs includes de­
scriptions of more than 2,230 training programs offered by some 630
academic and nonacademic organizations.

Barton-Dobenin and Hodgetts (1975), based on a study of manage­
ment training programs utilized by six separate industrial groups in
the state of Kansas, reported that the second most important factor
given for selecting a training program (behind subject content) was
the qualifications of those sponsoring the program. Results re­
flected a difference in sponsors of training programs as utilized by
type of industrial group. For example, over 80% of the banks sur­
veyed reported utilization of college training programs while such
programs were only reported as being utilized by 50% of the industrials surveyed. A similar relationship was reported according to the relative size of the firm. As an example, 96% of firms surveyed with annual sales or deposits of over $50 million reported utilization of training programs sponsored by trade associations. This same sponsor, however, was utilized by only 55.6% of firms falling in the 1 to 10 million dollar range. No indication was given, however, as to which sponsoring organization, for example, trade associations, professional consulting firms, or formal educational institutions, provided programs with the most educational benefit.

Andrews (1961, p. 127), in a survey of over 6,000 participants of university management training programs, asked respondents for their preference as to the sponsorship of future programs. Seventy-two percent of those responding recommended university sponsorship, while 15% favored sponsorship by a company or association—the remaining 13% stated no preference. No substantial support is present in literature, however, for any one sponsor over others in terms of the degree of educational merit provided.

Summary

Management training programs have grown in response to a variety of factors from automation and other technical changes creating new skill requirements in the work force to slack resources in the field of education. Management training can be accomplished either in-house or out-of-house with each method possessing
advantages and disadvantages depending on the specific situation. Despite the growth of management training programs and a continued demand for them, there are doubts as to the effects of management training programs and limited provisions for program evaluation.

Of all the training program characteristics discussed in the second section, only the nine listed below were judged, based on a review of literature, to be indicative of educational merit:

1. Advertised objectives
2. Advertised major topics
3. Modifying training programs for participants
4. Class size
5. Precourse preparation time
6. Out-of-class preparation time
7. Provisions for evaluation
8. Participant recognition
9. Instructional methods

Table 3 beginning in Chapter III on page 69 contains an item by item summary of the review of literature results to include which specific aspects of the nine items above were judged to be indicative of educational merit.
CHAPTER III

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL MERIT

As stated in the first chapter, one purpose of this research project was to determine which information items known about a training program prior to attendance can be utilized to indicate the educational merit of the program. Where possible, the previous literature review chapter supported this study objective by locating and identifying rationale for employing selected training program characteristics as indicators of educational merit. This chapter attempts the same task from a more direct approach.

More specifically, corporate training directors were surveyed as to their opinion of the predictive value of various training program characteristics as indicators of a program's educational merit.

Method

A survey, addressed to the corporate president and requesting completion by the corporate training officer, was sent to 100 large United States corporations selected randomly from Fortune's 500 industrials list. A copy of the survey questionnaire utilized is contained in Appendix A. The initial cover letter and two follow-up letters that accompanied the questionnaire mailings are contained in Appendices B, C, and D, respectively. The initial mailing produced 24 responses prior to the second mailing 2 weeks later. The second mailing resulted in an additional 17 responses. A third request...
yielded seven responses and follow-up phone calls an additional three responses for a total of 51, representing a 51% response rate.

Contact was made with 32 of the 49 nonrespondent corporations either through comments on returned (and uncompleted) questionnaires or follow-up phone calls. Of these 32, 11 gave no reason for not participating, eight reported limited staffing or time, four were not involved with management training, two had no corporate training officer, and seven felt that the study topic was not applicable to their corporation. There is no indication that bias is present as a result of any distinguishable differences between response and nonresponse groups.

The survey instrument was patterned after information contained in the 1978 Directory of Management Education Programs compiled by the American Management Association (AMA). This directory will be addressed in more detail in Chapter IV where it is utilized as a source of data.

The survey was designed to measure the opinions of corporate training officers regarding whether or not various characteristics known about management training programs prior to attendance are indicative of educational merit. Based on position titles it is clear that respondents were predominately from those corporate offices dealing with training and organizational development functions. It is, therefore, concluded that the survey questionnaires were directed to the appropriate "corporate training officer" location for completion. Of the 51 respondents there were 47
separate position titles. A listing of the position titles of corporate respondents is contained in Appendix E. Responding corporations included representation from a wide variety of industries. A stratification of responding firms is presented in Table 2. A review of a variety of brochures and fliers advertising management training programs confirmed that information relating to a majority of the items reflected on the questionnaire was normally present and therefore available prior to attending the training program. Of 85 such brochures reviewed, information was present on an average for more than 60% of the questionnaire items. Based on the preceding facts, the survey instrument is judged to possess content validity.

The instructions accompanying and contained on each page of the questionnaire were tested during a pilot test of the questionnaire and are clear and explicit. This opinion is supported by the completed questionnaires themselves in that respondents in nearly all cases followed instructions and gave no indication of not understanding the questions. Accordingly the survey questionnaire is considered to be reliable.

A definition of educational merit was intentionally not provided as part of the survey. Individual respondents were left to answer the survey based on their own definitions of educational merit. Since respondents represent one of the prime beneficiaries of the purpose for which this study was conducted, it is felt that their interpretation of educational merit is more appropriate than any that could be provided by the researcher.
Table 2

Stratification of Responding Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Firm</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural production—crops</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and gas extraction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and kindred products</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco manufacturers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile mill products</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper and allied products</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals and allied products</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum refining and related industries</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, clay, glass, and concrete products</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary metal industries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery, except electrical</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and electronic machinery, equipment, and supplies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas, anal, and control inst; photo, medical, and optical goods; watches and clocks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous manufacturing industries</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade—durable goods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade—nondurable goods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Firms are classified according to the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code prepared by the Technical Committee on Standard Industrial Classification, under the sponsorship and supervision of the Office of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President.
Educational Indicator Results

Table 3, beginning on page 69, summarizes the results of the survey. Also contained in Table 3 is a summary of rationale support presented in the previous literature review chapter. The number in parentheses below each item number is the beginning page number where that item was discussed. Those four items without page numbers were not discussed in Chapter II. An asterisk next to an item number indicates an item determined to be an indicator of educational merit. Indicators of educational merit were defined as those items which satisfy either or both of the following two criteria:

1. Indicator of educational merit according to a review of literature.

2. More than 50% of survey respondents judged item to be indicative of educational merit.

For each educational merit indicator item, brackets are used to highlight that aspect(s) of the item indicative of educational merit. The specific aspect(s) is determined based on a majority of respondents. In some cases several responses are grouped together as a combined indicator of educational merit—the rationale for such groupings is discussed in the next section. The order of appearance ties to the survey questionnaire contained in Appendix A. The results reported in Table 3 will be discussed in the next section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>Specific advertised objectives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General advertised objectives</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 NR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>Specific advertised major topics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General advertised major topics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 NR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>Designed for all management levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designed for specific management levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1 NR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Designed for organizations of all sizes</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designed for organizations of specific size(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Program which in relation to participant's needs is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes modified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never modified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>Program whose class size is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>Program whose class size is (continued):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>(2 NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>Program whose attendees come from:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private industry</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonprofit organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armed forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Highest degree held by majority of participants:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's 23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit X 72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Program whose attendees' typical age is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to over 60 11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-30 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-40 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-50 7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-40 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-50 7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-60 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item no.</td>
<td>Survey item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Program whose attendees' typical age is (continued):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Program whose attendees' average field experience in years is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>Program whose instructional source is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>Nonacademic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
<th>Review of literature</th>
<th>Survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>Program whose instructional source is (continued):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>(1 NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>Program taught by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-4 instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 or more instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>Program whose instructors are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff--full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff--part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>(4 NR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (35)</td>
<td>Highest degree held by majority of instructors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4 NR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15* (36)</td>
<td>Program length:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>Program length (continued):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 6 weeks</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>Program offered:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full day</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>Program hours/day:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 or less</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 or more</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 NR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>Precourse preparation time of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-10 hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 10 hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>Out-of-class preparation time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 hours or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Provisions for vacation/reward:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does provide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not provide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 NR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21*</td>
<td>Program has existed for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 or more years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Program offered:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 a year</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 a year</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 a year</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-8 a year</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 a year</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 or more a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (42)</td>
<td>Program offered at:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same location</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Program is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X 60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (44)</td>
<td>Program relatively:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inexpensive</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X 76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 (44)</td>
<td>Program cost includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition only</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related costs</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X 66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Financial assistance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is available</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is unavailable</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28*</td>
<td>Program has admission requirements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes: (Multiple response, therefore exceeds 100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employer recommendation</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant must be employed</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant has special qualifications</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course prerequisites</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item no.</td>
<td>Survey item</td>
<td>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**29* Program has provisions for evaluation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Review of literature</th>
<th>Survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes: (Multiple response, therefore exceeds 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By participants</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By instructor(s)</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By sponsoring agency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By participants' organization</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not indicative of educational merit (1 NR)

**30* Program which offers credit/ recognition:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes: (Multiple response, therefore exceeds 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (best)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEU</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Indicator of educational merit as supported by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30*</td>
<td>Program which offers (49) credit/recognition (continued):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicative of educational merit</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31*</td>
<td>Program whose instructional methods used are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semistructured conference</td>
<td>Yes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstructured conference</td>
<td>a. If info is available to match method to program—this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q and A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group project</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitivity training</td>
<td>b. If info is not available for match then the more instruction methods utilized the better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation/ business game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Designates item as an indicator of educational merit.

[ ] Designates aspect(s) of item indicative of educational merit.

( NR) Identifies number of nonrespondents (NR).

X Item not indicative of educational merit according to review of literature.
Discussion of Indicator Results

The following discussion will present results of the survey of corporate training officers which collected their views pertaining to each of the 31 training program characteristics in regard to which items were indicators of the educational merit of a management training program. The item numbers contained in the discussion refer to the items contained in Table 3.

The first five survey items address aspects relating to how specific or customer oriented a seminar is advertised to be. All of these items (course objectives, course topics, management level, and size of organization for which the course is designed and whether or not the course is modified for participants) are identified as indicators of educational merit according to the established criteria, i.e., literature review and/or survey responses. As reflected by the brackets, those aspects of an item representing specificity are indicative of educational merit. For item number 5 the two responses, modified and sometimes modified, have been grouped together as being indicative of educational merit due to the substantial percentage response for each.

The sixth item, class size, is identified as an indicator of educational merit by both criteria. Class sizes indicative of educational merit are identified as those classes with 30 or less students. The three class size categories of 30 students or less were grouped together as indicators of educational merit since they were neighboring categories with substantial percentage responses for
The next four items, numbers 7 through 10, deal with characteristics of program attendees: their employing organization, education, age, and work experience. Of these items only the type of participants' employing organization, item number 7, was judged to be indicative of educational merit. Of all the respondents stating that this item is indicative of educational merit, 100% reported that classes composed of attendees from private industry are most indicative of educational merit. This seems extremely significant until one realized that bias may be present by the fact that all survey respondents are members of private industry.

Whether a seminar is presented by an academic or nonacademic instructional source is the subject of item number 11. According to survey responses, this item is determined to be an indicator of educational merit. Educational merit is indicated by those seminars whose instructional source is nonacademic. This item will form the basis of study in the next chapter.

The next three items, numbers 12, 13, and 14, cover characteristics of the instructor(s): number per class, full- or part-time, and educational degree. The first two were judged to be indicators of educational merit but the latter, education degree, was not. Educational merit, according to items 12 and 13, is indicated by seminars with one to four instructors who are full-time. For item number 12 the two categories contained in the range of four or less instructors per program were grouped together as a indicator of educational merit due to the substantial percentage of responses for
Items 15 through 19 all relate to the amount of training time: length of the program, full or part day, hours per day, and pre-course and out-of-class preparation time. All are indicators of educational merit in accordance with the selection criteria. Educational merit is indicated in those seminars whose period of instruction is from 1 to 5 days in length. Due to the fact they are neighboring categories containing all responses other than those not indicative of educational merit, the five categories, representing programs from 1 to 5 days in length, were grouped together as being indicative of educational merit. Seminars conducted full day, rather than part day, are indicated to contain educational merit. Educational merit is indicated in those programs with 5 to 8 hours of training per day. The two categories reflecting programs with from 5 to 8 hours per day were combined together as an indicator of educational merit due to the substantial percentage response for each and the much lower response rate of neighboring categories. In addition those seminars characterized by precourse preparation and/or out-of-class preparation time are judged to have educational merit. The three categories making up 1 or more hours of precourse preparation time and the two categories comprising 1 or more hours of out-of-class preparation time were grouped together as indicators of educational merit due to their response percentages and the substantial percentage difference when compared to the neighboring category of no preparation time.
Item number 20 dealing with whether or not a seminar has provisions for vacation aspects was not determined to be indicative of educational merit.

How long a course has been in existence, item number 21, was judged to be indicative of educational merit. This merit is indicated in those programs that have been in existence for 1 to 5 years.

The next three items, number 22 through 24, cover the yearly offering frequency of a seminar and its location: same or various and residential or nonresidential. None of the three were selected as indicators of educational merit based on the criteria.

Financial aspects of a course is the subject of items 25 through 27: whether it is expensive, what is included in the cost, and whether financial assistance is available. None of the three are considered to be indicative of educational merit.

Item number 28, whether or not a program has admission requirements, is judged to be an indicator of educational merit. Educational merit is indicated in those programs that have an admission requirement or any combination thereof. These four categories were grouped together due to the high percentage response rates for each.

Whether or not a program does or does not have provisions for evaluation is judged to be an indicator of educational merit; item number 29. Programs characterized by one or more provisions for evaluation are judged to have educational merit. Again, due to the high percentage response rate for each, the four categories, representing provisions for evaluation, were combined together as being
indicative of educational merit.

Item number 30, whether or not a program offered credit or recognition, was determined to be an indicator of educational merit. Educational merit is indicated in those programs which offer one or more forms of recognition. The three categories representing each of these forms of recognition were grouped together as an indicator of educational merit due to the percentage response for each and the fact they are neighboring categories.

The last item indicative of educational merit is the instructional method or methods utilized. The review of literature (see p. 52) determined that the instructional method(s) indicates educational merit in two instances: (1) if the method can be matched to the program, and (2) if such a matching is not possible, the more instructional methods utilized the more educational merit indicated. In conducting the survey it was not feasible to explore the first indication relating to matching. Therefore, the survey results were summarized by the number of instructional methods selected by respondents. Based on these results, educational merit is indicated in those seminars utilizing from four to seven separate methods of instruction; over 77% of the respondents fell within this range. The two neighboring categories, contained in the four-to-seven method range, were grouped together as an indicator of educational merit due to their high percentage response rates in relation to neighboring categories.

In summary, 20 of 31 variables studied were judged to be indicators of educational merit based on a survey of corporate training
officers.

The next chapter will utilize the information presented in Table 3 to compare the educational merit of academic versus non-academic out-of-house management training programs.
CHAPTER IV

AN APPLICATION OF EDUCATIONAL MERIT INDICATORS

The second study objective, as stated in Chapter I, was to utilize knowledge of educational merit indicators to test for a difference between the educational merit of out-of-house management training programs provided by academic and nonacademic organizations. This chapter supports this second study objective by utilizing indicators of educational merit developed and supported in the previous two chapters to test for a difference in the indicated educational merit of management training programs offered by two separate instructional sources: (1) academic and (2) nonacademic. The programs tested are those described in the Chapter I section entitled "Scope of the Study," out-of-house and short duration workshops or seminars.

Review of Hypothesis

Although the review of literature did not distinguish between training program sponsors in regard to educational merit, the surveyed corporate training officers were clearly of the opinion that nonacademic instructional sources were more indicative of educational merit than academic sources. Based on these views, it is hypothesized that the judged educational merit of management training programs offered by academic sources will differ from the judged
educational merit of similar management training programs offered by nonacademic sources.

Method

Information on management training programs currently offered came from the 1978 Directory of Management Education Programs compiled by the American Management Association (AMA). The survey questionnaire and review of literature were both patterned on training program information provided in the AMA directory. The directory contains descriptions of 2,233 management and professional development programs offered by over 630 organizational contributors. These contributors include representatives from the two instructional sources under consideration—930 academic and 1,303 nonacademic.

Of the total development programs described in the directory, only those programs categorized strictly as management were sampled. A total of 536 of the 930 academic programs described in the directory fell in this category; similarly, of the 1,303 nonacademic programs, 583 were categorized strictly as management.

A sample size of 50% of each of the academic and nonacademic management programs described in the directory was chosen which resulted in a sample of 268 academic and 292 nonacademic programs. Sample selection was systematic in that every other program was chosen from the strictly management programs as listed in the directory. Data coding was documented in detail and coding determination was almost entirely objective, reducing judgments on the part of the
researcher to a bare minimum.

The previous chapter identified 20 of the 31 survey items as being indicators of educational merit (those asterisked in Table 3). One of the indicators of educational merit is the instructional source—academic or nonacademic, item number 11. Since this item represents the sampled independent variable it is discarded as an indicator leaving 19 indicators of educational merit.

Indicator Application Results

Fisher's exact probability tests of the sampled academic and nonacademic courses in regard to each of the 19 variables indicative of educational merit resulted in six with a difference at the $\alpha = .05$ level or less. Table 4 on the next two pages summarizes the results of the surveyed academic and nonacademic program characteristics related to the 19 variables indicative of educational merit. The second column briefly identifies that aspect of the variable indicative of educational merit—the same aspect identified in the previous chapter and bracketed in Table 3. The third and fourth columns reflect the percentage of sampled academic and nonacademic programs that possess educational merit according to the educational merit indications for each variable. The right hand column presents the Fisher's exact probability ($p$), equal to or less than, for obtaining the indicated results. In each case a $2 \times 2$ contingency table was tested with one axis representing academic or nonacademic and the other indicative of educational merit or not indicative of educational merit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Educational merit indicated by</th>
<th>% with educational merit</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Nonacademic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course objective statement</td>
<td>Stated specifically</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course topic statement</td>
<td>Stated specifically</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target management level</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target organization size</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program modification</td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>30 or less</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants' organization</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instructors</td>
<td>4 or less</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor status</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program length</td>
<td>1-5 days</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full or part day</td>
<td>Full day</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours per day</td>
<td>5-6 hours</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precourse preparation</td>
<td>1 hour or more</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-class preparation</td>
<td>1 hour or more</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in existence</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Educational merit indicated by</th>
<th>% with educational merit</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission requirements</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for evaluation</td>
<td>Has evaluation</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition or credit</td>
<td>Diploma, CEU, or certificate</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional methods</td>
<td>4-7 methods</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. See Appendix F for listing of size n for each academic and nonacademic sample by variable.

*p < .05.

For many variables several characteristics were combined together to establish a dichotomy of indicative and nonindicative indicators of educational merit. These groupings provided the detail of data required and in some cases were necessitated by low cell observation counts. A discussion of the results for each of the 19 variables follows.

Discussion of Application Results

The item numbers appearing in parentheses in the following paragraphs refer to the item number results reflected in Table 3 beginning on page 69 in Chapter III.
A Fisher's exact probability test of how specifically stated a program's objectives are by academic versus nonacademic sources resulted in a \( p = 0.03 \). The percentage of nonacademic programs sampled reflects 44.8% with specifically stated objectives whereas the percentage of specifically stated objectives in the academic sample was 35.8%. Based on this fact and the Fisher's exact probability test, nonacademic programs are determined to have statistically more specifically stated objectives than academic programs. Specifically stated objectives were judged in the previous chapter (item 1) to be indicative of educational merit in a program. Based on the specificity of stated objectives, programs offered by nonacademic sources are judged to possess more educational merit than those offered by academic sources.

The previous chapter determined that programs with specifically stated topics (item 2) possessed more educational merit than those with general statements of course topics. A Fisher's exact probability test for difference between sampled academic and nonacademic programs in regard to how specifically stated the program topics were resulted in a \( p = 0.55 \). Based on these results, no conclusions can be drawn concerning the educational merit of academic versus nonacademic programs as determined by topic statements.

Chapter III judged programs with specifically targeted management levels (item 3) to contain more educational merit than those with unspecifically targeted management levels. A Fisher's exact probability test yielded a \( p = 0.28 \) for this indicator. Based on the results of this study, no difference between the educational merit
of academic and nonacademic programs were identified with regard to this variable.

The previous chapter judged programs targeted at specific organizational sizes (item 4) to contain more educational merit than those targeted at all sizes of organizations. The targeted organizational size of sampled academic and nonacademic programs reflected no probable difference based on a Fisher's exact probability test which resulted in a $p = .29$. As a result no difference between academic and nonacademic programs can be claimed based on the variable, organizational size.

Although programs modified to meet participants' needs (item 5) were judged in Chapter III to possess more educational merit than those not modified, this variable failed to identify a difference between sampled academic and nonacademic programs. A Fisher's exact probability test produced a $p = .11$.

The previous chapter determined that programs with class sizes of 30 or less students (item 6) contained more educational merit than programs with larger class sizes. A Fisher's exact probability test of sampled academic and nonacademic programs in regard to class size produced a $p = .48$. Based on these results, no difference between academic and nonacademic programs can be claimed as determined by the variable, class size.

Programs whose participants come from private industry (item 7) were judged in the previous chapter to possess more educational merit than programs whose participants come from other organizations. A Fisher's exact probability test of sampled academic versus
nonacademic programs produced a $p = .91$. As a result no probable
difference can be claimed between academic and nonacademic programs
based on the participants' organization.

A difference is present between academic and nonacademic pro-
grams in relation to the number of instructors per course (item 12).
A Fisher's exact probability test of sampled academic and non-
academic programs produced a $p = .00$. The percentage of the pro-
grams with four or less instructors is 68.1% for academic and 86.8%
for nonacademic. Programs with four or less instructors were deter-
mined in the last chapter to possess more educational merit than
programs with more than four instructors. Based on these percent-
ages and the Fisher's exact probability result, nonacademic programs
were determined to have more educational merit than academic pro-
grams as indicated by the number of instructors.

Programs taught by a full-time staff of instructor(s) (item 13)
were determined in Chapter III to possess more educational merit
than programs whose instructors were part-time. Based on a Fisher's
exact probability test, with a $p = .06$, no probable difference can
be identified between academic and nonacademic programs based on in-
structor status.

A difference exists between academic and nonacademic seminars
in regard to the length of the program (item 15). A Fisher's exact
probability test yielded a $p = .00$ for this variable. Based on the
results of the previous chapter, programs from 1 to 5 days in length
were judged to contain more educational merit than programs of
shorter or longer instructional times. The percentage of academic
programs falling in the 1 to 5 day range was 74.5% while 88.7% of the nonacademic programs fell in the same range. As a result of these percentages and the Fisher's exact probability test, non-academic programs are judged to possess more educational merit than academic programs in regard to program length.

A difference also exists between academic and nonacademic programs in relation to the instructional time per day as determined by whether a program is full day or part day (item 16). The previous chapter judged programs offered full day to possess more educational merit than programs whose daily instructional time was part day. Of the academic programs surveyed, 84.9% were offered on a full-day basis. Conversely, 95.5% of the sampled nonacademic programs were full day. Based on these percentages and a Fisher's exact probability test resulting in a $\chi^2 = .00$, nonacademic programs are determined to contain more educational merit than academic programs in regard to the instructional time per day.

However, program length measured in hours per day (item 17) produced no probable difference between academic and nonacademic programs. The previous chapter judged programs with 5 to 8 hours of instruction per day to contain more educational merit than programs with daily instructional time outside the 5 to 8 hour range. With a Fisher's exact probability test result of $p = .16$, no probable difference can be claimed based on number of instructional hours per day.

A difference exists between academic and nonacademic in regard to precourse preparation time requirements (item 18). Programs with
precourse preparation time were determined in the last chapter to possess more educational merit than programs without precourse preparation time requirements. Of the sampled academic programs, 27.1% reported requirements of precourse preparation time while 36.0% of sampled nonacademic programs had precourse preparation requirements. Based on these percentages and a Fisher's exact probability result of \( p = .03 \), nonacademic programs are determined to have more educational merit than academic programs as judged by requirements for precourse preparation time.

A difference between academic and nonacademic programs in relation to the requirement for out-of-class preparation time (item 19) also exists based on a Fisher's exact probability test result of \( p = .00 \). The previous chapter determined that programs with out-of-class preparation requirements had more educational merit than programs with no such requirements. Of the academic programs surveyed, 69.2% had out-of-class preparation requirements while only 53.8% of nonacademic programs reported similar requirements. Based on these percentages and the Fisher's exact probability test, academic programs are judged to possess more educational merit than nonacademic programs as determined by the requirement for out-of-class preparation time.

Chapter III identified programs in existence from 1 to 5 years (item 21) to possess more educational merit than programs in existence other than the 1 to 5 year range. Based on a Fisher's exact probability result of \( p = .66 \), no probable difference between academic and nonacademic programs can be claimed in regard to a
program's time in existence.

Although Chapter III determined that programs with admission requirements contained more educational merit than programs without admission requirements (item 23), this variable did not result in a probable difference between academic and nonacademic programs. A Fisher's exact probability test produced a \( p = .09 \) for this variable.

Chapter III judged programs with provisions for evaluation (item 29) to possess more educational merit than programs without evaluation provisions. This variable produced no probable difference between academic and nonacademic programs based on a Fisher's exact probability test result of \( p = .65 \).

No probable difference between academic and nonacademic programs was determined based on recognition or credit offered to participants completing the program (item 30). The previous chapter judged programs offering either diplomas, certificates, or CEUs to program participants to possess more educational merit than programs with no recognition or credit. This indicator of educational merit, however, failed to distinguish between academic and nonacademic programs with a Fisher's exact probability test result of \( p = .28 \).

Chapter III determined programs utilizing 4 to 7 methods of instruction (item 31) to possess more educational merit than programs using more or less methods of instruction. A \( p = .78 \) was determined in a Fisher's exact probability test in regard to this variable. Based on the number of instructional methods utilized, no probable difference in the educational merit of academic versus
nonacademic programs can be claimed.

In summary the preceding test results of 19 indicators of educational merit provided a significant difference between programs with academic versus nonacademic instructional sources in regard to six variables. Of these six, five indicated that programs with non-academic instructional sources possessed more educational merit than programs with academic instructional sources.

The fact that the views of corporate training officers were used as one of two factors in selecting indicators of educational merit may at first appear to present a bias, since these selected indicators were utilized to test for a difference in the educational merit contained in academic versus nonacademic management training programs. Since corporate training officers are part of the non-academic environment they may have influenced the results in favor of nonacademic programs. However, the scope of this study centered on out-of-house management training programs directed at the work environment. With this perspective in mind it is appropriate to judge the educational merit of training programs from the corporate perspective.

In the next chapter conclusions and implications based on the results of this and preceding chapters will be discussed.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter has several purposes. First, to provide a summary of study findings and then to present the resulting conclusions and implications, and recommendations and future study topics.

Summary

This study had two objectives: first, to identify indicators of educational merit in management training programs based on information normally available prior to attendance, and second, to test for a difference in the educational merit of management training programs offered by academic versus nonacademic sources. A total of 31 separate variables were studied as possible indicators of educational merit. Based on a review of literature and a random sample of corporate training officers, 20 of 31 variables were determined to be indicators of educational merit.

One of the 20 variables judged to be an indicator of educational merit was instructional source—academic or nonacademic. No distinction in terms of educational merit was found between these two instructional sources based on a review of literature. A majority of the training officers surveyed, however, stated that programs offered by nonacademic sources possessed more educational merit than those presented by academic sources. Eighty-eight percent of those surveyed who picked instructional source as an indicator of
educational merit selected courses with nonacademic instructional sources as being most indicative of educational merit. This view was supported by the results of Chapter IV where indicators of educational merit were utilized to test for a difference between the educational merit of sampled academic and nonacademic management training programs.

For this test the specific indicator of educational merit relating to instructional source was eliminated leaving 19 indicators of educational merit to apply to sampled management training program characteristics from both academic and nonacademic programs. Based on a Fisher's exact probability test and applying an α = .05, six of the 19 indicators produced significant results. Five of the six significant indicators determined that nonacademic programs possessed more educational merit than academic programs.

Conclusions and Implications

In line with the two objectives of this study and based on the findings there are two basic conclusions. First, it is concluded that information is normally known about management training seminars prior to attendance that provides an indication of the educational merit of the training program. This study identified 20 such information items indicative of educational merit. The 20 items indicative of educational merit are those identified in Table 3 by an asterisk.

Secondly, it is concluded, based on the indicators of educational merit identified in this study, that management training
programs presented by nonacademic sources possess more educational merit than similar programs offered by academic sources.

Based on the results of this study, individuals involved in the training program selection process can make determinations about the educational merit of management training programs. These determinations will be most useful in those instances where only the normal advertised brochure type information is known about a program. If other information, such as first hand knowledge provided by a person who has previously attended the same course, is available it should most definitely be utilized in the course selection process. In fact, the indicators presented in this study should ideally be used more as a screening tool as opposed to a basis for a final decision. Other ancillary elements also need to be considered. For example, travel cost is one factor which is not an indicator of educational merit yet could have a significant impact on the overall cost of a training program and the selection decision.

Study findings also have implications for planners of management training programs. The items identified by corporate training officers as being indicative of educational merit provide a good indication also of what type of management training program corporations are willing to pay for. This information should be of prime concern to both academic and nonacademic program planners, much in the same way a businessman strives to market a product in response to customer demands. Training program planners, by applying the findings of this study where feasible, should be able to design more marketable training programs.
Recommendations and Future Study Topics

The primary purpose of this study was to identify indicators of educational merit in management training seminars that could be utilized by individuals in the work environment during the training program selection process. As concluded in the previous section, 20 such indicators were identified. It is recommended that individuals responsible for selecting management training programs utilize the indicator items identified in this study in their selection process. If several programs are under consideration, they can be compared based on the educational merit indicated for each by the 20 indicator items identified. All other factors being equal, the program with the most indicated educational merit should be selected.

The results of this study form the basis of several future studies that could improve the usefulness of the findings in the program selection process. Two such studies are readily apparent.

First, this study did not attempt to distinguish between individual indicators of educational merit based on their capability to identify educational merit. Based on the evidence presented in the review of literature and the varying ranges of item to item responses by the surveyed corporate training officers, there is ample evidence that some of the identified indicators may be stronger indicators of educational merit than others. Usefulness of applying the 20 indicators to the training program selection process would be enhanced significantly if the individual indicators, or combination of indicators, could be weighted according to their ability to
indicate educational merit. This information would provide for a more definitive ranking of candidate programs during the training program selection process. A follow-on study correlating the educational merit of training programs (perhaps judged during as well as after a program has been conducted) to the indicator items identified in this study would provide the genesis of the data required for such weighting of indicators.

The true test of the educational merit of a training program is the impact on the attendees' behavior once they return to the work environment following the training program. While it is recognized that such behavior changes are very difficult to document and measure, they would, if related to the indicators identified in this study, again enhance the usefulness of the identified indicators. For example, if those programs provided by nonacademic sources were found to result in significantly more cases of behavior changes resulting in improved management than those provided by academic programs, the usefulness of this indicator would be much enhanced.

Regardless of the potential improvements generated by any possible follow-on studies, the findings of this study do provide valuable information to individuals involved in selecting management training programs as well as to individuals planning such training programs.
Appendix A

Survey Questionnaire
Corporate Training Officer

A request for your organization to participate in a national research project on out-of-house management training has been made to your corporation president. This research project is designed to study management training programs directed at the work environment by instructional sources outside that environment. Seminars, workshops, or clinics are common names applied to such training programs.

It is requested that you complete this questionnaire as soon as possible—it is estimated that this should take 15 minutes or less. Your reply will be kept in the strictest confidence with no individual response identified in any way in the final report. Your name and organizational title are requested so that I may provide you with a summary copy of the final report upon its completion.

If you desire any additional information about the study, please request it along with the return of the questionnaire or call Mr. Doug Loomer, office: home: .

When finished please send the completed questionnaire in the return envelope provided to:

Mr. Douglas R. Loomer

COPY
Data requested on this page is for background information and provides for a point of contact to receive a summary copy of study results.

Name ____________________________
Title ______________________________
Corporation _________________________
Division ___________________________
Date Completed _______________________

Which of the following does your organization utilize to accomplish management training? (Select one of the following)

[ ] Only out-of-house management training programs

[ ] Combination of out-of-house and in-house management training programs

[ ] Only in-house management training programs

[ ] Management training is not provided (go to next page)

Out-of-house management training is provided by

[ ] Various instructional sources

[ ] A single instructional source

[ ] Other (specify) ______

In-house management training is provided by

[ ] In-house personnel

[ ] Package programs brought from outside

[ ] Outside consultants

[ ] Other (specify) ______
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AS YOU FEEL THEY APPLY TO THE EDUCATIONAL MERIT OF OUT-OF-HOUSE MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINARS OR WORKSHOPS.

FOLLOW THE SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS AT THE TOP OF EACH PAGE AND RESPOND BY PLACING AN X IN THE ( ) OPPOSITE YOUR CHOICE (OR CHOICES WHERE INSTRUCTIONS INDICATE THAT MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE APPROPRIATE.)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.
For each of the following items, select the ONE response that you feel is most indicative of educational merit.

A MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINAR OR WORKSHOP...

1. For which the advertised objectives are
   (  ) General
   (  ) Specific
   (  ) Not indicative of educational merit

2. For which the advertised major topics covered are
   (  ) General
   (  ) Specific
   (  ) Not indicative of educational merit

3. Designed for management at
   (  ) All levels within an organization
   (  ) Specific level(s) within an organization
   (  ) Not indicative of educational merit

4. Designed for management from organizations of
   (  ) All sizes
   (  ) Specific size(s)
   (  ) Not indicative of educational merit
For each of the following items, select the ONE response that you feel is most indicative of educational merit.

A MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINAR OR WORKSHOP...

5. Which is
   ( ) Modified
   ( ) Sometimes modified
to meet
   ( ) Never modified
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

6. Whose usual class size is
   ( ) 1 - 10 people
   ( ) 11 - 20
   ( ) 21 - 30
   ( ) 31 - 40
   ( ) 41 - 50
   ( ) 51 - 100
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
   ( ) 101 - 200
   ( ) 201 - 300
   ( ) 301 - 400
   ( ) 401 - 500
   ( ) More than 500

7. Whose majority of participants come from
   ( ) Private industry
   ( ) Non-profit organizations
   ( ) Government (national, state or local)
   ( ) Armed forces
   ( ) Other (specify)______________________________
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
For each of the following items, select the ONE response that you feel is most indicative of educational merit.

A MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINAR OR WORKSHOP...

8. Where the highest degree held by the majority of participants is
   ( ) A doctoral degree
   ( ) A masters degree
   ( ) A bachelors degree
   ( ) No degree
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

9. Whose participants have a typical age of
   ( ) Less than 20 years
   ( ) 20 to over 60
   ( ) 20 - 30
   ( ) 20 - 40
   ( ) 20 - 50
   ( ) 20 - 60
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
   ( ) 30 - 40
   ( ) 30 - 50
   ( ) 30 - 60
   ( ) 40 - 50
   ( ) 50 - 60
   ( ) Over 60

10. Whose participants average experience in their field is
    ( ) 1 year or less
    ( ) 2 - 4 years
    ( ) 5 years
    ( ) 6 - 8 years
    ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
    ( ) 9 - 10 years
    ( ) 11 - 15 years
    ( ) 16 - 20 years
    ( ) More than 20 years
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For each of the following items, select the ONE response that you feel is most indicative of educational merit.

A MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINAR OR WORKSHOP.

11. Whose instructional source is best categorized as
   ( ) Academic
   ( ) Nonacademic
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

12. Taught by
   ( ) One instructor
   ( ) 2 - 4 instructors
   ( ) 5 - 10 instructors
   ( ) 11 or more instructors
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

13. Whose instructors are
   ( ) Staff members: full time
   ( ) Staff members: part time
   ( ) Temporary
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

14. Where the highest degree held by the majority of instructor(s) is a
   ( ) Bachelors degree
   ( ) Masters degree
   ( ) Doctorate degree
   ( ) No degree
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
For each of the following items, select the **ONE** response that you feel is most indicative of educational merit.

A MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINAR OR WORKSHOP...

15. Whose length in work days is

   ( ) ½ day          ( ) 2 weeks
   ( ) 1 day          ( ) 3 weeks
   ( ) 2 days         ( ) 4 weeks
   ( ) 3 days         ( ) 5 weeks
   ( ) 4 days         ( ) 6 weeks
   ( ) 5 days         ( ) Over 6 weeks
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

16. Which is offered

   ( ) Full day
   ( ) Part day
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

17. With

   ( ) 4 or less classroom hours per day
   ( ) 5 - 6 classroom hours per day
   ( ) 7 - 8 classroom hours per day
   ( ) 9 or more classroom hours per day
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
For each of the following items, select the ONE response that you feel is most indicative of educational merit.

A MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINAR OR WORKSHOP...

18. With pre-course preparation time of
   ( ) None
   ( ) 1 - 3 hours
   ( ) 4 - 10 hours
   ( ) Over 10 hours
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

19. With out-of-class preparation time during the course of
   ( ) None
   ( ) 1 - 3 hours
   ( ) 4 hours and over
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

20. Which
   ( ) Provides for vacation or related reward type aspects
   ( ) Does not provide for
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
For each of the following items, select the ONE response that you feel is most indicative of educational merit.

A MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINAR OR WORKSHOP...

21. That has been in existence for
   ( ) A year or less
   ( ) 1 - 5 years
   ( ) 6 - 10 years
   ( ) 11 - 15 years
   ( ) 16 - 20 years
   ( ) 21 or more years
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

22. Which is offered
   ( ) Once a year
   ( ) Twice a year
   ( ) Three times a year
   ( ) Four times a year
   ( ) 5 to 8 times a year
   ( ) 9 to 12 times a year
   ( ) 13 or more times a year
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

23. Which is usually run in
   ( ) The same location(s) each time it is given
   ( ) Various locations
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

24. Which is
   ( ) Residential
   ( ) Nonresidential
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
For each of the following items, select the one response that you feel is most indicative of educational merit.

A MANAGEMENT TRAINING SEMINAR OR WORKSHOP...

25. Which is relatively
   ( ) Expensive
   ( ) Inexpensive
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

26. Whose advertized cost includes
   ( ) Tuition only
   ( ) Related costs also (e.g. food, lodging, course materials, etc.)
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit

27. For which financial assistance is
   ( ) Available
   ( ) Unavailable
   ( ) Not indicative of educational merit
28. A management training seminar or workshop which has: (Select one of the following)
( ) Admission requirements
( ) No admission requirements
( ) Not indicative of educational merit

Go to question 29

If admission requirements—which of the following indicate(s) educational merit?
(May select more than one if appropriate)
( ) Recommendation from employer
( ) Applicant must be presently employed
( ) Applicant must possess special qualifications, background or experience
( ) Course prerequisites
( ) Other (specify)_________________________
29. A management training seminar or workshop which: (Select one of the following)

( ) Has provisions for course evaluation
( ) Does not have provisions for evaluation
( ) Not indicative of educational merit

If provisions for course evaluation—
which of the following sources of evaluation indicates educational merit?
(May select more than one if appropriate)

( ) Program participants
( ) Program instructors/speakers
( ) Sponsoring organization staff
( ) Participants' organization
( ) Other (specify) ____________
What best indicates educational merit?

30. A management training seminar or workshop which offers: (select one of the following)

( ) Recognition/credit for completion

( ) No recognition/credit for completion

( ) Not indicative of educational merit

If recognition/credit— which of the following form(s) of recognition/credit indicate educational merit?

(May select more than one if appropriate)

( ) Diploma

( ) Certificate

( ) Continuing Education Units (CEUs)

( ) Other (specify) _____________________

_______________________________
What best indicates educational merit?

31. A management training seminar or workshop
utilizing the following instructional method(s)
(May select more than one if appropriate)
( ) Semi-structured conference
( ) Unstructured conference
( ) Lecture
( ) Question & answer
( ) Group project
( ) Sensitivity training
( ) Case study
( ) Role playing
( ) Simulation/business game
( ) Other (specify)_______________________

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
PLEASE USE THE ENCLOSED RETURN ENVELOPE FOR MAILING
Appendix B

Cover Letter
This is a request for your organization to participate in a national research project on out-of-house management training programs. It is also an opportunity for you as a contributing corporation to learn some important comparative data about management training programs.

This research project is designed to study management training programs directed at the work environment by instructional sources outside that environment. Seminars, workshops or clinics are common names applied to such training programs.

The objective of this study is to identify information normally known about training programs prior to attendance and to analyze how indicative such information is of the educational merit of subsequent programs. Information of this nature will hopefully provide useful input to the training program selection process.

It is requested that you have your corporate training officer complete the attached questionnaire and return it to me within two weeks. The questionnaire has been mailed to one hundred of the largest United States corporations randomly chosen for this research project. Responses will be kept strictly confidential and the report will in no way identify individuals or firms. The respondent's identification is sought for background purposes and as a point of contact to provide a summary of results.

Completion of the questionnaire by your corporation will be greatly appreciated. As a contributing corporation I will ensure that you are furnished a summary of the results of this study upon its conclusion.

Your immediate attention to this request is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Uldis Smidchens, PhD
Professor

Douglas R. Loomer
Doctoral Candidate

Enc.:

Questionnaire
Addressed return envelope
Appendix C

First Follow-Up Letter
Two weeks ago I mailed a management training questionnaire for your attention to be completed by your corporate training officer. So far I have no record of anyone returning the questionnaire. If this has been accomplished in the last few days please ignore this letter and accept my sincere appreciation for contributing to this research project.

If you haven't been able to take action, it is requested that you do so within the next two weeks. A high percentage of return is necessary to make this study meaningful.

As a contributing corporation you will be provided with a valuable summary report on out-of-house management training programs.

Thank you for bearing with me on this second request—be assured that your help in this project is sincerely appreciated and that at all times complete confidentiality is preserved.

Approved by,

Uldis Smidchens, PhD
Professor

Cordially,

Douglas R. Loomer
Doctoral Candidate

Enc.: Questionnaire
Addressed return envelope
Appendix D

Second Follow-Up Letter
In the last month I have mailed two letters requesting your organization's participation in a national research project on management training programs. If, for any reason, you feel you can't cooperate in this study, please return the blank questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

As you know for research to be meaningful, a high response rate is required. If I don't receive a reply within two weeks I would like to telephone your office later in that week to discuss reasons why your corporation chooses not to participate in this industry and university research project.

Please know that strict confidentiality will be maintained in whatever action you take.

As before, I would like to offer you a summary report based on the results of this research project.

If your corporate training officer has returned the questionnaire in the last few days please ignore this request and accept my appreciation for your cooperation.

Approved by,
Uldis Smidchens, PhD
Professor

Cordially,
Douglas R. Loomer
Doctoral Candidate

Enc.:
Questionnaire
Addressed return envelope
Appendix E

Listing of Corporation Respondents
by Position Title
## Listing of Corporation Respondents by Position Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Training &amp; Organization Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Mgt. Dev.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Human Resource Mgt.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Supervisor of Professional Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Dir. Training &amp; Organizational Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Human Resources Planning and Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Personnel Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Personnel Mgr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Mgt. Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Education Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Industrial Relations Mgr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Mgt. Dev. Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Mgt. Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower Development &amp; Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Mgt. Employment and Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Dir. Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Training and Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Communication and Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Corp. Marketing Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. of Mgt. and Wholesaler Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Employee Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Training and Personnel Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Training and Dev.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Training Mgr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Corp. Mgt. Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Compensation and Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Dev. and Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Mgt. and Dev. and Training Mgr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Mgr. of Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Employee Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Mgt. Dev. and Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Training and Education Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Human Resource Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Mgr. Training and Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Training and Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Employee Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Training and Sales Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Mgr. Human Resource Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Mgr. Executive Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. of Mgt. Training and Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Organizational and Career Dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Mgt. Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No position identified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Number of Responses by Variable of Sampled Academic and Nonacademic Training Programs
### Sample n Responses for 19 Indicators of Educational Merit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Nonacademic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Obj. Statement</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Topic Statement</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Mgt. Level</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Org. Size</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Modification</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant's Organization</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Instructors</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Status</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Length</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full or Part Day</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours per Day</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precourse Preparation</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-class Preparation</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Existence</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Requirement</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for Evaluation</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition Credit</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Methods</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Population size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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