1996

A level three evaluation of a management training program

Elaine Marie Tenorio
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Tenorio, Elaine Marie, "A level three evaluation of a management training program" (1996). *Master's Theses*. 1407.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.v2ee-eh74>

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1407

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

A LEVEL THREE EVALUATION
OF A MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Elaine Marie Tenorio
December, 1996

UMI Number: 1382611

UMI Microform 1382611
Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

A stylized, cursive signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Howard Tokunaga', written over a horizontal line.

Howard Tokunaga, Ph.D.

A cursive signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rebecca Malatesta', written over a horizontal line.

Rebecca Malatesta, Ph.D.

A cursive signature in black ink, appearing to read 'James Asher', written over a horizontal line.

James Asher, Ph.D.

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

A cursive signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Serena H. Stanford', written over a horizontal line.

© 1996

Elaine Marie Tenorio

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

A LEVEL THREE EVALUATION OF A MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

by Elaine M. Tenorio

The purpose of this study was to determine if managers' leadership effectiveness and flexibility improved after they attended a management training program. Subjects consisted of 19 entry-level managers from a computer company. A Leadership Behavioral assessment was completed by managers prior to the training, one week after completing the training, and three months after completing the training.

Results of analyses of variance showed that managers' leadership effectiveness and flexibility improved and the number of good decisions managers made increased after they had attended the training. It was also found that management experience, age, number of employees currently being managed, and highest number of employees ever managed did not have an effect on these changes. Results from this study indicate that managers who attend this management training program may learn to be more effective leaders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	3
Background of the Company Studied	4
Kirkpatrick Model of Training Evaluation	5
Measurement of Behavior.....	7
Evaluation Strategy Used	9
Purpose of the Evaluation.....	10
Overview of the Course Evaluated.....	10
Questions to be Answered	13
METHOD	13
Participants	13
Instruments	14
Procedure	18
Pre-test Procedure	19
Post-test Procedure	20
Post-post Test Procedure	21
Scoring of Instruments.....	21
RESULTS	22
DISCUSSION	36
Implications.....	43
Limitations.....	46
Implications for Future Evaluations	47
Conclusions	49
REFERENCES	50

APPENDICES	52
Appendix A. LBAII-Self and Cover Letter	52
Appendix B. LBAII-Other and Cover Letter.....	59
Appendix C. Demographic Questionnaire.....	66
Appendix D. Signed Approval Form	67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Descriptive Statistics for Managers	23
2. Mean Flexibility Scores by Time Period	25
3. Mean Effectiveness Scores by Time Period	28
4. Means of Primary Leadership Style Scores.....	32
5. Analyses of Variance of Primary Leadership Style Scores	34
6. Mean Decision-Making Scores by Time Period.....	37
7. Analyses of Variance of Decision-Making Scores by Time Period	38
8. Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Flexibility Scores and Effectiveness Scores	40

A Level Three Evaluation of a Management Training Program

Elaine Marie Tenorio

San Jose State University

Running head: LEVEL THREE EVALUATION

Footnotes

Requests for reprints should be sent to Elaine M. Tenorio, Department of Psychology, San Jose State University, San Jose, California 95192

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if managers' leadership effectiveness and flexibility improved after they attended a management training program. Participants consisted of 19 entry-level managers from a computer company. A Leadership Behavioral assessment was completed by managers prior to the training, one week after completing the training, and three months after completing the training. Results of analyses of variance showed that managers' leadership effectiveness and flexibility improved and the number of good decisions managers made increased after they had attended the training. It was also found that management experience, age, number of subordinates currently being managed, and highest number of subordinates ever managed did not have an effect on these changes. Results from this study indicate that managers who attend this management training program may learn to be more effective leaders.

A Level Three Evaluation of a Management Training Program

Training has flourished into a multi-billion-dollar industry, not only in terms of money spent but also in amount of effort expended (Goldstein, 1986). A report by the Carnegie Foundation indicates that education and training has become a booming business, with industrial corporations spending more than \$40 billion annually on programs that range from improving remedial skills to developing managers and executives (Eurich, 1985). Recent reports indicate that organizations with 100 or more employees will spend more than \$45 billion a year on formal training (Gordon, 1990). This is an increase of \$5 billion in five years. With training and development growing into an industry of its own, each organization must determine exactly how much value training is contributing to its business goals. In other words, do the benefits of training outweigh the costs?

Because training has become an integral and costly part of organizations, there is currently an emphasis on establishing viable training programs, rather than programs that seem to be valuable but may not be meeting business needs or goals. To confront this challenge, organizations must systematically identify training needs, build content into programs based on job information, and evaluate training in terms of the objectives for which it was designed (Wexley & Latham, 1991). In other words, training for impact, rather than training for activity, must be developed (Robinson, 1990). Training for activity involves trainers who record and report information, such as the number of people who attend a particular training and the number of courses offered annually. Training for impact consists of linking training to business needs, obtaining management support for training, and measuring the results of training (Robinson, 1990).

The purpose of the following project was to implement a Level Three evaluation of a management training course at a major computer firm. Although the training division's main objective was to determine if transfer of training had occurred after managers had attended the course, the training division was also interested in demonstrating to other staff

members and other training departments how to initiate Level Three evaluations of their own training courses.

Background of the Company Studied

The company examined in this study is an organization which values training. It is a worldwide computer firm with headquarters located in Silicon Valley, California. The company was established approximately 8 years before this study and employs approximately 12,000 employees. Due to the size of the organization, a separate training division was required to meet the needs of employees. The company's training division is known as CTD (Company Training Division).

CTD is responsible for all aspects of training within the company. Thus, CTD may design and deliver a training program or assist a department in their selection of a training program from an outside vendor. CTD is a division comprised of various departments that are accountable to specific departments within the company. There are training departments specifically for the company's sales division, technical division, management, and executives.

Rather than viewing CTD as a part of the company itself, the director and department managers of CTD view the sales division, technical division, management, and executives as their customers. They believe that by adopting this philosophy a certain tone is set regarding their relationship with other departments. It is CTD's intention to come across as a separate entity which provides a service to its clients, the departments within the company.

Since CTD assumed this philosophy, it has recognized the importance and the need to establish vital and practical programs, courses in alignment with the company's goals and charter. The director and department managers of CTD decided to implement a standardized evaluation process to be utilized across all departments. They believed this would help manage the many training programs available at the company.

The difficulties in implementing a standardized evaluation process were two-fold. First, training programs had already been established within the company and were well-received by company employees. If future evaluation of these training programs indicated that some programs were not "productive," employees might resist changes to or elimination of particular training programs. Second, not all members of the internal training staff were educated, skilled, or even familiar with the processes required to undertake the evaluation task. Thus, CTD not only was faced with establishing viable training programs, but was also required to provide a skill set to those who were unfamiliar with the evaluation process.

To resolve both of these challenges, CTD management believed that establishing an Evaluation Task Force was the most effective way to facilitate the evaluation endeavor. The goal of the Task Force was to implement a uniform evaluation process to be used by each training department for all training programs. It was management's belief that establishing a uniform evaluation process would accomplish several objectives. First, it would flush out programs that did not benefit the company and do so in a systematic fashion. Second, it would ensure that those involved in any aspect of training would have the same perspective and speak the same language. Third, it was a way to substantiate the value of the programs delivered by CTD.

The Kirkpatrick Model (1974) was viewed by CTD as the most workable evaluation process available to attain their goals; they felt it was easy to follow and understand. Thus, the Kirkpatrick Model was adopted by the Company Training Division.

Kirkpatrick Model of Training Evaluation

According to Kirkpatrick (1974), evaluation changes from a complex, elusive generality into clear and achievable goals if it is broken down into logical, workable steps. Kirkpatrick believes that the problem is not necessarily in defining evaluation of a training

program, but how one begins this process of evaluation. The steps, or levels, he proposed are defined as follows:

Level 1: Reaction. How well did the participants like the program?

Level 2: Learning. What principles, facts, skills, and attitudes were learned from the program?

Level 3: Behavior. Were there changes in behavior back on the job as a result of the program?

Level 4: Results. What were the bottom-line results of the program in terms of reducing cost or turnover, improved quality or quantity, etc.?

Measurement of Reaction is determining the feelings of the participants. The types of questions asked when measuring reaction are: Did the instructor present the material in an interesting fashion? Was the information helpful? What did you like best about the training?

Measurement of Learning is determining how much or if any information was garnered from the training. It is the process of verifying a change or difference in the trainees' knowledge, skill levels, or attitudes as a result of attending the training seminar.

Measurement of Behavior is assessing whether the trainee takes the skills or information learned from the training and uses it in the workplace. This is quite different from learning in that a trainee may have full comprehension of the material from the training but may not use it once he or she is back on the job.

Measurement of Results involves an analysis of the cost of training versus the benefit of training. It measures the organization's rate of return in dollars spent on each trainee in relation to the change of behavior of that trainee. Possible ways to gauge results are to examine employee turnover, absenteeism, productivity increases or decreases, changes in the number of manufacturing errors, changes in morale, or increases or decreases in worker injuries.

Each of the four levels outlined by Kirkpatrick provides different information about the training and is limited to certain interpretations and conclusions. Kirkpatrick emphasizes that the four-level evaluation process can be used in almost any organization but that results from one organization cannot be generalized to another organization.

Measurement of Behavior

Kirkpatrick (1976) describes from his own personal experience the difference between learning training material and applying behavior learned from the material. He recounts a story about a human relations training program that he attended with a foreman named Herman who worked at a company in Milwaukee. Every time the instructor asked a question in regards to understanding human relationships, Herman raised his hand to answer. The answers Herman provided were always thorough and in depth in terms of understanding the dynamics of how relationships work. Kirkpatrick thought he would like to work for a man just like Herman. As it turns out, Kirkpatrick had a relative who worked for Herman. When Kirkpatrick inquired about this person, his relative relayed stories of Herman's bullishness and inability to consider another's feelings. It is from this experience that Kirkpatrick began to realize that there is difference between knowing the correct principles and techniques and applying them on the job.

Kirkpatrick (1976) believes that a more scientific approach is required when evaluating behavior change in training programs. There are several guidelines that should be followed. First, a before-and-after systematic appraisal of the individual's on-the-job performance should be conducted. The appraisal of performance should be conducted by the person receiving the training and the person's superior or superiors, subordinates, and peers who are familiar with the individual's performance. Second, statistical analysis should be performed to compare performance before and after the training and to relate changes to the training program. Third, the post-training appraisal should be conducted three months or more after the training is completed. Subsequent appraisals may add

validity to the study. Lastly, a control group should be used.

Organizations may have difficulty implementing all of the recommended levels advocated by Kirkpatrick because of limited resources (i.e., staff, money, and time). However, companies have tried to incorporate ways to measure changes in on-the-job behavior. Some examples of Level Three evaluation studies of changes in behavior are briefly reported. The Fleishman-Harris Studies (1955) used a Level Three evaluation on a training program that had been conducted at the central school of the International Harvester Company. Fleishman developed a battery of research instruments (seven pencil-and-paper questionnaires) measuring the effectiveness of a training course. These questionnaires were used to survey the trainees, their superiors, and subordinates. Supplementing Fleishman's data, Harris conducted a follow-up study in the same organization. Harris included a control group in his study.

Lindholm's (1953) Level Three evaluation was performed in the home office of a small insurance company. Lindholm used a questionnaire that had already been developed by a research program at the Industrial Relations Center of the University of Minnesota. The questionnaire was administered before and after the training. Statistical analysis was performed on the data. Lindholm did not use a control group.

Bell Telephone Company performed a Level Three evaluation of their training program, Personal Factors in Management. Stroud (1959) used four separate groups in her study. These four groups were asked to fill out a questionnaire: supervisors who attended the course and their superiors, and supervisors who were not taking the course and their superiors. Different sections of the questionnaire were completed by the respective groups. This evaluation was conducted after the training program had started. Although the questionnaire was not administered before the training, the respondents were asked to compare on-the-job behavior before the program with on-the-job behavior after the program.

These are only some examples of ways to approach evaluating behavioral changes in organizations. The results are not reported because they cannot be generalized to other organizations (Kirkpatrick, 1976). However, training techniques, evaluation strategies, assessment methodologies, and possibly the surveys or questionnaires (if modified to fit the organization) can be used by different organizations (Goldstein, 1986). Both Goldstein (1986) and Kirkpatrick (1976) contend that it is dangerous to attempt to generalize training results in one organization to another organization, due to the dramatic ways organizations differ.

Evaluation Strategy Used

CTD's Evaluation Task Force was set up to follow the four levels put forth by Kirkpatrick. Four groups were established within the Task Force, representing each of the four evaluation levels. Each group of the Task Force consisted of a cross-section of individuals from the different training departments within the company, to ensure that each of the training departments would be represented. The duties of these individuals were to develop evaluation methods that could be utilized across and within departments and to report the findings of the Task Force back to their respective departments.

The Level One Task Force group generated a standard survey to measure initial reactions of the training participants. A computerized form was developed and adopted by all departments and used after each training program. The Level Two Task Force group worked on ways to measure the difference between knowledge prior to the training and knowledge after the training. Due to the diversity of training programs within the entire training division, a myriad of methods to conduct Level Two evaluations were in the process of being considered when this study was undertaken, but none had yet been implemented. As the evaluation process was still in the early phases of development at the time of this study, neither the Level Three nor the Level Four Task Force groups had established any examples or methodology for evaluation of training.

In addition to the Task Force, outside experts were contracted to teach all employees involved with the training process about Kirkpatrick's four levels. Four half-day seminars were designed and delivered to employees. The purpose of each seminar was to introduce and familiarize the employees with the four levels of the Kirkpatrick model.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The evaluation of training programs was a relatively new endeavor for this organization. It was presumed by management that there would be a period of trial-and-error and that evaluation procedures developed would be applicable to some training programs but not to others. It was assumed that evaluation procedures from Levels Two to Four would most likely be utilized on a case-by-case basis, as it is the format and type of training that dictate the manner in which evaluation will occur. There were, however, problems or difficulties common to all levels across all trainings. The goal for this organization was to implement effective evaluation methods, to uncover the problems inherent in the evaluation process, and to discover solutions to these problems.

The purpose of this project was to provide an example of a Level Three evaluation. The manager of the Management and Executive Training Department (MET), a member of the Level Three Task Force group, elected to perform a Level Three evaluation on an entry-level management course offered through his department. The purpose in evaluating the Management Training Program (MTP) course was two-fold: to use MTP as the first example of a Level Three evaluation and to demonstrate the course's value to the company.

Overview of the Course Evaluated

The MTP course offered by the company is a highly visible and popular course. It is a required course for all managers and was one of the first training courses offered by the company. Although the training division of the company has been through various management and departmental structural changes over the years, the MTP course has remained basically intact. The manager of MET was particularly interested in evaluating

this course because it was high in both company visibility and company investment. Also, the cost of the training was high from the MET's perspective, due to the amount of administrative preparation time it entails and the fact that two trainers are required to deliver the course. From the participants' viewpoint, the course requires that they be off-site for one full week. Additionally, managers from across the country are required to attend the course, adding travel expense to the cost of the training.

The MTP course is multi-dimensional because it covers various aspects of management skills and company philosophy. It is comprised of modules which focus on differences in management styles, the development of team-building skills, the benefits of the team-building process, giving and receiving positive and negative feedback (interpersonal skills), Situational Leadership, the company's mission statement, and the company's charter.

Pre-course work is required and must be completed prior to attending the MTP course. Pre-course requirements are to read the text "Manager as Developer," and to answer the Leadership Behavioral Analysis II Assessment (LBAII-Self; Zigarmi, Edeburn, & Blanchard, 1991). The LBAII-Self is an instrument which assesses an individual's leadership style and measures leadership flexibility and effectiveness. In addition, the participant is also responsible for distributing LBAII-Other questionnaires to the participant's manager, peers, and subordinates. The LBAII-Other measures how a manager's superior, peers, and subordinates perceive that manager's leadership style.

Due to the diversity of material covered in the training, it was decided that only the Situational Leadership section of the MTP course would undergo a Level Three evaluation. This segment of the training was chosen because the company had obtained a measurement before the training (pre-test) of each trainee's leadership style, leadership flexibility, and leadership effectiveness. Additionally, the LBAII instrument had also been established to be a reliable and valid tool.

The theory of Situational Leadership is based on how a manager would react in a certain situation rather than on qualities a manager possesses, such as interpersonal skills or communication skills. A manager's reaction in a certain situation is dependent on the developmental level of the manager's subordinate at the time the event is occurring (Carew, Parisi-Carew, & Blanchard, 1990). Two key components of the Situational Leadership Model are a manager's ability to assess the developmental level of his or her subordinate (follower) and his or her ability to respond appropriately in each situation (Carew, Parisi-Carew, & Blanchard, 1990). The four leadership styles are categorized as Directing, Coaching, Supporting, and Delegating.

The developmental-level scale of subordinates (followers) is related to the four Leadership Style scores. In Situational Leadership, developmental level is used as an indicator to identify which is the most effective leadership style to implement for a particular situation (Carew et al., 1990). The developmental level of a follower is defined by Blanchard (1985) as "the degree of competence and commitment of... follower(s)--to perform a particular task without supervision" (p.4). Competence is related to knowledge or skills garnered through education, training, or experience. Commitment is a combination of both motivation and confidence.

At the start of the Situational Leadership portion of the training, on the third day of the training program, managers are given the LBAII-Self assessment they completed before the training and are asked to calculate their own scores from this assessment. This exercise is designed to allow managers to gain a better understanding of the Situational Leadership Model, what the LBAII-Self instrument measures, and how it is measured. Participants are also given a profile with the compiled results of feedback from their superior, peers, and subordinates. For the remainder of the training, these results are utilized to further each manager's awareness of possible applications of the Situational Leadership Model.

Questions to Be Answered

The Management and Executive Training Department was interested in obtaining as much information from the leadership data collected as possible. Two specific questions were developed:

- 1) Is there a difference between a manager's LBAII scores prior to attending the MTP course, one week after completing the MTP course, and three months after completing the course? It was hypothesized that the training would improve a manager's flexibility and effectiveness on the job. Additionally, it was hypothesized that a manager's superior, peers, and subordinates would report that the leadership skills of the manager had improved after he or she had attended the training.
- 2) If differences between the LBAII scores were identified, are these differences a function of the amount of time the manager had been managing at the company, prior management experience, the number of subordinates supervised (either currently or in the past), or the manager's age? It was hypothesized that these factors would not influence any differences found between leadership flexibility and effectiveness before and after the MTP course and that any differences identified could be attributed to completion of the MTP course.

Method

Participants

Participants utilized for this study were 19 managers from a worldwide computer firm that employs a total of approximately 12,000 employees. All participants were rated as Level 10 managers or above. Level 10 is defined by the company as the entry level, the lowest company rank, for a manager. All employees who reach Level 10 must complete the MTP course, but there is no time limit for enrolling in the course. In addition, each Level 10 manager is required to qualify for registration in the MTP course. The general criteria for qualification for the course are:

- 1) The manager must have at least six months' management experience prior to attending the course.

- 2) The manager must have at least six months' tenure at the company.
- 3) The manager must be presently managing one or more subordinates.
- 4) The manager must manage one or more subordinates, an intact work group/project team (a work group or project team within one department), or a cross-functional team (a work group or project team that includes team members from more than one department).

In addition, a Level 10 manager must perform the following duties with regard to the intact work group: conduct performance and salary reviews, and create and generate a mission-charter, goals, and objectives. A Level 10 manager of a cross-functional team must create and generate a mission-charter, goals, and objectives that address the needs of all the departments involved.

Participants in this study were managers who had completed the MTP course at four different time periods. Each class was offered once a month and the four separate classes took place over four consecutive months. Enrollment for each course was approximately 20 managers, but, as participation in the evaluation process was voluntary, not all managers who attended the course took part in this study. Some managers chose not to participate in the evaluation process and many who were initially involved in the process withdrew because of time constraints, restructuring of their department, or because they left the company. Attrition rate of the participants was 53%, thus, the final count of those who participated was: (a) Group 1, 4 managers (3 males and 1 female); (b) Group 2, 6 managers (6 males and 0 females); (c) Group 3, 6 managers (5 males and 1 female); and (d) Group 4, 3 managers (1 male and 2 females).

Instruments

The instrument used to measure behavioral changes of a manager throughout the evaluation process was the Leader Behavior Analysis II (LBAII), developed by Blanchard (1991) and provided by Blanchard Training and Development, Inc. Two forms were used:

the LBAII-Self and the LBAII-Other.

The LBAII-Self assessment measures a respondent's perception of his or her leadership style. The instrument is composed of 20 situations with 4 alternative responses to each situation. Managers are instructed to read each situation and think about how they would respond in that situation. They are then asked to choose the action which best describes the behavior they would exhibit in that situation (see Appendix A).

The LBAII-Other assessment measures the perceptions of a manager's leadership style, as described by a manager's superior, peers, or subordinates. The LBAII-Other is composed of the same 20 situations and 4 alternative responses as the LBAII-Self assessment. The LBAII-Other requires the respondent (the superior, peer, or subordinate) to choose the action he or she feels would be taken by the manager in the situation described (see Appendix B).

To estimate the reliability of the Leadership Behavior Analysis (LBAII) assessments, a Cronbach Alpha was calculated. The standardized item alpha was .75, indicating that the LBAII assessment has good reliability.

A demographic questionnaire was also given to managers to complete. This questionnaire requested information regarding both length of time in management prior to joining the company and currently at the company, present number of subordinates, highest number of subordinates managed at one time, and age range. The demographic questionnaire was not distributed to managers' superiors, peers, or subordinates, to ensure that the identities of these individuals remained anonymous (see Appendix C).

Ten different scores were derived from the LBAII instruments: two primary scores, Flexibility and Effectiveness, and eight secondary scores. The first set of four secondary scores represents different leadership styles. The four styles of leadership are Directing, Coaching, Supporting, and Delegating. The second set of four secondary scores represents the number and degree of decisions made by each manager. The four categories

of Decision-making scores are: Excellent decisions, Good decisions, Fair decisions, and Poor decisions.

Leadership styles are comprised of dual functions which vary by degree. The two functions are Directive Behavior (task functions) and Supportive Behavior (maintenance functions). Degrees of these functions are designated as high or low. Directive behavior (task functions) is related to accomplishing a task. It is defined as "the extent to which a leader engages in one-way communication: spells out the follower(s) role and tells the follower(s) what to do, where to do it, when to do it and how to do it; and then closely supervises performance" (Blanchard, 1985, p.2). Supportive Behavior (maintenance functions) is related to interpersonal interaction. It is defined as "the extent to which a leader engages in two-way communication, listens, provides support and encouragement, facilitates interaction, and involves follower(s) in decision-making." (Blanchard, 1985, p.2). The four leadership styles are different combinations of these task and maintenance functions.

Style 1, Directing, is characterized by high direction and low support. Leaders who utilize Directing exercise control over a follower's task(s), and initiate all decision-making and problem-solving. They are specific about roles, instructions, and goals and will closely supervise completion of a task.

Style 2, Coaching, is characterized by high direction and high support. Leaders who utilize Coaching will provide close supervision of a task and will begin to listen to the follower's concerns, ideas, and suggestions.

Style 3, Supporting, is characterized by low direction and high support. Leaders who employ Supporting will allow a follower to be involved with daily decision-making and problem-solving involving a task. This leader will be supportive of a follower's ability and knowledge when accomplishing a task.

Style 4, Delegating, is characterized by low direction and low support. Leaders

who demonstrate this style will engage in joint decision-making and agreement with a follower. In Delegating, responsibility for a task is owned by the follower.

A manager's Primary Leadership Style is calculated by determining the number of each type of response that an individual indicates as his or her chosen behavior. The four responses provided for each situation represent each of the four Leadership Styles. The Primary Leadership Style score determines the Primary Leadership Style and is calculated by looking at how many times a manager chooses an action that corresponds with a certain style. The style chosen most often by a manager is that manager's Primary Leadership Style. For example, if a respondent most often chooses actions that represent Directing, then that individual's Primary Leadership Style is Directing.

Leadership Flexibility demonstrates the ability of the respondent to vary his or her choice of the four leadership styles in different situations. To calculate Leadership Flexibility, the respondents were assigned a value of 1 for each time a particular leadership style was chosen. For example, the respondent may have chosen Directing three times, Coaching four times, Supporting eight times, and Delegating five times. The scores for each style are subtracted from 5, without concern for negative numbers. These numbers are then summed and subtracted from 30. Flexibility scores range from 0 to 30. A score close to zero indicates poor style flexibility and is obtained when you continue to select the same one or two styles. A score closer to thirty indicates good style flexibility and is obtained by using each of the four styles several times.

Decision-making scores are calculated by determining the number of choices a manager makes in each decision-making category. The four categories of decision-making are described by Blanchard as Excellent decisions, Good decisions, Fair decisions, and Poor decisions. Decision-making scores are used to determine Leadership Effectiveness scores.

Leadership Effectiveness is measured by a leader's ability to consistently choose the

correct action based on the development of a follower. For each particular situation there is an alternative which is considered the most effective behavior given that situation. Points are added from all 20 questions and correspond to a continuum of 0 to 80, with 0 being the lowest possible score and 80 being the highest possible score. A score closer to 20 indicates low Style Effectiveness choices were made and a score closer to 80 indicates good to excellent Style Effectiveness choices were made.

Procedure

Managers registered for the MTP class through the company's internal electronic mail system. Each of the four courses lasted for one week and was conducted off-site. The trainees resided at the training location for the duration of the course.

Four separate management training classes were involved in the Level Three evaluation. The recruitment of participants, dispersal of information and instructions, and collection of the assessment instruments was standardized for three of the four groups. The first group to enroll in the course, however, was given instructions regarding the evaluation process from the trainer who delivered the course, rather than the author of this study. The author, however, was present when instructions were given to the first group, to ensure that the information and the manner in which it was conveyed was equivalent to that of the other three groups.

The LBAII-Self assessment was administered to managers prior to their enrollment in the MTP course (pre-test), one week after completion of the MTP course (post-test), and three months after completion of the MTP course (post-post test).

Each LBAII-Self assessment was labeled with each manager's name and was coded with a number. This same number and the manager's name was also on the corresponding LBAII-Other assessments. In addition, there was a box on each LBAII-Other which was marked to define the relationship the manager had with the respondent, i.e., manager, peer, or subordinate. The "others" who completed the LBAII-Other assessments did not provide

names or any demographic information. This procedure was followed to ensure anonymity.

Pre-Test Procedure. A set of instructions and a pre-addressed envelope were provided to all superiors, peers, and subordinates who were given the pre-test assessments. Assessments were returned to and scored by Blanchard Training and Development, Inc. A profile which provided the results of the responses from the LBAII- Other assessments was prepared by Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., for each manager. These profiles were sent by mail to CTD.

On the third day of the training, Situational Leadership, the section of the course that was to be evaluated, was introduced. Managers were given the assessment they had completed before the training and were asked to calculate their own scores from this assessment. Participants were also given a copy of their profile with the compiled results of feedback from "others" along with their own score. For the remainder of the training, these results were utilized to further the managers' awareness of possible applications of the Situational Leadership Model.

On the last day of the training the author of this study was introduced and explained to course attendees the purpose of the training evaluation and the process involved.

The following information was relayed to the managers:

The training department of the managers' company was concerned about the overall quality of the training programs they were providing to the company and was interested in evaluating the effectiveness of the Situational Leadership segment of the MTP course. The evaluation was designed to measure the effectiveness of the Situational Leadership Model, not individual performance. The specific concerns of the training department were, "Is Situational Leadership being used back on the job? Does this portion of the MTP training make a difference?"

Additionally, evaluation was identified as an area of interest for the author of this

study. It was explained that the author had contracted with the organization to assist them with their evaluation process. In return, the author would utilize the data gathered for a graduate thesis for the Industrial/Organizational Psychology program at San Jose State University.

Managers were told that participation in the evaluation was voluntary and could be discontinued at any time, with no questions asked. The identities of those who did decide to participate in the process would remain anonymous throughout the study.

The procedure for those who agreed to be included in the evaluation process would be to photocopy all profile results before the completion of the course. Submission of a manager's profile would be considered consent to participate in the evaluation process. One week after the training, managers would receive the LBAII-Self assessment with a pre-addressed envelope. They would be asked to fill it out and return it to the author of this study. Three months after the training they would receive another package with the LBAII-Self assessment, LBAII-Other assessments, and pre-addressed envelopes. They would be required to complete the LBAII-Self assessment and to distribute the LBAII-Other assessments to the same individuals who had completed the assessments prior to the training.

After the author of this study outlined the procedures of the evaluation process, managers were asked if they had any questions. They were also given the author's telephone number, in case any questions were to arise during the course of the evaluation process.

Copies of the scoring profiles completed by Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., profiles completed by each manager, and all assessment forms were collected from trainees on the last day of the MTP course.

Post-Test Procedure. Managers who had agreed to participate in the evaluation process received an LBAII-Self instrument, instructions on how to complete and return the

instrument, and a self-addressed envelope through interdepartment mail. They were asked to return the completed assessment by mail to the author of this study within two weeks.

Follow-up calls were made by the author to participants who did not return the LBAII-Self assessment in a timely manner. These calls prompted the participants to return the instrument or allowed the participant to elect to discontinue participation in the evaluation process.

Post-Post Test Procedure. Managers who returned the first post-test received both the LBAII-Self assessment and LBAII-Other assessments through interdepartment mail three months after they had completed the training. Managers also received instructions on how to complete and return the LBAII-Self assessment and were asked to distribute the LBAII-Other assessments and instructions on how to complete the LBAII-Other to the superior, the peers, and the subordinates who had previously completed the assessments. In addition, a demographic questionnaire was included with the evaluation materials for each manager to complete. Managers were asked to return the LBAII-Self assessment, the demographic questionnaire, and the LBAII-Other assessments by mail to the author of this study within two weeks.

Follow-up calls were made by the author of this study to managers who did not return the assessments in a timely manner. These calls prompted the participants to return the assessments or allowed the participant to explain the reason for discontinuing participation in the evaluation process.

Scoring of Instruments. The LBAII-Self pre-test scores calculated by the managers and the LBAII-Other pre-test scores calculated by Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., were not used by the author of this study. Instead, to ensure continuity in the scoring process, copies of the actual assessments completed by managers and "others" were collected by the author and were used to calculate all scores discussed in this study.

The LBAII-Self scores were divided into three groups: pre-test, post-test, and post-

post test. These three groups of scores were looked at separately.

When calculating scores from the LBAII-Other assessments, however, pre-test scores and post-post test scores could not be matched to individual respondents for several reasons. First, the vendor who provided the assessments, Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., was under contract to the company to provide scoring profiles to all managers who completed the assessments. As the company did not want to make an exception to this policy for the purpose of this evaluation, the author was unable to determine which of a manager's "others" had completed each assessment. Second, it was the company's belief that using unmatched assessments would satisfy any concerns managers, superiors, peers, and subordinates may have had regarding anonymity. Third, because reorganizations occur frequently within the company, some of the employees who initially responded as "others" were transferred to other departments during the evaluation process. The solution utilized, to retain the largest sample possible, was to average the "other" pre-test scores and post-post test scores of each manager, thereby generating one overall average "other" score.

Results

Due to the small number of participants in the four separate training courses, data from the four training groups was combined. All analyses performed are based on this combined data. Descriptive statistics of managers are included in Table 1. On average, managers who participated in this study have approximately two years of management experience at the company, currently manage about six subordinates, and range in age from 31 to 36 years.

In order to determine if leadership flexibility was affected by training and months in management at the company, an analysis of variance was performed on the dependent variable Flexibility score, which represents the participant's ability to utilize the four leadership styles (Directing, Coaching, Supporting, and Delegating). Independent

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Managers (n = 19)

Demographic	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Years in Management at the Company	2.07	1.66
Years in Management at Previous Companies	2.34	3.78
Number of Subordinates Presently Being Managed	5.74	3.63
Highest Number of Subordinates Managed	10.00	4.63

Age Range	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
25-30	2	10.5
31-36	10	52.6
37-42	3	15.8
43-48	3	15.8
49-54	1	5.3
Total	19	100.00

variables used were time period and months in management at the company. Time period was denoted as (1) prior to the training (pre-test), (2) one week after the training (post-test), and (3) three months after the training (post-post test). Months in management at the company was denoted as (1) 0 to 36 months, and (2) 37 to 72 months. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant [$F(2,56) = .45$, $p = .64$]. The main effect for months in management at the company was not statistically significant [$F(1,56) = 2.74$, $p = .104$]. However, the main effect for time period was significant [$F(2,56) = 6.65$, $p = .003$]. A Tukey-B procedure showed that the mean Flexibility score of the pre-test group (mean = 17.16) was significantly lower than that of the post-test group (mean = 20.84) and that of the post-post test group (mean = 20.74). Means for two-way analyses of variance with the dependent variable Flexibility score are included in Table 2.

To determine whether a manager's Flexibility score was affected by time period and previous management experience, an analysis of variance was performed. The independent variables used were time period and months in management at previous companies, which was denoted as (1) 0 to 23 months and, (2) 24 to 180 months. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, [$F(2,56) = 2.28$, $p = .113$]. The main effect for previous management experience was not statistically significant, [$F(1,56) = .223$, $p = .639$].

An analysis of variance was performed to examine whether a manager's Flexibility score was affected by time period and number of subordinates presently being managed. The independent variables used were time period and number of subordinates presently being managed, which was denoted as (1) 0-6 subordinates, and (2) 7-12 subordinates. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, [$F(2,56) = .78$, $p = .461$]. The main effect for number of subordinates presently being managed was not statistically significant, [$F(1,56) = .010$, $p = .919$].

An analysis of variance was performed to investigate whether or not a manager's

Table 2

Mean Flexibility Scores by Time Period (n = 19)

Months in Management at the Company

	0-36	37-72	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	16.89	17.40	17.16
Post-test	20.00	21.45	20.84
Post-post test	19.33	22.00	20.74
Overall	18.32		

Months of Previous Management Experience

	0-23	24-180	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	18.00	16.00	17.16
Post-test	19.64	22.50	20.84
Post-post test	20.55	21.00	20.74
Overall	19.83		

Table 2 (continued)

Number of Subordinates Presently Being Managed

	0-6	7-12	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	17.80	16.44	17.16
Post-test	20.80	20.89	20.84
Post-post test	20.00	21.56	20.74
Overall	19.63		

Highest Number of Subordinates Managed

	0-9	10-120	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	16.40	18.00	17.16
Post-test	21.20	20.44	20.84
Post-post test	20.00	21.56	20.74
Overall	19.00		

Age Range of Managers in Years

	25-36	37-60	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	17.83	16.00	17.16
Post-test	20.17	22.00	20.84
Post-post test	20.67	20.86	20.74
Overall	19.62		

Flexibility score was affected by time period and highest number of subordinates ever managed. The independent variables used were time period and highest number of subordinates managed, which was denoted as (1) 0-9 subordinates and, (2) 10-120 subordinates. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, $[F(2,56) = .680, p = .511]$. The main effect for the highest number of subordinates managed was not statistically significant, $[F(1,56) = .720, p = .400]$.

To examine whether a manager's Flexibility score was affected by time period and age, an analysis of variance was performed. The independent variables used were time period and age range of managers, which was denoted as (1) 25-36 years and, (2) 37-60 years. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, $[F(2,56) = 1.19, p = .313]$. The main effect for age range of managers was not statistically significant, $[F(1,56) = .004, p = .948]$.

In order to determine if a manager's Effectiveness score was affected by time period and months in management at the company, an analysis of variance was performed using the independent variables time period and months in management at the company. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, $[F(2,56) = .466, p = .630]$. The main effect for months in management at the company was not statistically significant, $[F(1,56) = 1.31, p = .257]$. However, the main effect for time period was significant, $[F(2,56) = 3.59, p = .035]$. A Tukey-B procedure showed that the mean Effectiveness score of the post-test group (mean = 63.32) was significantly higher than the mean Effectiveness score of the pre-test group (mean = 58.42). Means for all two-way analyses of variance with the dependent variable Effectiveness score are included in Table 3.

An analysis of variance was performed using the independent variables time period and total months in management at previous companies to determine if a manager's Effectiveness score was affected by time period and months in management at previous

Table 3

Mean Effectiveness Scores by Time Period (n = 19)

Months in Management at the Company

	0-36	37-72	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	57.33	59.40	58.42
Post-test	61.25	64.82	63.32
Post-post test	62.56	62.40	62.47
Overall	60.29		

Months of Previous Management Experience

	0-23	24-180	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	58.64	58.13	58.42
Post-test	63.64	62.88	63.32
Post-post test	64.55	59.63	62.47
Overall	62.21		

Table 3 (continued)

Number of Subordinates Presently Being Managed

	0-6	7-12	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	58.30	58.56	58.42
Post-test	62.50	64.22	63.32
Post-post test	62.00	63.00	62.47
Overall	60.93		

Highest Number of Subordinates Managed

	0-9	10-120	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	57.40	59.56	58.42
Post-test	63.50	63.11	63.32
Post-post test	63.60	61.22	62.47
Overall	61.30		

Age Range of Managers in Years

	25-36	37-60	Overall
Time Period			
Pre-test	58.08	59.00	58.42
Post-test	63.33	63.29	63.32
Post-post test	64.17	59.47	62.47
Overall	61.47		

companies. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, [$F(2,56) = 8.22, p = .445$]. The main effect for months in management at previous companies was not statistically significant, [$F(1,56) = 1.71, p = .197$].

To examine if a manager's Effectiveness score was affected by time period and number of subordinates presently being managed, an analysis of variance was performed using the independent variables time period and number of subordinates presently being managed. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, [$F(2,56) = .070, p = .933$]. The main effect for number of subordinates presently being managed was not statistically significant, [$F(1,56) = .384, p = .538$].

An analysis of variance was performed using the independent variables time period and highest number of subordinates managed to investigate whether or not a manager's Effectiveness score was affected by time period and the highest number of subordinates ever managed. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, [$F(2,56) = .682, p = .510$]. The main effect for highest number of subordinates managed was not statistically significant, [$F(1,56) = .016, p = .898$].

An analysis of variance was conducted using the independent variables time period and age range of managers to determine if a manager's Effectiveness score was affected by time period and age. The result of the two-way interaction was not statistically significant, [$F(2,56) = 1.10, p = .342$]. The main effect for age range of managers was not statistically significant, [$F(1,56) = .585, p = .448$].

In order to determine if there were shifts in Primary Leadership scores as a result of training, a one-way analysis of variance was performed on the variables Primary Leadership Style score (number of times one leadership style is chosen over another) and time period. The one-way analysis was statistically significant [$F(2,84) = 3.16, p = .048$]. A Tukey-B procedure showed that the Primary Leadership Style score of the pre-test group was significantly higher than that of the post-post test group. Specifically, a difference in

preference of one of the four Leadership Styles over the other three styles was found between the pre-test scores and the post-post test scores.

One-way analyses of variance performed on Primary Leadership Style scores and the following variables: months in management at the company, months in management at previous companies, number of subordinates presently being managed, highest number of subordinates managed, and age range of managers were not statistically significant. Means for one-way analyses of variance are listed in Table 4 and ANOVA tables for one-way analyses of variance are listed in Table 5.

In order to determine if there was an increase in excellent or good decisions made by managers and/or a decrease in fair or poor decisions made by managers as a result of the MTP course, one-way analyses of variance were performed on the variables Decision-making scores (number of times a poor, fair, good, or excellent alternative was chosen by a participant in response to a hypothetical situation) and time period.

A one-way analysis of variance performed on the variables Fair Decision-making scores (number of times a fair alternative was chosen by a participant in response to a hypothetical situation) and time period was statistically significant [$F(2,84) = 8.34$, $p = .0005$]. A Tukey-B procedure showed that the mean Fair Decision-making score of the pre-test group was significantly higher than that of both the post-test group and the post-post test group. Specifically, the pre-test group made more fair decisions than did the post-test group or the post-post test group.

A one-way analysis of variance performed on the variables Excellent Decision-making scores (number of times an excellent alternative is chosen by a participant in response to a hypothetical situation) and time period was also statistically significant [$F(2,84) = 8.13$, $p = .0006$]. A Tukey-B procedure showed that the mean Excellent Decision-making score of the pre-test group was significantly lower than that of both the post-test group and the post-post test group. Specifically, the pre-test group made fewer

Table 4

Means of Primary Leadership Style Scores (n = 19)

Time Period	Score
Pre-test	9.42
Post-test	8.89
Post-post test	8.27
Months in Management at the Company	Score
0-36	9.69
37-72	9.89
Months of Previous Management Experience	Score
0-23	9.52
24-80	9.08
Number of Subordinates Presently Being Managed	Score
0-6	9.30
7-12	9.37

Table 4 (continued)

Highest Number of Subordinates Managed	Score
0-9	9.40
10-120	9.26
Age Range of Managers in Years	Score
25-36	9.44
37-60	9.14

Table 5

Analyses of Variance of Primary Leadership Style Scores (n = 19)

Primary Leadership Style Scores by Time Period

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	21.91	2	10.96	3.16	.0477*
Within Groups	284.40	82	3.47		
Total	306.31	84			

Primary Leadership Style Scores by Months in Management at the Company

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	6.16	1	6.16	1.48	.2285
Within Groups	228.51	55	4.15		
Total	234.67	56			

Primary Leadership Style Scores by Months of Previous Management Experience

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	2.59	1	2.59	.61	.4366
Within Groups	232.08	55	4.22		
Total	234.67	56			

Table 5 (continued)

Primary Leadership Style Scores by Number of Subordinates Presently Being Managed

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	.07	1	.07	.02	.8983
Within Groups	234.60	55	4.27		
Total	234.67	56			

Primary Leadership Style Scores by Highest Number of Subordinates Managed

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	.28	1	.28	.07	.7981
Within Groups	234.39	55	4.26		
Total	234.67	56			

Primary Leadership Style Scores by Age Range of Managers in Years

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1.21	1	1.21	.28	.5961
Within Groups	233.46	55	4.24		
Total	234.67	56			

* $p < .05$

excellent decisions than the post-test group and the post-post test group.

Results of one-way analyses of variance performed on number of Poor Decision-making scores and number of Good Decision-making Scores were nonsignificant. Means for one-way analyses of variance are listed in Table 6 and ANOVA tables for one-way analyses of variance are listed in Table 7.

Correlations performed to determine if there was a relationship between Flexibility scores and the variables length of time in management at the company, number of subordinates presently being managed, and age range of managers were not statistically significant. Correlations are listed in Table 8.

Correlations were also performed to determine if there was a relationship between Effectiveness scores and the variables length of time in management at the company, number of subordinates presently being managed, and age range of managers. The correlation between age range and Effectiveness scores was not statistically significant, however, correlations between Effectiveness scores and length of time in management at the company and Effectiveness scores and the number of subordinates presently being managed were statistically significant. The correlation between Effectiveness scores and length of time in management at the company was negative, meaning that Effectiveness scores decrease the longer a manager has been at the company. The correlation between Effectiveness scores and number of subordinates presently being managed was positive. This result indicates that as the number of subordinates a manager oversees increases, so does a manager's Effectiveness score.

Discussion

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine if a manager's leadership style improved after attending the company's Management Training Program (MTP). The most desired outcome from the Situational Leadership portion of the MTP course would be to witness a significant increase between managers' effectiveness before the training and

Table 6

Mean Decision-Making Scores by Time Period (n = 19)

Decision-Making Scores	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-post test
Poor	1.94	1.21	1.94
Fair	5.90	3.79	4.45
Good	5.67	5.47	5.76
Excellent	6.49	9.53	8.03

Table 7

Analyses of Variance of Decision-Making Scores by Time Period (n = 19)

Poor Decision-making

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	7.84	2	3.92	2.57	.0825
Within Groups	124.92	82	1.52		
Total	132.75	84			

Fair Decision-making

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	63.51	2	31.75	8.34	.0005*
Within Groups	312.07	82	3.81		
Total	375.58	84			

Good Decision-making

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	.98	2	.49	.15	.8578
Within Groups	260.13	82	3.17		
Total	261.11	84			

Table 7 (continued)

Excellent Decision-making

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	115.35	2	57.67	8.13	.0006*
Within Groups	581.95	82	7.10		
Total	697.29	84			

* $p < .001$

Table 8

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Flexibility Scores and EffectivenessScores (n = 19)

	Flexibility	Effectiveness
Years of Management at Company	-.12	-.49*
Number of Subordinates Presently Being Managed	.12	.49*
Age Range of Managers	.008	-.10

* p < .001

managers' effectiveness after the training. Results from this evaluation indicated a significant increase in Effectiveness scores between those taken before the training and those taken one week after the training. It was also shown that management experience at the company, management experience at previous companies, the number of subordinates presently being managed, the highest number of subordinates ever managed, and age range were not related to the increase in a manager's effectiveness score. The implication of the above result is that individuals who attend the training program may become more effective leaders. It should be noted, however, that although Effectiveness scores increased significantly one week after the training, the scores decreased between one week after the training and three months after the training. Further examination of this finding uncovered a possible explanation for the decrease in scores from one week after the training to three months after the training: it was found that the longer a manager had been employed at the company, the more his or her Effectiveness score decreased. A possible explanation could be that natural information decay occurred within the several months after managers had completed the training.

Results from managers' self-assessments showed a significant increase between pre-training Flexibility scores and scores taken one week after the training and three months after the training. In addition, data obtained from the course attendees' superiors, peers, and subordinates indicated that managers' leadership flexibility improved after the training. It was also found that management experience at the company, management experience at previous companies, the number of subordinates presently being managed, the highest number of subordinates ever managed, and age range were not related to increases found in Flexibility scores.

An individual's Flexibility score is an indication of that person's ability to use a range of leadership styles. Although this may not necessarily impact performance directly, a good Flexibility score indicates that a respondent is comfortable moving among the four

leadership styles. The usefulness and value of this may pertain to the training itself. It is beneficial for course attendees to see the importance of being comfortable with the use of all leadership styles.

Results of this study indicated that there were significant changes with respect to Primary Leadership Style scores. Specifically, there was a shift between a participant's Primary Leadership Style score prior to the training and three months after the training. It was also found that management experience at the company, management experience at previous companies, the number of subordinates presently being managed, the highest number of subordinates ever managed, and age range were not factors related to changes in a manager's Primary Leadership Style score.

A shift in Primary Leadership scores implies that after attending the training leadership styles of the managers changed. A change in Primary Leadership scores does not necessarily demonstrate that the managers became more effective or more flexible leaders after the training, but it does help to explain why there were changes in Effectiveness scores and Flexibility scores between the time periods: Flexibility scores and Effectiveness scores are based on Primary Leadership scores.

A significant decrease in the number of Fair decisions made by managers before the training, one week after the training, and three months after the training was identified. A significant increase in the number of Excellent decisions made by managers was also found. Specifically, the managers' ability to make "excellent decisions" increased immediately after the training and three months after the training. This data aids in the explanation and support of the significant differences found when looking at Effectiveness scores and Flexibility scores: Effectiveness scores are a derivative of Decision-making scores.

Increased Effectiveness scores and increased Flexibility scores indicate that managers who attended the training improved with regard to their ability to judge the

developmental level of a subordinate and to apply the appropriate response needed for that subordinate to successfully accomplish a task at hand or to problem-solve. The increase in the managers' scores indicates that after the training managers became more knowledgeable and familiar with leadership options and were better able to respond to situations with the most appropriate leadership style. In other words, managers who attended the training not only showed that they had a grasp of the information immediately after the training, but were using this information and putting it into practice back on the job site.

Implications

The premise of the Situational Leadership Model is that there is no one best leadership style: leaders who are able to positively impact performance and satisfaction are those who adapt their style to fit each situation (Blanchard, 1984). Measurement of a manager's ability to act in this manner is determined by the LBAII-Self and LBAII-Other Effectiveness scores. If this assumption is true and the LBAII is a measure of this ability, the potential impact of this result is extremely positive for this organization. The implication of this result is that the training is positively increasing managers' abilities to assess the developmental level of subordinates and to administer the appropriate amount of directive and supportive behavior (Blanchard, 1984). In other words, after attending the training, managers are better able to appraise the skill levels of a subordinate in relation to the subordinate's knowledge and to facilitate that individual's problem-solving and task completion.

To further support the strength of his contention and to ensure that the LBAII is an assessment which measures the behavior and ability of a manager to act in this manner, Blanchard correlated the LBAII-Other with two other valid and reliable instruments: the Wilson Multi-Level Management Survey (MLMS) and the Leaded Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), both of which measure leadership, task, and relationship constructs. Results of the comparison between the LBAII and the two assessments were

based on LBAll-Other responses (Zigarmi et al., 1991). Results of the comparison indicated that the LBAll was highly correlated to both the MLMS and the LBDQ. Blanchard (1984) contends that since the assessments are correlated one can assume that the following managerial behaviors can be influenced: the setting of timelines and the clarification of goals; the definition of roles; careful explanation of how tasks or goals can be reached; thoughtful listening to subordinates; adequate and appropriate praise; request for input; shared information about self and organization; and team-building. If a manager possesses and is able to employ these skills, this creates the potential for both a manager and his or her subordinate to experience a positive interaction in regards to their work and to their relationship. Thus, increasing the skill base of managers creates managers who have successful interactions with their subordinates.

In addition to improving the relationships between managers and subordinates, another consequence of training managers to be effective leaders is one which impacts the organization itself. If all parties within the organization are operating at an optimum level and putting their best efforts forward, the organization reaps the benefit of functioning productively (i.e., meeting goals). Thus, Blanchard (1984) claims that the successful combination of directive and supportive behaviors matches not only a subordinate's needs but organizational output as well.

Although transfer of training was found when examining the impact of the MTP course, correlations performed suggest that there are other factors which may have an influence over Effectiveness scores. The correlation between Effectiveness scores and length of time in management at the company was negative. This suggests that the longer a manager had been at the company, the more his or her managerial effectiveness decreased. One possible reason for this is that the organizational culture of the company may be influencing how a manager responds to his or her subordinates. It may be that one leadership style is rewarded or perceived as being the "best" or the accepted way to respond

and managers are more willing to or feel that they must adopt this particular style.

Adapting to the culture of the organization in order to fit in (or be liked) may be forcing managers to exhibit certain behaviors.

The correlation between Effectiveness scores and number of subordinates presently managed was positive. This result indicates that as the number of subordinates a manager oversees increases, so does the managerial effectiveness of that manager. One possible explanation for this is that the more individuals one manages, the more effective one has to be with managing resources. Managing more individuals might thereby force a manager to rely on those skills that will get the job done in the most efficient manner and to manage subordinates so that they will do the same.

The results of the above correlations may also imply that management or leadership skills may be related to or affected by the environment. Thus, not only is training important, but the organizational environment is important as well. An organization may provide skill-based training and information to ensure that its managers are effective and productive, but its culture may be counter to the information the organization presents to individuals in its training programs. The concern then is not only whether or not transfer of training occurs, but whether or not the training and organizational environment supports the knowledge, behaviors, and skills that are being taught in the training programs. It would appear from the results of this evaluation that the retaining and application of knowledge garnered from training are not the only components necessary to ensure successful results of this particular training program.

Although the results of this study cannot be generalized to other organizations, what was gleaned from this process may be. The methodology and implementation of this project has produced a good example of a Level Three evaluation.

Results from this evaluation indicate that instituting a Level Three evaluation may reap benefits by determining if training is working and may also provide additional

information about an organization. This case may serve as a guide to other companies as to the importance of having the full support of all parties involved and of using a control group when conducting an evaluation. Additionally, this study illustrates the importance of collecting and examining data on as many variables as possible, because there may be other factors besides training which influence on-the-job performance.

Limitations

There were several limitations to the evaluation process used in this study. The first limitation was the lack of a control group. Although CTD management recognized the value of including a control group in the study, due to limited resources it was not logistically feasible to incorporate a control group in this evaluation process. Thus, no comparisons could be made between those who had participated in the training program versus those who had not. If a control group had been included in the study and it was determined that managers who attended the training had higher Effectiveness scores than those who did not, the results of this study would provide a much stronger assertion that the training will improve a manager's performance. Hence, the results would be more conclusive that the observed differences are a result of training and not other factors.

The second issue of concern was participant attrition. Over half of the participants, 53%, discontinued participation in the evaluation process between the completion of the MTP course and three months after the course. Participant loss occurred for several reasons. Some managers who had initially been eager to participate in the evaluation withdrew because of time and work load constraints. Also, there was no apparent incentive or advantage for managers to participate in the study nor were there any consequences for withdrawal from the study. Reorganization of departments within the company was another cause of participant loss. Some managers were transferred to other departments during the course of the evaluation process and some "others" in the study were transferred as well.

Participant attrition during the study brings up the issue of whether there are differences between those who remained in the study and those who did not. The managers who completed the evaluation process may be individuals who are more interested in improving their performance. Their Effectiveness scores may have increased as a result of their desire to become better managers, rather than because they attended the training program.

The third limitation was a result of the voluntary nature of the evaluation process. It is possible that there are differences between those who volunteered for the evaluation and those who did not. The increase in Effectiveness scores found could be due to the fact that those who partook in the evaluation are more dedicated managers and are more concerned about doing a better job than those who did not volunteer. Those who decided to volunteer may have found the training information more valuable and made more of a conscious effort to utilize their new skills than those who did not volunteer. In addition, the fact that the evaluation process was voluntary rather than mandatory decreased the size of the sample used in this study.

The fourth limitation was a result of the author's inability to match LBAT-Other scores taken before the training to scores taken three months after the training. As the assessments completed by trainees and "others" before the training were returned to the organization who produced the managers' profiles, the author of this study was unable to match the assessments completed by "others" before the training to assessments completed by "others" three months after the training. This lack of control over the pre-test assessments necessitated the creation of the averaged "others" scores and may have had an effect on the results of this study.

Implications For Future Evaluations

If future training evaluations of the Management Training Program course are to be conducted, changes in some of the procedures may help to improve the strength of

evaluation results. One change that would strengthen evaluation results would be to have a control group. This may be difficult to implement, however, as evaluation of managers who completed the training program was logistically difficult to accomplish in and of itself. To include those who do not attend the training program would make the task an even more tremendous one.

Any future evaluations should include all managers who attend the training and should be incorporated as part of the actual training program. Incorporating Level Three evaluation in the infrastructure of the course would obviate differences between those who do volunteer and those who do not. Additionally, more control should be exercised over the participation of "others" in the evaluation process. This could be accomplished by assigning "others" a number with which to identify themselves. This number could be included on all assessments completed and returned by "others". Providing a number to respondents would retain each respondent's anonymity, while still allowing data collected before the training and data collected after the training to be matched. Including all trainees in the evaluation process and matching assessments completed by "others" would produce stronger evaluation results.

A major area of concern for this company is the frequency of reorganization. As the "others" who completed LBAII-Other assessments before the training also completed assessments three months after the managers had attended the training, it was necessary that the group of "others" remain intact. Reorganization makes it difficult to measure intact groups over a period of time. As a Level Three evaluation measures change over time, this poses a problem. One possible solution would be to limit the data collected in the evaluation process by using self-report assessments completed by participants only, and not to include "others" in the evaluation process. However, although using self-report data might address the problem regarding the participant attrition of "others", it would limit the data available to be used in the evaluation. Self-report is limiting in this particular case

because changes in leadership style, effectiveness, and flexibility would be measured only by managers who attended the training and are directly responsible for any changes and would not include responses from individuals who work closely with the managers. It is those individuals who would be affected by any actual change in managers' behavior. Before deciding whether or not self-report would be a viable alternative in this case, the advantages and disadvantages must be carefully weighed.

Conclusions

Conclusions from this evaluation are very encouraging as they suggest that managers are honing and improving their leadership skills as a result of attending the Management Training Program. Although adopting more rigorous evaluation procedures may be difficult within this organization, the results and information obtained from an improved evaluation procedure may well be worth the effort.

References

Blanchard, K. (1984). Situational leadership II. San Diego, CA: Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.

Blanchard, K. (1985). SLII: A situational approach to managing people. Escondido, CA: Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.

Eurich, N. P. (1985). Corporate classrooms. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation.

Fleishman, E. A., Harris, E. F. & Buntt, H. E. (1955). Leadership and supervision in industry. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.

Goldstein, I. L. (1986). Training in organizations: Needs assessment, development and evaluation (2nd ed.). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Gordon, J. (1990, October). Where the training goes. Training Magazine, p. 51.

Group Development and Situational Leadership II. (1990). A model for managing groups. [Brochure]. Escondido, CA: Carew, D., Parisi-Carew, E., Blanchard, K.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1976). Training and development handbook: A guide to human resource development. (R. L. Graig, Ed.). New York: McGraw- Hill.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1977, November). Evaluating training programs. Training and Development Journal, pp. 9-12.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1991). Training and development handbook: A guide to human resource development. New York: McGraw-Hill.

LBAII. (1991). Research on the LBAII: A validity and reliability study. [Brochure]. Zigarmi, D., Edeburn, E., Blanchard, K.: Authors.

Lindholm, T. R. (1953, November-December). Supervisory training and employee attitudes. Journal of the ASTD, pp. 50-53.

Robinson, D. G. & Robinson, J. C. (1990). Training for impact: How to link training to business needs and measure the results. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stroud, P. V. (1959, November-December). Evaluating a human relations training program. Personnel.

Wexley, K. N. & Latham, G. P. (1991). Developing and training human resources in organizations (2nd ed.). New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Appendix A

125 State Place
Escondido, CA 92029
619 489-5005

Dear Manager:

Enclosed with this letter is a set of *Leader Behavior Analysis* (LBAI) instruments that will provide you with valuable data on how you and others perceive the behavior you use in attempting to influence them. The distribution of the enclosed materials should be as follows:

"Self" - You should complete the LBAI Self instrument. **Make sure your name is written on the LBAI Self (and all the LBAI Others).** As you read each of the 20 situations, decide what you would do, not what you should do, in each case. The questionnaire should then be returned back to Blanchard Training & Development, Inc. in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope **TODAY.**

"Supervisor" - You should give the LBAI Other instrument marked "Supervisor" to your immediate supervisor, asking that person to read the 20 situations and decide what you would do in each case. They should then return the questionnaire to Blanchard Training and Development, Inc. in the envelope provided **TODAY.**

"Associate" - You should give LBAI Other instrument marked "Associate" to two associates of your choice, asking them to complete the questionnaire choosing the response that best describes what you would do in each of the 20 situations. The associates then need to return the questionnaire to Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., **TODAY.**

"Team Member" - You should give the LBAI Others marked "Team Member" to subordinates of your choice - subordinates who work directly for you. Instruct your subordinates to complete the questionnaire by reading the 20 situations and choosing a response that best describes what you would do in such a dilemma. Again, each subordinate should return the questionnaire to Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., **TODAY.**

A cover letter is included in each of the LBAI Other questionnaires which also outlines the procedure for completing and returning the questionnaires. When these forms are all received back at BTD, we will have them scored and you will receive a profile of your leadership style.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Linda Hulst". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Linda Hulst
Assessment Instrument Coordinator

LEADER BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS II™

Appendix A

Kenneth H. Blanchard, Ronald K. Hambleton,
Drea Zigarmi and Douglas Forsyth

SELF-A

PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE

DIRECTIONS:

The purpose of the LBA II Self-A is to provide you with information about your perceptions of your own leadership style. The instrument consists of twenty typical job situations that involve a leader and one or more staff members. Following each situation are four possible actions that a leader may take. Assume that you are the leader involved in each of the twenty situations. In each of the situations, you must choose one of the four leader decisions. Circle the letter of the decision that you think would most closely describe your behavior in the situation presented. Circle only one choice.

Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.
125 State Place, Escondido, CA 92029
(800) 728-6000 (619) 489-5005

© 1991 Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.

Item # 115 II

1 You have asked a new employee to write a report to buy new equipment for the division. She needs to learn more about this equipment to make a sound decision about options and costs. She feels this assignment will stretch her already full schedule. You would...

A Tell her you want the report. Explain what you want in the report. Outline the steps she should take to become knowledgeable about the new equipment. Set weekly meetings with her to track progress.

B Ask her to produce the report. Discuss its importance. Ask her for a deadline for completion. Give her resources she thinks she needs. Periodically check with her to track progress.

C Tell her you want the report and discuss its importance. Explain what you want in the report. Outline steps she should take to learn more about the equipment. Listen to her concerns and use her ideas when possible. Plan weekly meetings to track her progress.

D Ask her to produce the report. Discuss its importance. Explore the barriers she feels must be removed and the strategies for removing them. Ask her to set a deadline for completion and periodically check with her to track progress.

2 Your task force has been working hard to complete its division-wide report. A new member has joined the group. He must present cost figures at the end of next week, but he knows nothing about the report requirements and format. He is excited about learning more about his role in the group. You would...

A Tell him exactly what is needed. Specify the format and requirements. Introduce him to other task-force members. Check with him frequently during the week to monitor progress and to specify any corrections.

B Ask him if there is anything you can do to help. Introduce him to other task-force members. Explore with him what he thinks he needs to get "up to speed" with the report. Check with him frequently during the week to see how he is doing.

C Specify the report format and information needed, and solicit his ideas. Introduce him to each task-force member. Check with him frequently during the week to see how the report is progressing and to help with modifications.

D Welcome him and introduce him to members of the task force who could help him. Check with him during the week to see how he is doing.

3 You have recently noticed a performance problem with one of your people. He seems to show a "don't care" attitude. Only your constant prodding has brought about task completion. You suspect he may not have enough expertise to complete the high-priority task you have given him. You would...

A Specify the steps he needs to take and the outcomes you want. Clarify timelines and paperwork requirements. Frequently check to see if the task is progressing as it should.

B Specify the steps he needs to take and the outcomes you want. Ask for his ideas and incorporate them as appropriate. Ask him to share his feelings about this task assignment. Frequently check to see the task is progressing as it should.

C Involve him in problem solving for this task. Offer your help and encourage him to use his ideas to complete the project. Ask him to share his feelings about the assignment. Frequently check to see that the task is progressing as it should.

D Let him know how important this task is. Ask him to outline his plan for completion and to send you a copy. Frequently check to see if the task is progressing as it should.

4 Your work group's composition has changed because of company restructuring. Performance levels have dropped. Deadlines are being missed and your boss is concerned. Group members want to improve their performance but need more knowledge and skills. You would...

A Ask them to develop their own plan for improving performance. Be available to help them, if asked. Ask them what training they think they need to improve performance, and give them the resources they need. Continue to track performance.

B Discuss your plan to solve this problem. Ask for their input and include their ideas in your plan, if possible. Explain the rationale for your plan. Track performance to see how it is carried out.

C Outline the specific steps you want them to follow to solve this problem. Be specific about the time needed and the skills you want them to learn. Continue to track performance.

D Help them determine a plan, and encourage them to be creative. Support their plan as you continue to track performance.

5 Because of budget cuts, it is necessary to consolidate. You have asked a highly experienced department member to take charge of the consolidation. This person has worked in all areas of your department. In the past, she has usually been eager to help. While you feel she is able to perform the assignment, she seems indifferent to the task. You would...

A Reassure her. Outline the steps she should take to handle this project. Ask for her ideas and incorporate them when possible, but make sure she follows your general approach. Frequently check to see how things are going.

B Reassure her. Ask her to handle the project as she sees fit. Let her know that you are available for help. Be patient, but frequently check to see what is being done.

C Reassure her. Ask her to determine the best way to approach the project. Help her develop options, and encourage her to use her own ideas. Frequently check to see how she is doing.

D Reassure her. Outline an overall plan and specify the steps you want her to follow. Frequently check to see how the steps are being implemented.

6 For the second time in a month, you are having a problem with one of your employees. His weekly progress reports have been incomplete and late. In the past year, he has submitted accurately completed reports on time. This is the first time you have spoken to him about this problem. You would...

A Tell him to improve the completeness and timeliness of his paperwork. Go over the areas that are incomplete. Make sure he knows what is expected and how to fill out each report section. Continue to track his performance.

B Ask him to turn in his paperwork on time and accurately, without pushing him. Continue to track his performance.

C Discuss time and completion standards with him. Listen to his concerns, but make sure he knows what is expected. Go over each report section, and answer any questions he may have. Use his ideas, if possible. Continue to track his performance.

D Ask him why the paperwork is incomplete. Listen to his concerns, and do what you can to help him understand the importance of timeliness and completeness. Continue to track his performance.

7 You have asked one of your senior employees to take on a new project. In the past, his performance has been outstanding. The project you have given him is important to the future of your work group. He is excited about the new assignment but doesn't know where to begin because he lacks project information. Your relationship with him is good. You would...

A Explain why you think he has the skills to do the job. Ask him what problems he anticipates and help him explore alternative solutions. Frequently stay in touch to support him.

B Specify how he should handle the project. Define the activities necessary to complete the job. Regularly check to see how things are going.

C Ask him for a plan for completing the project in two weeks and to send you a copy for your approval. Give him enough time to get started, without pushing him. Frequently offer your support.

D Outline how the project should be handled, and solicit his ideas and suggestions. Incorporate his ideas when possible, but make sure your general outline is followed. Regularly check to see how things are going.

8 One of your staff members is feeling insecure about a job you have assigned to him. He is highly competent and you know that he has the skills to successfully complete the task. The deadline for completion is near. You would...

A Let him know of your concerns about the impending deadline. Help him explore alternative action steps, and encourage him to use his own ideas. Frequently check with him to lend your support.

B Discuss with him your concerns about the impending deadline. Outline an action plan for him to follow, and get his reactions to the plan. Modify the plan if possible but make sure he follows your general outline. Frequently check with him to see how things are going.

C Specify the reasons for on-time completion of the assignment. Outline the steps you would like him to start following. Ask that the steps be followed. Frequently check to see how he is progressing.

D Ask him if there are any problems, but let him resolve the issue himself. Remind him of the impending deadline, without pushing him. Ask for an update in three days.

Leader Behavior Analysis II

Appendix A

Level Three Evaluation

56

9 Your staff has asked you to consider a change in their work schedule. Their changes make good sense to you. Your staff is well aware of the need for change. Members are very competent and work well together. You would...

A Help them explore alternative scheduling possibilities. Be available to facilitate their group discussion. Support the plan they develop. Check to see how they implement their plan.

B Design the work schedule yourself. Explain the rationale behind your design. Listen to their reactions, ask for their ideas and use their recommendations when possible. Check to see how they carry out your schedule.

C Allow the staff to set a work schedule on their own. Let them implement their plan after you approve it. Check with them at a later date to assess their progress.

D Design the work schedule yourself. Explain how the schedule will work, and answer any questions they may have. Check to see that your schedule is followed.

10 Due to an organizational change, you have been assigned six new people whose performance has been declining over the past three months. They do not seem to have the task knowledge and skills to do their new jobs, and their attitudes have worsened because of the change. In a group meeting, you would...

A Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Ask them to decide what to do about it and set a deadline for implementing their solution. Monitor their progress.

B Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Specify the action steps you want them to follow. Give constructive feedback on how to improve performance. Continue to monitor performance.

C Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Outline the steps you want them to follow, explain why and seek their feedback. Use their ideas when possible, but make sure they follow your general approach. Continue to monitor performance.

D Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Ask them why their performance is declining. Listen to their concerns and ideas. Help them create their own plan for improving performance. Track their performance.

11 A member of your department has had a fine performance record over the last 22 months. He is excited by the challenges of the upcoming year. Budgets and unit goals have not changed much from last year. In a meeting with him to discuss goals and an action plan for next year, you would...

A Ask him to submit an outline of his goals and an action plan for next year for your approval. Tell him you will call him if you have any questions.

B Prepare a list of goals and an action plan that you think he can accomplish next year. Send it to him and meet with him to see if he has any questions.

C Prepare a list of goals and an action plan that you think he can achieve next year. Meet with him to discuss his reactions and suggestions. Modify the plan as you listen to his ideas, but make sure you make the final decisions.

D Ask him to send you an outline of his goals and an action plan for next year. Review the goals and plan with him. Listen to his ideas and help him explore alternatives. Let him make the final decisions on his goals and plan.

12 Your unit has had an excellent performance record over the past two years. However, they have recently experienced three major setbacks due to factors beyond their control. Their performance and morale have drastically dropped and your boss is concerned. In a group meeting, you would...

A Discuss the recent setbacks. Give them the specific steps you want them to follow to improve their performance. Continue to track performance.

B Ask them how they feel about the recent setbacks. Listen to their concerns, and encourage and help them explore their ideas for improving performance. Continue to track performance.

C Discuss the recent setbacks. Clarify the steps you want them to follow to improve performance. Listen to their ideas and incorporate them, if possible. Emphasize results. Encourage them to keep trying. Continue to track performance.

D Discuss the recent setbacks, without pressuring them. Ask them to set a deadline to improve performance and to support each other along the way. Continue to track performance.

13 You were recently assigned a new employee who will perform an important job in your unit. Even though she is inexperienced, she is enthusiastic and feels she has the confidence to do the job. You would...

A Allow her time to determine what the job requires and how to do it. Let her know why the job is important. Ask her to contact you if she needs help. Track her progress.

B Specify the results you want and when you want them. Clearly define the steps she should take to achieve results. Show her how to do the job. Track her progress.

C Discuss the results you want and when you want them. Clearly define the steps she can take to achieve results. Explain why these steps are necessary and get her ideas. Use her ideas if possible, but make sure your general plan is followed. Track her performance.

D Ask her how she plans to tackle this job. Help her explore the problems she anticipates by generating possible alternative solutions. Encourage her to carry out her plan. Be available to listen to her concerns. Track her performance.

14 Your boss has asked you to increase your unit's output by seven percent. You know this can be done, but it will require your active involvement. To free your time, you must reassign the task of developing a new cost-control system to one of your employees. The person you want has had considerable experience with cost-control systems, but she is slightly unsure of doing this task on her own. You would...

A Assign her the task and listen to her concerns. Explain why you think she has the skills to handle this assignment. Help her explore alternative approaches if she thinks it would be helpful. Encourage and support her by providing needed resources. Track her progress.

B Assign her the task and listen to her concerns. Discuss the steps she should follow to complete the task. Ask for her ideas and suggestions. After incorporating her ideas, if possible, make sure she follows your general approach. Track her progress.

C Assign her the task. Listen to her concerns, but let her resolve the issue. Give her time to adjust, and avoid asking for results right away. Track her progress.

D Assign her the task. Listen to her concerns, and minimize her feelings of insecurity by telling her specifically how to handle this task. Outline the steps to be taken. Closely monitor her progress.

15 Your boss has asked you to assign someone to serve on a company-wide task force. This task force will make recommendations for restructuring the company's compensation plan. You have chosen a highly productive employee, who knows how her co-workers feel about the existing compensation plan. She has successfully led another unit task force. She wants the assignment. You would...

A Give her the assignment, but tell her how she should represent her co-workers' point of view. Specify that she give you a progress report within two days of each task-force meeting.

B Ask her to accept the assignment. Help her develop the point of view she will take on the task force. Periodically check with her.

C Give her the assignment. Discuss what she should do to ensure her co-workers' perspective is considered by the task force. Ask for her ideas and make sure she follows your general approach. Ask her to report to you after every task-force meeting.

D Give her the assignment. Ask her to keep you informed as things progress. Periodically check with her.

16 Due to illness in your family, you have been forced to miss two meetings of a committee under your direction. Upon attending the next meeting, you find that the committee is operating well and making progress toward completing its goals. All group members come prepared, participate and seem to be enthusiastic about their progress. You are unsure of what your role should be. You would...

A Thank the committee members for their work so far. Let the group continue to work as it has during the last two meetings.

B Thank the committee members for their work so far. Set the agenda for the next meeting. Begin to direct the group's activities.

C Thank the committee members for their work so far. Do what you can to make the members feel important and involved. Try to solicit alternative ideas and suggestions.

D Thank the committee members for their work so far. Set the agenda for the next meeting, but make sure to solicit their ideas and suggestions.

Leader Behavior Analysis II

Appendix A

Level Three Evaluation

58

17 Your staff is very competent and works well on their own. Their enthusiasm is high because of a recent success. Their performance as a group is outstanding. Now, you must set unit goals for next year. In a group meeting, you would...

A Praise them for last year's results. Involve the group in problem solving and goal setting for next year. Encourage them to be creative and help them explore alternatives. Track the implementation of their plan.

B Praise them for last year's results. Challenge them by setting the goals for next year. Outline the action steps necessary to accomplish these goals. Track the implementation of your plan.

C Praise them for last year's results. Ask them to set the goals for next year, and define the action plan needed to accomplish these goals. Be available to contribute when asked. Track the implementation of their plan.

D Praise them for last year's results. Set the goals for next year and outline the action steps necessary to accomplish these goals. Solicit their ideas and suggestions and incorporate them if possible. Track the implementation of your plan.

18 You and your boss know that your department needs a new set of work procedures to improve long-term performance. Department members are eager to make some changes but, because of their specialized functions, they lack the knowledge and skills for understanding the "big picture." You would...

A Outline the new procedures. Organize and direct the implementation. Involve the group in a discussion of alternatives. Use their suggestions when possible, but make them follow your general approach. Track their use of the new procedures.

B Outline and demonstrate the new procedures. Closely direct the group in their initial use of the procedures. Track their use.

C Involve the group in a discussion of what the new procedures should be. Encourage their initiative and creativity in developing the new procedures. Help them explore possible alternatives. Support their use of the procedures. Closely track results.

D Ask the group to formulate and implement a set of new procedures. Answer any informational concerns, but give them the responsibility for the task. Closely track the use of the new procedures.

19 You were recently appointed head of your division. Since taking over, you have noticed a drop in performance. There have been changes in technology, and your staff has not mastered the new skills and techniques. Worst of all, they do not seem to be motivated to learn these skills. In a group meeting, you would...

A Discuss the staff's drop in performance. Listen to their concerns. Ask for their solutions for improving performance. Express your faith in their strategies. Emphasize their past efforts, but track performance as they carry out their strategies.

B Outline the necessary corrective actions you want them to take. Discuss this outline and incorporate their ideas, but see that they implement your corrective action plan. Track their performance.

C Tell them about the drop in performance. Ask them to analyze the problem, and draft a set of action steps for your approval. Set a deadline for the plan. Track its implementation.

D Outline and direct the necessary corrective actions you want them to take. Define roles, responsibilities and standards. Frequently check to see if their performance is improving.

20 You have noticed that one of your inexperienced employees is not properly completing certain tasks. She has submitted inaccurate and incomplete reports. She is not enthusiastic about this task and often thinks paperwork is a waste of time. You would...

A Let her know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Discuss the steps she should take and clarify why these steps are important. Ask for her suggestions, but make sure she follows your general outline.

B Let her know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Ask her to set and meet her own paperwork deadlines. Give her more time to do the job properly. Monitor her performance.

C Let her know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Ask her what she plans to do about it. Help her develop a plan for solving her problems. Monitor her performance.

D Let her know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Specify the steps she should take with appropriate deadlines. Show her how to complete the reports. Monitor her performance.

Dear Respondent:

Appendix B

125 State Place
Escondido, CA 92025
619 489-5005

The manager or supervisor who brought you this questionnaire has or will be working with Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., to learn more about his/her leadership style. As part of the training, we would like to know how you feel about this person's leadership style. To do this we have a number of questions which ask for your personal opinions about how this person would tend to respond in a number of different situations. These questions are not designed to be tricky, and there are no right or wrong answers. The information you and others provide will be analyzed by BTD Associates and the results provided to managers in summary form, so that no individual response is identified.

DO NOT put your name on the questionnaire, but double check the circle on the front cover of the LBAII Other that indicates your relationship to the person who gave you the instrument. If the indication is wrong, please correct it. *Also check to see that the person's name who gave you the questionnaire is written on the front cover.*

The instrument you are being asked to complete is called the LBAII Other. It consists of 20 situations. Please read the directions and indicate which of the four choices you think best describes what your boss/co-worker/follower would do in each of the 20 situations. Do not indicate what you would do, but **what your supervisor/associate/team member would do.**

The information from this survey will be used to help managers who are participating in this training see themselves more clearly and to assess areas of strength as well as areas needing improvement. In order to get a complete profile, we must have responses accurately reflect your opinions, and we must have responses to all 20 situations. If you are uncertain of how to respond, please use your best judgment. If you have any questions about the instrument, feel free to call (800) 728-6000 ext. 236. Once you have completed the survey please put it in the envelope provided, seal it, and send it directly to Blanchard Training and Development, Inc., **TODAY**.

Your participation is essential to the success of this training, and we genuinely appreciate your cooperation. We hope you find this questionnaire interesting and thought-provoking.

Thank you for helping us obtain the most from this training.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Linda Hulst'.

Linda Hulst

Assessment Instrument Coordinator

LBA II

Level Three Evaluation

Appendix B

60

LEADER BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS II™

Kenneth H. Blanchard, Ronald K. Hambleton,
Drea Zigarmi and Douglas Forsyth

OTHER

PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE

DIRECTIONS:

The purpose of the LBA II Other is to provide a leader with information about your perceptions of his or her leadership style. The instrument consists of twenty typical job situations that involve a leader and one or more staff members. Following each situation are four possible actions that a leader may take. Assume _____

(name of leader)

is involved in each of the twenty situations. In each of the situations, you must choose one of the four leader decisions. Circle the letter of the decision that you think would best describe the behavior of this leader in the situation presented. Circle only one choice.

Leader's ☐ Supervisor
 ☐ Associate
 ☒ Team Member

92-022

Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.
125 State Place, Escondido, CA 92029
(800) 728-6000 (619) 489-5005

© 1991 Blanchard Training and Development, Inc.

Item # 117 II

500

1 A new employee has been asked to write a report to buy new equipment for the division. She needs to learn more about this equipment to make a sound decision about options and costs. She feels this assignment will stretch her already full schedule. This manager would...

A Tell her when the report is needed, and what should be in the report. Outline the steps the employee should take to become knowledgeable about the new equipment. Set weekly meetings with her to track progress.

B Ask her to produce the report, and discuss its importance. Ask her for a deadline for completion. Give her the resources she thinks she needs. Periodically check with her to track progress.

C Tell her when the report is needed, and discuss its importance. Explain what the report should include. Outline steps the employee should take to learn more about the equipment. Listen to her concerns and use her ideas when possible. Plan weekly meetings to track her progress.

D Ask her to produce the report, and discuss its importance. Explore the barriers the employee feels must be removed and the strategies for removing them. Ask her to set a deadline for completion and periodically check with her to track progress.

2 This manager's task force has been working hard to complete its division-wide report. A new member has joined the group. He must present cost figures at the end of next week, but he knows nothing about the report requirements and format. He is excited about learning more about his role in the group. This manager would...

A Tell him exactly what is needed, and specify the format and requirements. Introduce him to other task-force members. Check with him frequently during the week to monitor his progress and to specify corrections.

B Ask him if there is anything he or she can do to help. Introduce him to other task-force members. Explore with him what he thinks he needs to get "up to speed" with the report. Check with him frequently during the week to see how he is doing.

C Specify the report format and information needed, and solicit his ideas. Introduce him to each task-force member. Check with him frequently during the week to see how the report is progressing and to help with modifications.

D Welcome him and introduce him to members of the task force who could help him. Check with him during the week to see how he is doing.

3 This manager has recently noticed a performance problem with an employee. He seems to show a "don't care" attitude. Only this manager's constant prodding has brought about task completion. The manager suspects this employee may not have enough expertise to complete the high-priority task that has been given him. This manager would...

A Specify the steps this employee needs to take and the desired outcomes. Clarify timelines and paperwork requirements. Frequently check to see if the task is progressing as it should.

B Specify the steps this employee needs to take and the desired outcomes. Ask for his ideas and incorporate them as appropriate. Ask him to share his feelings about this task assignment. Frequently check to see the task is progressing as it should.

C Involve this employee in problem solving for this task. Offer help and encourage him to use his ideas to complete the project. Ask him to share his feelings about the assignment. Frequently check to see that the task is progressing as it should.

D Let this employee know how important this task is. Ask him to outline his plan for completion and to send the manager a copy. Frequently check to see if the task is progressing as it should.

4 The composition of this manager's work group has changed because of company restructuring. Performance levels have dropped. Deadlines are being missed and the manager's boss is concerned. Group members want to improve their performance but need more knowledge and skills. This manager would...

A Ask the group to develop their own plan for improving performance. Be available to help them, if asked. Ask them what training they think they need to improve performance, and give them the resources they need. Continue to track performance.

B Discuss a plan to solve this problem. Ask the group for their input and include their ideas in the plan, if possible. Explain the rationale for the plan. Track performance to see how it is carried out.

C Outline the specific steps the group should follow to solve this problem. Be specific about the time requirements and the skills they need to learn. Continue to track performance.

D Help them determine a plan, and encourage them to be creative. Support their plan and continue to track performance.

5 Because of budget cuts, it is necessary to consolidate. A highly experienced department member has been asked to take charge of the consolidation. This person has worked in all areas of this manager's department. In the past, she has usually been eager to help. While this manager feels she is able to perform the assignment, the employee seems indifferent to the task. This manager would...

A Reassure her. Outline the steps she should take to handle this project. Ask for her ideas and incorporate them when possible, but make sure she follows the manager's general approach. Frequently check to see how things are going.

B Reassure her. Ask her to handle the project as she sees fit. Be patient, but be available to help. Frequently check to see what is being done.

C Reassure her. Ask her to determine the best way to approach the project. Help her develop options, and encourage her to use her own ideas. Frequently check to see how she is doing.

D Reassure her. Outline an overall plan and specify the steps she should follow. Frequently check to see how the steps are being implemented.

6 For the second time in a month, an employee's weekly progress reports have been incomplete and late. In the past year, he has submitted accurately completed reports on time. This is the first time this manager has spoken to him about this problem. This manager would...

A Tell him to improve the completeness and timeliness of his paperwork. Go over the areas that are incomplete. Make sure he knows what is expected and how to fill out each report section. Continue to track his performance.

B Ask him to turn in his paperwork on time and accurately, without pushing him. Continue to track his performance.

C Discuss time and completion standards with him. Listen to his concerns, but make sure he knows what is expected. Go over each report section, and answer any questions he may have. Use his ideas, if possible. Continue to track his performance.

D Ask him why the paperwork is incomplete. Listen to his concerns, and do what can be done to help him understand the importance of timeliness and completeness. Continue to track his performance.

7 A senior employee has been asked to take on a new project. In the past, his performance has been outstanding. The project he has been given is important to the future of this manager's work group. He is excited about the new assignment but doesn't know where to begin because he lacks project information. The manager's relationship with him is good. This manager would...

A Explain why this employee has the skills to do the job. Ask him what problems he anticipates and help him explore alternative solutions. Frequently stay in touch to support him.

B Specify how this employee should handle the project. Define the activities necessary to complete the job. Regularly check to see how things are going.

C Ask this employee for a plan for completing the project in two weeks. Ask him to send a copy for approval. Give him enough time to get started, without pushing him. Frequently offer support.

D Outline how the project should be handled, and solicit the employee's ideas and suggestions. Use his ideas when possible, but make sure the manager's general outline is followed. Regularly check to see how things are going.

8 A staff member is feeling insecure about a job that has been assigned to him. He is highly competent and this manager knows that this employee has the skills to successfully complete the task. The deadline for completion is near. This manager would...

A Let the employee know of his or her concerns about the impending deadline. Help him explore alternative action steps, and encourage him to use his own ideas. Frequently check with him to lend support.

B Discuss his or her concerns about the impending deadline. Outline an action plan for the employee to follow, and get his reactions to the plan. Modify the plan if possible but make sure the employee follows the general outline. Frequently check with him to see how things are going.

C Specify the reasons for on-time completion of the assignment. Outline the steps the employee should follow. Ask that the steps be followed. Frequently check to see how he is progressing.

D Ask the employee if there are any problems, but let him resolve the issue himself. Remind him of the impending deadline, without pushing him. Ask for an update in three days.

Leader Behavior Analysis II™

Appendix B

Level Three Evaluation

63

9 The staff has asked this manager to consider a change in their work schedule. Their changes make good sense and the manager is well aware of the need for change. Members are very competent and work well together. This manager would...

A Help them explore alternative scheduling possibilities. Be available to facilitate their group discussion. Support the plan they develop. Check to see how they implement their plan.

B Design the work schedule and explain the rationale behind the design. Listen to their reactions, ask for their ideas and use their recommendations when possible. Check to see how they carry out the schedule.

C Allow the staff to set a work schedule on their own. Let them implement their plan after the manager has approved it. Check with them at a later date to assess their progress.

D Design the work schedule and explain how it will work. Answer any questions they may have. Check to see that the schedule is followed.

10 Due to an organizational change, this manager has been assigned six new people whose performance has been declining over the past three months. They do not seem to have the task knowledge and skills to do their new jobs, and their attitudes have worsened because of the change. In a group meeting, this manager would...

A Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Ask them to decide what to do about it and set a deadline for implementing their solution. Monitor their progress.

B Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Specify the action steps they should follow. Give them constructive feedback on how to improve their performance. Continue to monitor performance.

C Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Outline the steps they should follow. Explain why the steps are important, and seek their feedback. Use their ideas when possible, but make sure they follow the general approach. Continue to monitor performance.

D Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Ask them why their performance is declining. Listen to their concerns and ideas. Help them create their own plan for improving performance. Track their performance.

11 A department member has had a fine performance record over the last 22 months. This employee is excited by the challenges of the upcoming year. Budgets and unit goals have not changed much from last year. In a meeting with him to discuss goals and an action plan for next year, this manager would...

A Ask this employee to submit an outline of his goals and an action plan for next year for the manager's approval. Tell the employee to expect a call if there are any questions.

B Prepare a list of goals and an action plan for the employee to accomplish next year. Send it to him and meet with him to see if he has any questions.

C Prepare a list of goals and an action plan for the employee to achieve next year. Meet with him to discuss his reactions and suggestions. Modify the plan while listening to his ideas, but make the final decisions.

D Ask this employee to submit an outline of his goals and an action plan for next year. Review the goals and plan with him. Listen to his ideas and help him explore alternatives. Let him make the final decisions on his goals and plan.

12 This manager's unit has had an excellent performance record over the past two years. However, they have recently experienced three major setbacks due to factors beyond their control. Their performance and morale have drastically dropped and this manager's boss is concerned. In a group meeting, this manager would...

A Discuss the recent setbacks. Give them the specific steps they should follow to improve their performance. Continue to track performance.

B Ask them how they feel about the recent setbacks. Listen to their concerns, and encourage and help them explore their ideas for improving performance. Continue to track performance.

C Discuss the recent setbacks. Clarify the steps they should follow to improve performance. Listen to their ideas and incorporate them, if possible. Emphasize results. Encourage them to keep trying. Continue to track performance.

D Discuss the recent setbacks, without pressuring them. Ask them to set a deadline to improve performance and to support each other along the way. Continue to track performance.

13 This manager was recently assigned a new employee who will perform an important job in the unit. Even though this employee is inexperienced, she is enthusiastic and feels she has the confidence to do the job. This manager would...

A Allow her time to determine what the job requires and how to do it. Let her know why the job is important. Ask her to be in touch if she needs help. Track her progress.

B Specify the desired results and timelines. Clearly define the steps the employee should take to achieve results. Show her how to do the job. Track her progress.

C Discuss the desired results and timelines. Clearly define the steps she can take to achieve the results. Explain why these steps are necessary and get her ideas. Use her ideas if possible, but make sure the manager's general plan is followed. Track her performance.

D Ask her how she plans to tackle this job. Help her explore the problems she anticipates by generating possible alternative solutions. Encourage her to carry out her plan. Be available to listen to her concerns. Track her performance.

14 This manager's boss has requested a seven percent increase in the unit's output. This manager knows this can be done, but it will require his or her active involvement. To free the manager's time, the task of developing a new cost-control system must be reassigned. The person chosen has had considerable experience with cost-control systems, but is slightly unsure of doing this task on her own. This manager would...

A Assign her the task and listen to her concerns. Express confidence in her skills to handle this assignment. Help her explore alternative approaches if she thinks it would be helpful. Encourage and support her by providing needed resources. Track her progress.

B Assign her the task and listen to her concerns. Discuss the steps she should follow to complete the task. Ask for her ideas and suggestions. After incorporating her ideas, if possible, make sure she follows the manager's general approach. Track her progress.

C Assign her the task. Listen to her concerns, but let her resolve the issue. Give her time to adjust, and avoid asking for results right away. Track her progress.

D Assign her the task. Listen to her concerns, and minimize her feelings of insecurity by telling her specifically how to handle this task. Outline the steps to be taken. Closely monitor her progress.

15 This manager's boss has asked to have someone assigned to serve on a company-wide task force. This task force will make recommendations for restructuring the company's compensation plan. This manager has chosen a highly productive employee, who knows how her co-workers feel about the existing compensation plan. She has successfully led another unit task force. She wants the assignment. This manager would...

A Give this employee the assignment, but tell her how she should represent her co-workers' point-of-view. Specify that she give the manager a progress report within two days of each task-force meeting.

B Ask this employee to accept the assignment. Help her develop the point-of-view she will take on the task force. Periodically check with her.

C Give this employee the assignment. Discuss what she should do to ensure her co-workers' perspective is considered by the task force. Ask for her ideas and make sure she follows the manager's general approach. Ask her for a report after every task-force meeting.

D Give this employee the assignment. Ask for updates as things progress. Periodically check with her.

16 Due to a family illness, this manager has been forced to miss two meetings of a committee he or she directs. Upon attending the next meeting, this manager finds that the committee is operating well and making progress toward completing its goals. All group members come prepared, participate and seem to be enthusiastic about their progress. This manager is unsure of what his or her role should be. This manager would...

A Thank the committee members for their work so far. Let the group continue to work as it has during the last two meetings.

B Thank the committee members for their work so far. Set the agenda for the next meeting. Begin to direct the group's activities.

C Thank the committee members for their work so far. Make the members feel important and involved. Try to solicit alternative ideas and suggestions.

D Thank the committee members for their work so far. Set the agenda for the next meeting, but make sure to solicit their ideas and suggestions.

Leader Behavior Analysis II™

Appendix B

Level Three Evaluation

65

7 This manager's staff is very competent and works well on their own. Their enthusiasm is high because of a recent success. Their performance as a group is outstanding. Now, this manager must set unit goals for next year. In a group meeting, this manager would...

A Praise them for last year's results. Involve the group in problem solving and goal setting for next year. Encourage them to be creative and help them explore alternatives. Track the implementation of their plan.

B Praise them for last year's results. Challenge them by setting the goals for next year. Outline the action steps necessary to accomplish these goals. Track implementation of the plan.

C Praise them for last year's results. Ask them to set the goals for next year, and define the action plan needed to accomplish these goals. Be available to contribute when needed. Track the implementation of their plan.

D Praise them for last year's results. Set the goals for next year and outline the action steps necessary to accomplish these goals. Solicit the group's ideas and suggestions and incorporate them if possible. Track implementation of their plan.

8 This manager and his or her boss know that the manager's department needs a new set of work procedures to improve long-term performance. Department members are eager to make some changes but, because of their specialized functions, they lack the knowledge and skills for understanding the "big picture." This manager would...

A Outline the new procedures. Organize and direct the implementation. Involve the group in a discussion of alternatives. Use their suggestions when possible, but see that they follow the general outline. Track their use of the new procedures.

B Outline and demonstrate the new procedures. Closely direct the group in their initial use of the new procedures. Track their use.

C Involve the group in a discussion of what the new procedures should be. Encourage their initiative and creativity in developing the new procedures. Help them explore possible alternatives. Support their use of the new procedures. Closely track results.

D Ask the group to formulate and implement a set of new procedures. Answer any informational concerns, but give them the responsibility for the task. Closely track the use of the new procedures.

19 This manager was recently appointed head of the division. Since taking over, there has been a drop in performance. There have been changes in technology, and this manager's staff has not mastered the new skills and techniques. Worst of all, they do not seem to be motivated to learn these skills. In a group meeting, this manager would...

A Discuss the staff's drop in performance. Listen to their concerns. Ask for their solutions for improving performance. Express faith in their strategies. Emphasize their past efforts, but track performance as they carry out their strategies.

B Outline the necessary corrective actions they should take. Explore alternatives and incorporate their ideas. Modify the plan if appropriate, but see that they implement it. Track their performance.

C Tell them about the drop in performance. Ask them to analyze the problem, and draft a set of action steps for approval. Set a deadline for the plan. Track its implementation.

D Outline and direct the necessary corrective actions they should take. Define roles, responsibilities and standards. Frequently check to see if their performance is improving.

20 This manager has noticed that an inexperienced employee is not properly completing certain tasks. She has submitted inaccurate and incomplete reports. She is not enthusiastic about this task and often thinks paperwork is a waste of time. This manager would...

A Let the employee know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Discuss the steps she should take and clarify why these steps are important. Ask for her suggestions, but make sure she follows the manager's general outline.

B Let the employee know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Ask her to set and meet her own paperwork deadlines. Give her more time to do the job properly. Monitor her performance.

C Let the employee know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Ask her what she plans to do about it. Help her develop a plan for solving her problems. Monitor her performance.

D Let the employee know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Specify the steps she should take with appropriate deadlines. Show her how to complete the reports. Monitor her performance.

Appendix C

Demographic Information

Managing@[The Company] Evaluation Process

- 1. How many years have you been in management at [the Company]?*
- 2. How many years were you in management prior to [the Company]?*
- 3. What is your title?*
- 4. What is your position/level of management? (First level, second level...)*
- 5. How many subordinates are you managing at the present time?*
- 6. What's the largest number of employees you have managed at one time?*
- 7. Age range... (circle one)*
Under 25 25-30 31-36 37-42 43-48 49-54 55-60 Over 60

Office of the Academic Vice President • Associate Academic Vice President • Graduate Studies and Research
One Washington Square • San José, California 95192-0025 • 408/924-2480

To: Elaine Marie Tenorio
165 Shelley Ave.
Campbell, CA 95008

From: Serena W. Stanford *Serena W. Stanford*
AAVP, Graduate Studies and Research

Date: June 10, 1993

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request to use human subjects in the study entitled:

"Is there transfer of training of the Situational Leadership Module from a management training course?"

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project, and with regard to any and all data that may be collected from the subjects. The Board's approval includes continued monitoring of your research by the Board to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must notify Dr. Serena Stanford immediately. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma and release of potentially damaging personal information.

Please also be advised that each subject needs to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate or withdrawal will not affect any services the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted. If you have questions, please contact me at 408-924-2480.