Western Kentucky University
TopSCHOLAR®

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects | Graduate School

Summer 2015

Training Evaluation Investigating Core Self-Evaluations and Perceptions of Training Transfer

Thomas P. Patterson

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses

Part of the Applied Behavior Analysis Commons, and the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation
Patterson, Thomas P., "Training Evaluation Investigating Core Self-Evaluations and Perceptions of Training Transfer" (2015). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects.* Paper 1533.
http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1533

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

TRAINING EVALUATION INVESTIGATING CORE SELF-EVALUATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING TRANSFER

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychological Sciences
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

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

By
Thomas Patterson

August 2015

TRAINING EVALUATION INVESTIGATING CORE SELF-EVALUATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING TRANSFER

Date Recommended July 1, 2015

Amber N. Schroeder, Director of Thesis

Elizabeth L. Shoenfelt

Reagan D. Brown

8-18-15

Dean, Graduate Studies and Research Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Most importantly, I would like to acknowledge and thank my thesis chair, Dr. Amber Schroeder. It is only through Dr. Schroeder's continued support that the delivery of this study is possible. Through her tireless labor and dedication, this study is brought to term.

In addition, I would like to thank my committee member, Dr. Betsy Shoenfelt for her assistance and feedback on my project as well as her support during the project, and committee member Dr. Reagan Brown who provided help with technical statistics and I thank him for his assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ……1

Method ……22

Results ……32

Discussion ……34

Conclusion ……40

References ……41

Appendix A: Core Self-evaluations Survey and Enrollment Measure ……47

Appendix B: Perception of Self-Transfer Survey ……48

Appendix C: Morgan and Casper's (2000) Reaction Survey ……49

Appendix D: Study Reaction Survey ……51

Appendix E: Learning Assessment Difficulty Analysis……53

Appendix F: Updated Team Decision Making Learning Assessment ……54

Appendix G: Updated Time Management Learning Assessment ……56

Appendix H: Updated Easier Said Than Done Learning Assessment ……58

Appendix I: Updated Effective Discipline Learning Assessment ……60

Appendix J: Updated Habits Of Successful People Learning Assessment ……62

Appendix K: Updated Coaching Learning Assessment ……64

Appendix L: Updated Basic Supervision Learning Assessment ……66

Appendix M: Updated Assertive Communication Learning Assessment ……68

Appendix N: Updated Dealing With Change Learning Assessment ……70

Appendix O: Updated A Job Well Done Learning Assessment ……72

Appendix P: Updated Strategic Planning Learning Assessment ……74

Appendix Q: Updated Excel Intermediate II Learning Assessment …….....……...……76

Appendix R: Updated Dealing With Difficult Personalities Learning Assessment .....…78

Appendix S: Reaction Survey Item Classification ……...……...…..…80

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Correlations between CSE and Training Outcome Variables ……...…..…..33

Table 2. Course Correlations between CSE and Training Outcome Variables ……...….37

TRAINING EVALUATION INVESTIGATING CORE SELF-EVALUATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING TRANSFER

Thomas Patterson August 2015 86 Pages

Directed by: Amber N. Schroeder, Elizabeth L. Shoenfelt, and Reagan D. Brown

Department of Psychological Sciences Western Kentucky University

Although training evaluation is understood as an important way of determining the effectiveness of a training program, additional research in the area of training transfer and core self-evaluations (CSE) could provide insight on measuring the effectiveness of training programs. Training transfer differences and CSE were examined in training courses offered in a workforce development program. The goals of the study were to: (1) evaluate the validity of using CSE as a means of predicting perceptions of transfer, (2) test the previous findings that utility reactions measures are a stronger predictor of transfer than affective reactions measures, (3) determine which type of enrollment format in the Career and Workforce Development program has higher transfer of training, (4) evaluate if CSE can predict different rates of learning, (5) determine if CSE correlates positively with affective and utility measures of reaction surveys, and (6) further examine the finding that utility measures positively correlate with knowledge gains. In order to do this, eight Western Kentucky University Career and Workforce Development training courses were evaluated. The study did not find support for any of the hypotheses. Possible reasons for this lack of support include a small sample size, a lack of responses to the transfer survey, the number of different courses evaluated, and characteristics of the training courses such as different trainers. Thus, additional research is needed in this area to better understand the nature of the relationships between CSE, perceptions of transfer, utility reactions, affective reactions, and training course knowledge gains.

Introduction

Training evaluation is a way of conceptualizing the costs and benefits of a training program (Cascio, 1989). Training evaluation is used to help guide managers making decisions about their organization's training program; however, factors other than the training program itself play a role in how well the training program is meeting its goals. Factors such as trainee characteristics, perceived organizational support, and the ability of the workplace to support using the training each play a part in determining the effectiveness of the training program (Mathieu & Button, 1992; Mathieu, Tannenbaum, & Salas, 1992; Noe & Wilk, 1993; Quiñones, 1997; Weiner, Nierenberg, & Goldstein, 1976). It is clear that trainee characteristics play a role in determining the level of transfer from a training program.

This paper presents a review of Kirkpatrick's (1959) training evaluation model and additions made to the model, followed by an overview of why training evaluations are done. The paper will then present a relatively recent addition to the personality testing literature with Judge, Erez, Bono, and Thoresen's (2003) concept of CSE and a review of how the concept could be applied to training evaluation to predict transfer of training from a training program.

What Is a Training Evaluation?

Training evaluation is the investigation of the outcomes of a training program (Kirkpatrick, 1996). One of the ways training evaluations can develop a framework is by comparing the training objectives and training knowledge gained to the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) needed for a job. Along with matching these objectives to the KSAs, training evaluation also matches the training to the goals and objectives of the

organization (Leach & Liu, 2003). Working with the organizational goals and objectives in mind, training evaluators can accurately investigate the effectiveness of a training program.

Kirkpatrick (1959) introduced a framework for the evaluation of training and education. This framework has become a standard in many applications of business, industrial training, and even military use. The original framework offers a basic model for identifying and targeting training-specific evaluation efforts. The framework suggests four measureable outcomes in the training evaluation: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. The first level, reactions, can be measured by how much the trainees enjoy the training or the feeling a training program imparts to the trainee. Reactions look at perceptions of relevancy of the material, the perceptions of the delivery methods and medium, and how much the trainee liked the instructor. The second level, learning, can be conceptualized as imparting principles of the organization, knowledge about the job, and proper techniques used to produce optimum results on the job. The third level, behavior is applying the things learned during the training on the job. These can be techniques learned or ways of behaving on the job. The third level is known as transfer of training. The fourth level, results, can be conceptualized as the overall change in the organization, or the goals attained though the training (Faerman & Ban, 1993). These changes can be measured by lower costs, a reduction in turnover, less frequent absences, fewer problems for employees, improved morale, and an increase in the quality or quantity of production. The framework was developed quite some time ago, but has withstood the test of time and is currently in use today even with changes taking place throughout the field of training evaluation (Alliger & Janak, 1989; Kirkpatrick, 1996).

Training evaluations can be costly and time consuming, but there are good reasons why organizations perform them. Next, reasons organizations perform training evaluations will be discussed.

Why Do a Training Evaluation?

Training evaluation is performed to save money, to help organizations decide what to do with their training programs, and because of increased pressure on organizations to justify the use of training programs. Each will be described in more detail below.

Reason 1: To Reduce Cost

There are many reasons why organizations do training evaluations. Each year the government and private industries in the United States spend billions of dollars on training and employee development activities (Faerman & Ban, 1993). It has been estimated that the United States federal government spends at least $633 million each year and that American industries spend up to $100 billion on training and development activities (Faerman & Ban, 1993). Even in training salespeople alone, U.S. companies spend $7.1 billion annually, with an average salesperson spending more than 33 hours per year in training (Lorge, 1998). In 2011, more than $156 billion was spent by U.S. organizations on employee learning. Of this $156 billion, 56% (i.e., $87.5 billion) was spent for internal training (Miller, 2012). The remaining 44% was split between tuition reimbursement, accounting for 14% (i.e., $21.9 billion), and external training services, which accounted for 30% (i.e., $46.9 billion; Miller, 2012). These numbers show that training programs can be quite costly.

Due to the enormous amount of money that the government and private organizations have spent in the past and continue to spend today on training programs, it is quite natural that organizations would want some way of measuring the outputs of these training efforts. Saving money is a practical reason for doing a training evaluation; however, organizations have other reasons for performing training evaluations. One of these reasons is to help decide a direction for a training program.

Reason 2: To Help Organizations Decide the Direction for Programs

In training program creation, the goals and objectives of the organization are taken into account; however, these goals and objectives may change over time. Even though the goals or objectives may change, the training program may not change with them (Phillips, 1997). Training evaluation also can investigate whether the training is still matching the goals of the organization or if the goals have changed. The training evaluation may suggest cutting or keeping a training program entirely. However, the evaluation itself may not just suggest an entire keep or discard recommendation. For example, if just one part of a program is ineffective, it may need to be changed or discarded (Kumpikaitė, 2007). The data gathered on a training program can help establish a database to assist management in making decisions (Phillips, 1997). The database can help by aiding in selecting new employees and choosing which employees receive training. Employees deficient in certain areas can be recommended to participate in programs designed to target these deficiencies.

Training evaluations also evaluate other aspects of training programs. Training evaluations look at whether the particular training program can be used in other parts of the organization (i.e., intra-organizational validity) or in other organizations (i.e., inter-

organizational validity; Kumpikaitė, 2007). In this way, the training evaluation can help an organization determine its best course of action for expanding a program into other levels within an organization or for other positions. Training evaluation can identify the strengths and weaknesses of a particular program by helping to identify deficiencies (Phillips, 1997). By identifying deficiencies, training programs can be adjusted, and these problem areas can be targeted for improvement. Training evaluation gives managers and organizations information about how to best utilize training programs and who should participate in future training (Phillips, 1997). The evaluations can shed light on who benefited the most from the training and who benefited the least. In this way, potential trainees who need particular skills developed may be targeted for training. For this reason alone, evaluations should be performed; however, without a driving force behind it, training evaluation can often fall to the wayside because of cost and the time required to perform such evaluations.

Reason 3: Increased Accountability

Another force that may drive training evaluations is increased accountability. Over the past two decades, organizations under increased competition have been asked to become more accountable and to justify the existence of training programs in terms of cost and performance (Phillips, 1997). Companies spending significant amounts on training are increasingly required to formally justify these expenditures, and this increased pressure for accountability in organizations has affected not only practitioners within organizations, but has led to increased interest in the evaluation of training programs in academic circles (Faerman & Ban, 1993). Through increased pressure in organizations to justify its programs, training evaluation has become a bigger focus in

many academic programs, even being suggested as being taught as part of a Master's program for Industrial-Organizational Psychologists (Trahan & McAllister, 2002). From the business board room to the academic classroom, training evaluation is more readily understood as a part of training programs themselves.

It is well understood that training evaluation is important; however, organizations often lack a clear understanding of how to measure and evaluate training efforts. As such, perhaps the most critical issue facing training is how to consistently assess training programs and their outcomes (Leach & Liu, 2003). One way organizations assess training programs is by using Kirkpatrick's (1959) model; however, there are issues to be aware of when using this model, which will be discussed next.

Issues with Kirkpatrick's (1959) Four-Level Model

Kirkpatrick's (1959) model of training evaluation has withstood the test of time; however, that is not to say it is without issues. Alliger and Janak (1989) identified three problems the model contains: (a) the levels are arranged from providing the least amount of information to the most amount of information, (b) the assumption that the preceding level causes the following level, and (c) the assumption that the outcomes measured at each level are positively correlated with each other. The problems with these assumptions are discussed in more detail below.

The first issue with the model is the assumption that training is supposed to change the organization at all four levels. This is not always the case. Some training programs may be used to reward employees, raise employees' spirits, or be a stepping stone in a career path for employees. If the training is meant to raise employees' morale, it might be expected only to have an impact at the reaction level (Alliger & Janak, 1989).

If the training is meant to give employees a history of the organization and impart knowledge to the employees, a training evaluation measuring a change in behavior of an employee might not be of much use to investigators. In addition, the way the model is structured can be a bit misleading. Level four of the model measures benefits to the organization. With this step coming last, it may be easy to draw the conclusion that this level is always the most important; however, this is not always the case. Focusing strictly on the cost reduction of a training program can take the focus off of other important areas of the training intervention process. Focusing on the purely quantitative side of the training evaluation results can take focus off of the qualitative side of the training evaluation (Alliger & Janak, 1989). The levels are often thought to be arranged in the order of the least important to the most important; however, this is not necessarily the case.

The second issue of the model is the assumption that outcomes at the preceding levels cause the outcomes at the next level. The difficulties in proving causation are apparent in this assumption (Alliger & Janak, 1989). The timing of the measurements to assess each level is also an issue. The first two levels, reaction and learning, are often measured immediately following training. The next two levels, behavior and results, need time to pass to be properly measured. This difference in the time of measurement can be an issue in proving causality, especially in the case of an organization that is constantly changing (Alliger & Janak, 1989). New employees and new ways of doing things are constantly influencing organizations in other ways. Training programs in an organization do not exist in a vacuum, so it is difficult to prove that the training is having an impact on the organization. It is assumed that positive reactions lead to more

knowledge gained (Alliger & Janak, 1989). However, people are not especially good at reporting their own level of learning, and having a positive reaction to a training program may cloud a trainee's judgment (Hofstadter & Dennett, 1981). Another point Alliger and Janak make is that trainees will actually learn more when they push themselves in a challenging way. However, when push themselves too much, they may not find the training experience as enjoyable, thus having less positive reactions. In cases like this, reaction and learning criteria may actually be negatively correlated. If this is the case, it is difficult to follow the assumption that Kirkpatrick's (1959) model makes in regard to the levels causing each other.

The third issue of the model is the assumption that all four levels are positively correlated. Similar to the previous point, a correlation between levels has been shown to some degree in the literature to not always be the case. Most often the first level, reaction, may not correlate with the third and fourth levels (Alliger & Janak, 1989). In a training evaluation measuring the effectiveness of an interview training program, it was found that the first two levels correlated; however, the first two levels were uncorrelated with the third level, behavioral change (Campion & Campion, 1987). This may seem like a failure on the part of the training program to produce behavioral change, but it lends some evidence to the notion that levels of evaluation are not always positively correlated. Furthermore, Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennett, Traver, and Shotland (1997) found evidence to divide reaction measures into two categories: utility and affective categories. Both types of reactions measure how the participant viewed the training; however, they measure how the participant felt regarding different aspects of the training. Utility items measure whether the participant views the training as having improved his or her ability

to perform on the job, as well as the usefulness of training for subsequent job performance (Alliger et al., 1997). In effect, utility reactions are a judgment of the training toward future work application. Affective items measure if the participant enjoyed the training (Warr & Bruce, 1995). Utility measures correlated more strongly with transfer of training than affective measures correlated with transfer. Utility measures were also found to correlate more strongly with transfer than measures of knowledge immediately taken after training and measures of knowledge taken at a later time after training (Alliger et al., 1997). These findings give support to using reaction measures in training evaluation; however, Kirkpatrick's (1959) basic model should be expanded to include utility and affective reaction criteria when evaluating training programs.

In determining how to evaluate specific training programs, other issues at an organizational level should first be discussed, including the percentage of training evaluations performed at each level of evaluation, the cost and resources needed to perform a training evaluation, and the difficulty of evaluating training at higher levels.

Issues of Training Evaluation at an Organizational Level

Organizations that are spending resources on training likely want to see that their training expenditures actually aid the firm in reaching its objectives. However, training organizations rarely provide assessments of how training has helped their customers reach these objectives (Honeycutt & Stevenson, 1989). Sales training organizations most often provide evaluations at one of the two lowest stages in Kirkpatrick's (1959) hierarchy. Van Buren and Erskine (2002) stated in the 2002 American Society of Training and Development (ASTD) state of the industry report that 78% of organizations

assess reaction measures, 32% assess learning, 9% assess behavioral change, and 7% assess organizational results. These numbers show that training evaluation is found in organizations; however, to properly measure whether the training is having an effect on the organization, more than the two bottom levels of training evaluation need to be assessed.

Given the cost and difficulty of measuring behavioral change, most organizations have primarily looked at reaction measures, most often using evaluations at the end of the course that ask participants if they liked the course and if they thought the material covered was relevant or useful (Ban & Faerman, 1990). Beyond the first two levels of evaluation, measuring behavioral changes is a much more difficult task because this type of evaluation requires an opportunity for trainees to use the behavior, and it is difficult to predict when trainees will apply the learning (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Another issue is that training evaluation requires a systematic appraisal of performance before and after training has taken place (Ban & Faerman, 1990). The difficulty in gathering a systematic appraisal of performance is compounded if the training has been going on for some time in an organization or if job performance appraisal measures have changed recently. In measuring the effectiveness of a training program, the outcomes of the program need to be evaluated. To evaluate the outcomes of a program, the changes in the organization the training program produces need to be measured. This change in the organization could be at a higher organizational level and be quantified by total sales or the change could take place at an individual employee level and be quantified by improved customer service. However, if the training program that is going to be evaluated has been going on for some time, it may be difficult to get a measurement of an organization's total sales or

establish employees' customer service skills before the training program was implemented. If the job performance measures have recently changed, then comparing a job performance measurement taken before the job performance measurement was updated with a measurement after the performance update to assess if the training had an effect will be difficult because scores from the two different performance appraisals may be incompatible.

Another issue is that these before and after assessments of job performance should ideally be performed by multiple individuals, including the individual receiving the training, a supervisor, a subordinate, and the trainee's peers. However, a thorough evaluation of the performance of an individual performed by multiple coworkers is rarely completed in an organization (Ban & Faerman, 1990). If the difficulty of having multiple individuals rate the performance of a trainee was not enough for practitioners to deal with, an evaluation should have a control group that has not participated in the training (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Securing a control group might not even be possible in anything other than a large organization (Ban & Faerman, 1990). Adding further to the complications of getting a control group, the control group should be as similar to the experimental group in demographic variables as possible. This higher level of measuring behavioral change is quite costly and time consuming, which is likely why this level of investigation is seldom performed.

Besides the expenditure of time and money, some managers may resist training evaluation at a behavioral change level because they do not want to find out that the training program they have devoted company resources toward does not produce results (Ghodsian, Bjork, & Benjamin, 1997). If it is found that participants do not enjoy the

training, it is much easier to fix than if the training does not change any behaviors (Faerman & Ban, 1993). The practicality of doing what works and is cost effective often wins out in training evaluation, reducing the overall effectiveness of the evaluation because only lower levels of evaluation are being performed.

Organizations are not always opposed to doing a thorough training evaluation. Companies use a wide variety of evaluations, ranging from self-administered trainee reports to informal debriefing sessions to more advanced calculations of enhanced organizational benefit (Cascio, 1989). Measuring transfer of training is one of the key components of evaluating training at a higher level. Measuring transfer does come with issues of its own. Next, some of these issues will be discussed.

Things To Consider When Measuring Transfer

There are many variables that may influence whether an individual transfers things learned in training to behavior on the job (Blume, Ford, Baldwin, & Huang, 2010). Some of these variables have nothing to do with the training program per se, but should be considered when evaluating a training program. Being aware of and monitoring these kinds of variables can be useful in giving feedback about a training program and when deciding whether a particular training program is effective.

The first area of concern is pre-training characteristics. These include a participant's pre-training motivation, self-efficacy, a participant's locus of control (LOC), whether it was the choice of the individual to participate in the training, the organizational climate, and the framing of the training program (Mathieu & Button, 1992; Mathieu et al., 1992; Quiñones, 1997; Weiner et al., 1976). These characteristics and how they affect transfer of training will be discussed in the following paragraph.

Higher pre-training motivation is positively linked to transfer of learning (Mathieu et al., 1992). Highly motivated individuals are more likely to learn more in the training program and be more motivated to use the things learned in the training. Self-efficacy has been shown to be an important factor in motivation going into a training program, such that individuals higher in self-efficacy are typically more motivated to engage in the training process and thus get more out of the training (Mathieu & Button, 1992). Likewise, Weiner et al. (1976) found that an individual's LOC had a strong impact on how much an individual would learn in a training program. LOC refers to where an individual attributes control of the situation. In their study, individuals with an internal LOC learned more than did individuals with an external LOC. The difference in the learning performance levels was thought to be because an individual with an internal LOC believed they had more control over their outcomes and thus worked harder during the training to achieve their desired outcomes. As with pre-training trainee characteristics, contextual factors that occur before training play a role in determining training outcomes. Three organizational contextual factors that influence outcomes are: (a) the choice of the individual to participate in the training, (b) the organizational climate, and (c) the way the training is framed (Quiñones, 1997). Trainees who are given a choice to attend training compared with those who are not given a choice have been shown to be more motivated to learn, more satisfied with the training, and higher performers on a test of the training material (Quiñones, 1997). Likewise, organizational climate factors such as a trainees' perceived social support of the training program by supervisors and peers has been found to be positively linked to transfer of the techniques or knowledge learned in training (Quiñones, 1997). The framing of the training program

has an impact on how much participants are motivated. If the training is presented as a positive (e.g., a career benefit or career advancement step), then participants are more likely to be motivated than if the training is framed as remedial training (e.g., punishment for unwanted behavior; Quiñones, 1997). The way an organization frames a training program provides contextual cues as to how trainees feel about the training and, in turn, influences participants' training motivation.

The second area to be aware of is motivation during training. Factors that influence motivation during training are meta-cognition and an individual's goal orientation (Aleven & Koedinger, 2002; Seijts & Latham, 2005). Meta-cognition, the process of thinking about one's own thinking, has been shown to be an important factor in the learning process, as individuals better able to guide their thinking process are able to learn more in the training by developing better strategies for learning (Aleven & Koedinger, 2002). Another factor during training is an individual's goal orientation. There are two types of goal orientation: learning motivation and performance motivation (Seijts & Latham, 2005). Learning goals involve trainees trying to develop an understanding of how the material works and are applied in order to better understand the subject. Performance goals involve trainees trying to pass a test or know enough to get through the class. Learning goals are typically associated with higher learning achievements during training (Seijts & Latham, 2005). Training program designers and trainers should be aware of these types of goal orientations and strive to influence participants to develop learning goals rather than performance goals.

The third and final area concerning motivation in training is post-training characteristics. Post-training characteristics involve personal characteristics such as self-

efficacy and organizational characteristics such as perceived organizational support and having an opportunity to use the learned behaviors. Self-efficacy is an individual's belief he or she can produce behaviors necessary to meet his or her goals (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy is important because an individual needs to believe they will be successful in a particular technique or behavior learned in training to be motivated to try it on the job (Kraiger, Ford, & Salas, 1993). The organizational environment, such as the job being able to support the adoption of the new behaviors, also plays a role in the transfer of the things learned during training (Quiñones, 1997). If the things learned during training do not apply to the job, then trainees will have no opportunity to use these new skills. The trainees' perceived social support of the training program by supervisors and peers has been positively linked to transfer of the techniques or knowledge learned in training (Quiñones, 1997). If trainees perceive that their coworkers do not value what they have learned, they often will not attempt to perform the new techniques they have learned. Noe and Wilk (1993) found that motivation to learn, perceptions of benefits, and work environment perceptions were each positively correlated with how much participants learned.

Training programs aim to impart knowledge and change behavior. If a training evaluation is to give a precise estimate of the outcomes of a training program, it should take into account some of the trainee characteristic variables that determine whether the training is transferred (Blume et al., 2010). The training evaluation should also take these factors into consideration and provide feedback to the organization when and where appropriate. Whereas a number of pre-training characteristics have been linked to

training outcomes, one personality construct that has not yet been examined in this context is that of CSE. As such, this construct will be reviewed below.

Core Self-Evaluations

In studying what predicts transfer of training, one area that has promise is Judge et al.'s (2003) concept of core self-evaluations (CSE). Judge et al. defined CSE as a higher-order trait indicated by four established traits in the literature. The traits are (a) self-esteem, the overall value that an individual place on themselves as a person (Harter, 1989), (b) generalized self-efficacy, a self-evaluation of how well one can perform across a variety of situations (Locke, McClear, & Knight, 1996), (c) high emotional stability, the tendency to focus on positive aspects of one's self (Watson, 2000), and (d) locus of control, beliefs about the causes of events in one's life as being either internal or external of their own behavior (Rotter, 1966). Overall, CSE is an appraisal of one's effectiveness and capability as a person.

The CSE concept is likely to be important for predicting perceptions of transfer of training for several reasons. CSE has been shown to correlate significantly with job satisfaction and job performance (Judge et al., 2003), and job satisfaction and job performance have been shown to be related to organizational climate (Egan, Yang, & Bartlett, 2004; Rouiller, & Goldstein, 1993). Organizational climate has been shown to be related to training transfer (Quiñones, 1997). Because of the relationship between CSE and job satisfaction, job performance, and organizational climate, it is expected that CSE will correlate significantly with perceptions of transfer via its impact on job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational climate. CSE is likely to be important for measuring perceptions of transfer of training through generalized self-efficacy and

locus of control which have been shown to be related to transfer of training (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). In addition, high self-efficacy and an internal locus of control have been associated with higher levels of transfer of training (Mathieu & Button, 1992; Weiner et al., 1976). Because CSE is strongly linked to self-efficacy and locus of control, it is thought that they will also be related positively to perceptions of transfer.

Current Study Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 (H1): CSE will be positively correlated with self-reports of transfer.

Past research has shown that reaction measures of training often are correlated with training transfer; however, the relationship is not always consistent (Ruona, Leimbach, Holton, & Bates, 2002). Warr and Bruce (1995) found that reactions could be divided into two categories: utility and affective reactions. Utility reaction items measure whether the participant views the training as having improved his or her ability to perform on the job and as enhancing the usefulness of the training for job performance (Alliger et al., 1997). Affective reaction items measure whether the participant enjoyed the training. Similar to Warr and Bruce's findings, a meta-analysis found that utility reactions items correlated more strongly with training transfer than affective reaction items correlated with training transfer (Alliger et al., 1997). This study will attempt to replicate these findings.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Utility reactions will correlate more strongly with self-reported transfer than will affective reactions.

Trainees in the current study will be enrolled in three types of training courses: open, contract, and cohort enrollment. Trainees in the open enrollment course format have to sign up for each individual course. Trainees in the other enrollment types may

have voluntarily signed up for the program; however, they did not voluntarily sign up for each individual course (rather, they signed up for a training course bundle). It has been shown that trainees who voluntarily registered for a training course were more motivated than were trainees who did not voluntarily register for the course (Baldwin, Magjuka, & Loher, 1991). Thus, it is expected that students who voluntarily signed up for a course (i.e., those utilizing the open course enrollment format) will have higher transfer of training compared to the contract and cohort enrollment types due to their higher motivation to participate.

Hypothesis 3a-b (H3a-b): Open enrollment participants will have higher self-reported transfer than (a) contract enrollment and (b) cohort enrollment participants.

In addition to transfer of training, the current study aims to examine the relationship between CSE and other training outcomes. Judge (2009) reviewed research applying CSE to work situations and found that CSE is predictive of better performance on the job, career success, job and life satisfaction, and lower reported levels of stress and conflict. In addition, individuals who scored higher on CSE also dealt with setbacks better and better utilized opportunities. Judge and Hurst (2007) examined how CSE predicted utilization of opportunities. In particular they found that those who scored high in CSE were better able to make use of parental economic prosperity than those who scored low in CSE. That is, as parental economic prosperity increased, individuals were more likely to have higher incomes, but those with higher CSE scores had higher increases of income than those with low CSE scores. In regard to training outcomes, one measure of utilization of opportunities is learning outcomes. The current study aims to

use the difference between pre-learning and post-learning assessments as a measure of training success and capitalization of training resources. Because CSE is thought to be related to better capitalization of resources, participants with higher scores on the CSE are expected to learn more in the training courses and this will be reflected by their improvement from the pre-learning assessment to the post-learning assessment.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): CSE will positively correlate with the difference between pre-learning and post-learning assessments.

Another measure of training outcomes is training reaction surveys. Items on these surveys can be broken down into two categories: utility and affective items (Alliger et al., 1997). These reaction measures are used to judge the effectiveness of training and give feedback to trainers regarding the course content and teaching style. However, trainee characteristics may play a role in determining the scores of these reaction measures. Generalized self-efficacy, how well someone believes they can perform, motivate themselves to perform, and use cognitive resources to complete situational demands is a component of CSE (Judge, 2009). Bandura (1993) found that trainees' self-efficacy had a positive influence on motivation, academic accomplishments, and learning. Therefore, those who believe they can perform across a variety of situations are predicted to make better use of the training program content and thus rate the training as more useful. That is, those who have high self-efficacy (which would cause an increase in one's CSE) will likely have higher utility reaction scores because utility reaction items measure how much trainees perceive the training to help them in the workplace. Likewise, emotional stability, another component of CSE (Judge et al., 2003), has been found to predict happiness (Hills & Argyle (2001). Thus, those who are more emotionally stable are

predicted to have a better time in training and find the training more enjoyable because they are happier overall. As such, those who score higher on emotional stability (and therefore are likely to have higher CSE) will likely have higher affective reaction ratings because those who are happier will find the training more enjoyable. Therefore, spurred on by two of its sub-components, self-efficacy and emotional stability, CSE is expected to predict reaction survey training outcomes independent of the training course content and delivery.

The CSE is a short 12-item scale, and as such, it is easier to use than separate measures for self-efficacy and emotional stability. This ease of use will make it more practical for organizations wanting to use CSE for use in training evaluation. Through CSE, an individual's personal characteristics can be better understood, and understanding some of the personal characteristics that lead to training outcome reaction survey scores is useful for understanding the meaning of the measurements.

Hypothesis 5a-b (H5a-b): CSE will positively correlate with training (a) utility and (b) affective reaction ratings.

In a meta-analysis examining the effect of training, Alliger et al. (1997) found that utility reactions were positively correlated with immediate post-learning assessments given out after the training; however, the same relationship was not found between affective measures and immediate post-learning assessments. This led Alliger et al. to the conclusion that utility measures were a good predictor of post-learning assessment scores and by extension how much individuals have learned in a course. However, a more effective way of determining how much an individual learned in a course is comparing a before and after measurement of knowledge. The current study aims to

expand the knowledge of utility assessments by comparing utility measures to the difference between pre-learning assessments and post-learning assessments. This will be done by correlating utility measures with the difference between pre-learning assessment and post-learning assessment scores. Using post-learning assessments alone will not give a complete picture of how much an individual has learned in a course; however, using the difference between pre-learning assessments and post-learning assessments will provide a better understanding of how much someone has learned in the training course.

Understanding how different levels of training relate to each other is important to understanding the effectiveness of a training program. Often organizations want to assess their training, but they lack the time and the resources to assess the training at all levels (Van Buren & Erskine, 2002). With a better understanding of how levels of training and different training outcomes relate to each other, organizations can save time and money by substituting measures of training outcomes for each other. If reaction survey utility measures and course knowledge gained are found to be related, it is possible that an organization may find it more efficient to drop one form of measurement while still capturing a picture of training effectiveness; however, before they drop one form of measurement, it should be made clear that utility measures are related to learning. Alliger et al. (1997) found that utility measures were related to post-learning assessments and by conclusion learning; however, the current study aims to take this finding one step further and compare utility measures with a better measure of learning that is the difference between pre-learning and post-learning assessments.

Hypothesis 6 (H6): Training reaction survey utility ratings will positively correlate with the difference between pre-learning and post-learning assessments.

Method

This study evaluated the training courses of Western Kentucky University's (WKU) Division of Extended Learning and Outreach's (DELO) Career & Workforce Development Program. This evaluation utilized Kirkpatrick's (1959) reaction, learning, and behavior criteria.

Participants and Evaluation Context

Participants were drawn from the trainees enrolled in WKU's Career and Workforce Development Program in the spring of 2015. Trainees were generally managers, supervisors, line supervisors, and executive managers who worked at local organizations in the Bowling Green, Kentucky area, although anyone was free to enroll in the courses. A total of thirteen unique courses were projected to be evaluated with a total of 21 training sessions to be evaluated. Some courses were offered only once during the training evaluation time period, and some courses were offered multiple times. The estimated number of students was 15 for each training session for an estimated 315 participants. Courses that were planned to be evaluated included: (1) Team Decision Making, (2) Time Management, (3) Easier Said Than Done, (4) Effective Discipline, (5) Habits of Successful People, (6) Coaching, (7) Basic Supervision, (8) Assertive Communication, (9) Dealing With Change, (10) A Job Well Done, (11) Strategic Planning, (12) Excel Intermediate II, and (13) Dealing With Difficult Personalities. At the beginning of each course, trainees were asked to participate in a training evaluation study for the course in which they were enrolled. Trainees were not required to participate in the study to take part in the training. Trainees were free to withdraw from the study at any time without any adverse consequences. After a series of setbacks

limiting the number of different courses evaluated and the number of trainees, 83 trainees from eight different courses in Western Kentucky University's Career and Workforce Development program participated in the study.

Measures

The measures consisted of a CSE measure, transfer assessment, reaction survey, pre-course learning assessment, post-course learning assessment, and a follow-up learning assessment. Demographic information such as sex, race, and age was not collected to retain participant anonymity. Each measure will be described below.

Core self-evaluations. The CSES (see Appendix A) is Judge et al.'s (2003) 12-item scale with six items worded positively and six worded negatively. A sample item is "I am confident I get the success I deserve in life." In Judge et al.'s study the scale was validated on four samples with all coefficient alpha reliability estimates above .80 and an average reliability of .84. Across the samples, the average item-total correlations ranged from .48 to .55. After the negatively worded items had been reversed, all of the items were positively intercorrelated. The coefficient alpha and item-total correlations suggested a high level of internal consistency. Test-retest reliability showed good stability at .81. CSE was thought to be a higher order construct that subsumes the four traits of self-esteem, self-efficacy, low neuroticism, and locus of control. Across the four samples, the CSES was correlated with each of these traits, with corrected correlations of r_c = .87 for self-esteem, r_c = .82 for generalized self-efficacy, r_c = .76 for neuroticism, and r_c = .50 for locus of control (Judge et al., 2003).

Judge et al.'s (2003) scoring method was used to obtain the CSES score. To do this, six CSE items were reverse coded so that all items on the scale would be positively

worded and higher numbers would indicate a more positive response. After these items were reverse coded, a composite score was created. These items had a Cronbach's alpha of .713.

At the end of the CSE measurement survey, there was a question measuring the enrollment type of the trainee.

Transfer assessment. The nine-item perceived transfer survey (see Appendix B) comes from a study done by Facteau, Dobbins, Russell, Ladd, and Kudisch (1995). The scale measures managers' perceptions of how much the training has affected their ability to reach desirable outcomes in the workplace. Transfer scale items created by Facteau et al. were based on a review of relevant literature on training and development. The items were constructed to be as specific as possible to improve the accuracy of the self-report assessment. A sample item is "The productivity of my subordinates has improved due to the skills that I learned in the training course." The questions on the transfer survey were worded slightly differently than on the original scale to better suit the current study and the individual courses offered through the Career and Workforce Development program. The original scale asked participants if changes had occurred after more than one training course had been completed; however, the current study looked at changes after one course had been taken. In every item, the wording was changed from "training courses" to "the training course." Because the transfer survey was completed after participants had returned to work, it was expected that the survey would get an accurate measure of an individual's perception of transfer. Facteau et al. reported that a confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the items loaded onto their hypothesized factors and that fit indices indicated adequate fit to the hypothesized model. The courses evaluated taught

supervisor and manager relations with peers and subordinates within the workplace, so the transfer survey items were highly appropriate to the study.

Reaction survey. Before each course could be evaluated, a reactions form had to be adapted. Morgan and Casper's (2000) 29-item validated reaction survey (see Appendix C) was used to adapt a reaction form for the current study. Items on Morgan and Casper's reaction survey are divided into six factors (i.e., trainee satisfaction with the instructor, trainee satisfaction with the training management administration process, trainee satisfaction with the testing process, trainee perceptions of the utility of the training, trainee perceptions of course materials, and trainee perceptions of the course structure). These six factors aimed to help DELO better understand the responses to the reaction survey. By keeping each item in a factor, DELO would be able to gain an overall understanding of how the course is performing in that particular area. This overall understanding provides insight beyond examining the individual items on the reaction survey.

Several factors were not useful or relevant to the Career and Workforce Development program evaluation. These included the factors of trainee satisfaction with the training management administration process and trainee perceptions of the course structure. The training management administration process factor items were removed due to the inappropriate content of these items relative to the Career and Workforce Development training courses. These items examined trainees' perceptions about training offered though company training; however, the Career and Workforce Development training courses were not part of a particular company's training program. As such, the items were inappropriate for assessing the reactions of training courses in

the Career and Workforce Development program. The trainee perceptions of the course structure factor was eliminated due to the vagueness of the items. The two items from this factor asked if the participant was satisfied with the length and pace of the course. The response categories for these items range from "Very Satisfied" to "Very Dissatisfied." Although these two items were removed, other items from Morgan and Casper's (2000) reaction form validation study captured the same information, but with more useful response categories. Three items from Morgan and Casper's study were kept on the reaction survey and placed at the end of this study's reaction survey after the section containing the previous questions. These three questions asked about the length of the training course, the amount of student participation, and the pace of the training course.

An additional item outside of Morgan and Casper's (2000) study was added at the end of the reaction survey that was of interest to DELO; this item measured the challenge of the course. The response categories to this item were designed to match the response categories of the three previous items as much as possible. In addition to the added challenge question, an open response question asking for additional comments was added to capture any relevant information about the training course. An additional reason for minimizing the number of items on the reaction survey was DELO's concern that after a four-hour training course, a long reaction survey coupled with a learning assessment might have made the responses gathered from participants less reliable. By keeping most of the items from the original validated reaction survey, the damage to the validity and reliability of each factor was minimized as much as possible and still provided enough relevant information to conduct a training evaluation.

Thus, the study reaction form contained 25 items (see Appendix D). Ten second-year Industrial-Organizational Psychology students served as subject matter experts (SMEs) to examine the reaction survey. These SMEs categorized the reaction survey items into reaction and utility categories using a Q-sort method. Items that were categorized as utility items at least 80% of the time were classified as utility items. Items that were categorized as affective items at least 80% of the time were classified as affective items. Items that the SMEs rated as affective items more than 80% of the time were used to create a composite score. These items had a Cronbach's alpha of .83. Likewise, items that the SMEs rated as utility items more than 80% of the time were used to create a composite score. These items had a Cronbach's alpha of .85. Items that failed to meet either criterion were categorized as neither. The items categorized as neither were kept on the reaction survey to help DELO gain additional information about their courses; however, the items were not analyzed as utility or affective reaction items for the full study if they were classified as neither by the SMEs. Items 2, 4, 5, 6, and 18 were categorized as affective items. Items 12, 14, and 15 were categorized as utility items. Items 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, and 20 were categorized as neither. A more detailed description of the items and the percentages these items received can be found in Appendix E.

Learning assessments. To validate the learning assessment for each course, learning assessments were created from the course materials. Each learning assessment aimed to measure whether the trainees learned the content of the course. There were a total of six instructors who teach Career and Workforce Development courses. All six instructors were asked to participate in the pilot test of the learning assessments.

Instructors who taught each course were asked if the items were relevant based on the course content, if the items were clearly worded, and for any additional questions that might have been relevant in measuring whether the trainees learned the course content. This was done to ensure the questions and answer responses were relevant to the content of the course. Each learning assessment item was kept if at least 80% of the instructors who taught that particular course found the item relevant to the course. Items with a less than an 80% relevancy rating were discarded. Additional items and answer choices that were thought to be relevant were discussed with the DELO instructors and added if appropriate. Each learning assessment and its feedback was examined with the program director and in particular the items that received less than an 80% relevancy rating, comments, and answer choices made by the two DELO instructors were discussed and examined. Items which received a less than an 80% relevancy score were either removed completely, reworded, or the answer choices were changed to make the learning assessments relevant to the courses. The updated learning assessments can be found in Appendices F-R. Team Decision Making (Appendix F) contained 9 items, Time Management (Appendix G) contained 10 items, Easier Said Than Done (Appendix H) contained 10 items, Effective Discipline (Appendix I) contained 8 items, Habits of Successful People (Appendix J) contained 11 items, Coaching (Appendix K) contained 8 items, Basic Supervision (Appendix L) contained 8 items, Assertive Communication (Appendix M) contained 8 items, Dealing With Change (Appendix N) contained 8 items, A Job Well Done (Appendix O) contained 7 items, Strategic Planning (Appendix P) contained 10 items, Excel Intermediate II (Appendix Q) contained 7 items, and Dealing With Difficult Personalities (Appendix R) contained 7 items.

After the learning assessments were piloted with the instructors and updated with the instructor feedback, the updated learning assessments were piloted by the SMEs (i.e., 10 Industrial-Organizational Psychology graduate students). The SMEs, who had not completed the training, took the learning assessments, and the responses were analyzed to examine item difficulty. Item difficulty was assessed to provide insight into the difficulty of each learning assessment. This information can help instructors in better understanding areas in their courses with which trainees are having difficulty.

Item difficulty was assessed by looking at the number of correct responses by the SMEs. Items that were answered correctly less than or equal to 50% of the time were judged as "hard." Items that were answered correctly more than 50% of the time, but less than 75% of the time were classified as "medium." Items that were answered correctly more than or equal to 75% of the time were classified as "easy." Item difficulty was assessed to provide insight into the difficulty of each learning assessment. This information can help instructors in better understanding areas in their courses with which trainees are having difficulty. The results of the SME pilot test were entered into a data file and analyzed. A detailed description of the difficulty of each item is found in Appendix S.

One concern was the low level of difficulty of the learning assessments. Overall, the learning assessments may have been a little easy for the SMEs, but the learning assessments were constructed to be administered to people at a lower academic level. Many of the items that were categorized as "easy" were recommended by DELO because they captured the main themes of the course, and removing these items would have lessened the learning assessments because the learning assessments would then fail to

capture important course content information. When reviewing the learning assessments with DELO, the lower level of the students was stressed, so a comparatively easier learning assessment may have been more appropriate for these trainees. In addition, some of the content on the piloted learning assessments overlapped with some of the content in the SMEs' Industrial-Organizational Psychology program classes, making the learning assessments appear easier than they were in reality. After careful consideration it was decided to keep the learning assessments unaltered in difficulty level.

The final learning assessment for each course was developed based on the results of the validation pilot study. As the same assessment was used for the pre-course learning assessment, the post-course learning assessment, and the follow-up learning assessment, the questions and the response choices to the questions were shuffled to minimize memory effects of previously encountering the question as much as possible. Although shuffling the questions and answer choices could not completely erase the memorization effects, it was hoped that this was a better alternative to creating a dual form or split test method due to the Career and Workforce Development training program time constraints.

To score the trainees' learning assessments, each item on each courses' learning assessment was coded as either a "0" for incorrect or a "1" for correct. A pre-learning assessment composite score was created by averaging the coded items on the pre-learning assessment. A post-learning composite score was created by averaging the items on the post-learning assessment. An individual's score could range from "0" meaning they answered each item incorrectly to "1" meaning they answered each item correctly. Because each course's learning assessment varied in the number of items and the

difficulty of the items, a learning assessment *z* score composite score was created for individuals within that course using the mean score for that course and the course's standard deviation. That is, other individuals within each course were used for comparison to score each individual so they could be compared to other individuals in other courses in a meaningful way. Within each course, individuals who scored higher than average received a positive score and individuals who scored lower than average received a negative score. This was done for eight different courses, resulting in eight pre-learning assessment *z* score composite scores and eight post-learning assessment *z* score composite scores.

Next, the eight pre-learning assessment *z* scores were combined into a single score, and the eight post-learning assessment *z* scores were combined into a single score. Three points were added to each of these learning assessment *z* scores so that each score would be positive.

Procedure

Before the class began, trainees were asked to fill out the CSES form and pre-course learning assessment. At the end of the class, the trainees were instructed to take the reaction survey and post-course learning assessment. Participants were also given a folder with a blank envelope containing a self-assessment of transfer survey and a follow-up learning assessment. Trainees were asked to write their address on the blank envelope if they wished to participate in the follow-up evaluation. The self-assessment of transfer survey, follow-up learning assessment, and self-addressed and stamped envelope was mailed to trainees one month following training. Trainees were asked to return their

completed materials by mail to DELO within one week of receiving the transfer survey and the follow-up learning assessment.

Each of the assessments included a numeric code in the bottom right corner. This number corresponded to the course being evaluated, as well as a unique trainee identification number. In this way, trainees' materials could be matched without gathering any identifying data from the trainee.

Results

In the current study, hypothesis testing was conducted using the CSE composite score, the affective composite score, the utility composite score, and the learning assessment difference score. The learning assessment difference score was calculated by subtracting the overall pre-learning assessment z score from the overall post-learning assessment z score. This resulted in a score which quantified the gains in knowledge from the pre-learning assessment to the post-learning assessment. Bivariate correlations were examined among the study variables. The correlations between these variables can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Correlations between CSE and Training Outcome Variables

Variables	N	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. CSE	83	3.69	.405	-					
2. Affective Reactions	82	4.61	.433	.078	-				
3. Utility Reactions	82	4.47	.523	.086	.636*	-			
4. Pre-Learning Assessment *Z* Score	82	3.00	.955	.180	.082	-.141	-		
5. Post-Learning Assessment *Z* Score	82	3.00	.953	.055	-.085	-.076	.372*	-	
6. Learning Assessment Difference Score	82	.00	1.07	-.110	-141	.068	-.560*	.561*	-

Note. CSE = core self-evaluations.
* $p < .05$ (one-tailed)

Unfortunately, due to a lack of responses to the follow-up learning assessment ($n = 2$) and the transfer survey ($n = 2$), hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 could not be tested. Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 were tested by examining bivariate correlations with a one-tailed test for significance. Hypothesis 4 examined the correlation between CSE and learning, with learning being quantified by a learning assessment difference score. The correlation between CSE and the learning assessment difference score was slightly negative, however, the correlation was non-significant. Hypotheses 5a and 5b examined the correlation between CSE and both utility and affective reaction items. The correlations between CSE and both utility and affective items were slightly positive, but again both correlations were non-significant. Hypothesis 6 examined the correlation between utility items and the learning assessment difference score. The correlation was slightly positive; however, once again the relationship was non-significant.

Discussion

Although the study's hypotheses were either untestable or were not supported, the lack of support for the hypotheses does not provide clear evidence for a lack of a relationship between the hypothesized variables. Namely, the study did not find support for CSE predicting different rates of learning, for CSE predicting utility and affective reactions, or for utility items predicting knowledge gains. However, due to a number of limitations in the study, the correlations found may not be representative of the actual relationships between the hypothesized variables. Limitations include the number of training courses evaluated, a lack of trainee responses to the transfer survey, and a small sample size. A more detailed discussion of the limitations that may have interfered with the testing of the hypotheses will be discussed next.

Study Limitations

Originally, 13 different training courses were to be evaluated, and 315 trainees were estimated to take part in the study; however, after a series of setbacks, the number of training courses evaluated and the number of trainees decreased. The first setback was a cancellation of training courses due to weather and lack of trainees. In a particularly unfortunate week during which a number of training courses were planned to take place, a snowstorm caused the cancellation of all courses that week. Another setback was the cancellation of the training evaluation by several organizations for which the Career and Workforce Development program provides training. These organizations were concerned about the additional time that would be required to complete the training evaluation and did not allow the training evaluation to proceed. Another major setback to the study was the lack of trainee responses to the follow-up learning assessment and the transfer survey.

The follow-up learning assessment and the transfer survey were mailed to participants one month following the training course. Thirty-nine (46.9%) of the trainees provided an address to mail the follow-up learning assessment and transfer survey during the training evaluation. Out of the participants who provided information so a follow-up learning assessment and a transfer survey could be mailed, only two participants (2.4%) returned the materials.

Due to a lack of response in the follow-up learning assessments (n = 2) and transfer survey (n = 2), hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 could not be tested. Each of these hypotheses used perceptions of training transfer, so it was not possible to test these hypotheses with the responses received. In hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 a small sample size (n = 83) limited the power to detect statistically significant differences. Another influence on the relationship between CSE and training outcomes that may have had an impact on the outcomes of the study were the number of courses examined and the characteristics of the training courses. The current study examined CSE and training outcomes in eight different courses and looked at the results as a whole, much like a meta-analysis. It may have been possible that CSE did have an effect on some of the training outcomes for some of the courses, but did not have an effect on others. Characteristics of the training courses may have played a role in the relationship between CSE and training outcomes. To properly examine the characteristics of the training courses that may have played a role in the outcomes, the training courses need to be examined individually. Sample sizes in the training courses varied greatly, but examining the courses separately provides some insight into course differences. In Table 2 below, the hypothesized correlations were examined for each course. It is important to note that the correlations are not reliable

because of the small sample size for each course; however, the table shows that the results for each course varied greatly.

Table 2

Course Correlations between CSE and Training Outcome Variables

Course	Sample Size	CSE and Learning Assessment Difference Score	CSE and Utility Reactions	CSE and Affective Reactions	Utility Reactions and Learning Assessment Difference Score
Time Management	9	-.438	-.063	.133	-.259
		(.138)	(.436)	(.367)	(.250)
Easier Said Than Done	5	-.946**	-.442	-.456	.328
		(.007)	(.228)	(.220)	(.295)
Effective Discipline	14	.183	.133	-.038	.166
		(.275)	(.333)	(.451)	(.303)
Habits Of Successful People	20	-.083	-.036	.232	-.083
		(.364)	(.442)	(.170)	(.364)
Coaching	10	-.604*	.201	.570*	.068
		(.032)	(.289)	(.043)	(.426)
Basic Supervision	9	.248	.033	-.137	.112
		(.260)	(.466)	(.363)	(.387)
Strategic Planning	9	.040	.390	.154	.317
		(.460)	(.150)	(.346)	(.186)
Dealing With Difficult Personalities	7	.105	.061	.061	.655
		(.422)	(.454)	(.454)	(.079)

Note. CSE = core self-evaluations. *p* values are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ (one-tailed), ** $p < .01$ (one-tailed)

It is important that note that the small sample size for each course does not allow the hypotheses to be examined in each course individually with much statistical power; however, the results of Table 2 suggest there is a large amount of variability in the outcomes of the training courses. In particular, the relationship between CSE and the learning assessment difference score was found to be significant in the Easier Said Than Done and Coaching courses, although the relationship was not in the hypothesized direction. In the Coaching course, the relationship between CSE and affective reactions was statistically significant and in the hypothesized direction. It is important to note that by looking at the courses individually, the chances for finding statistically significant results increases greatly simply because there is more opportunity for significant results resulting in a Type I error.

Another limitation of the study was the number of different trainers who provided courses to be evaluated. Five different trainers' courses were evaluated. The individual characteristics of the trainers may have played a role in the training outcomes. Towler (2009) found that trainer expressiveness and whether the trainer provided interesting details was positively related to trainee problem solving scores. Across the five trainers who provided training for the training evaluation, it is possible and probable that the trainers differed in their expressiveness and the level of interesting detail they provided during the course. These trainer characteristics may have played a role in the outcomes of the training regardless of the trainee's characteristics, such as CSE.

Another limitation of the study that was due to the number of training courses evaluated and the small sample sizes is the way the learning assessments scores were calculated to compare trainees in various courses with trainees in other courses. Due to

the different number of items on each learning assessment and the different level of item difficulty between assessments, a way to compare trainees across courses was needed. The scores within each course were calculated as a *z* score within that course and compared to *z* scores of trainees in other courses. That is, trainees were given a score based on how well they did in relation to trainees in that course and then compared with trainees who were given a score based on how well they did in relation to trainees in their courses. Some courses had particularly low sample sizes and giving a trainee a score based on others within that course is not very reliable. For example an item answered either correctly or incorrectly could have dramatically changed the *z* score for that trainee as well as other trainees within a course with a small sample size. This is especially an issue in the Easier Said Than Done ($n = 5$) and Dealing With Difficult Personalities ($n = 7$) courses, which both had small sample sizes.

Future Directions

Although the three hypotheses that examined perceptions of training transfer could not be tested, there is still an opportunity for future studies to examine the relationship between CSE and perceptions of training transfer because of the theoretical relationship between these variables. The three hypotheses that examined CSE, utility reaction survey items, affective reaction survey items, and rates of learning were not supported; however, there is still room for future studies to examine the relationship between these variables, as the limitations of the current study made the examination of the relationship between these variables difficult. In particular, future researchers that wish to examine the relationship between CSE and training outcomes should strive to obtain a large sample, examine a smaller number of courses, and examine courses that are

taught between few trainers or one trainer to minimize differing trainer characteristics that may play a role in training outcomes. If future studies meet these criteria, the relationship between CSE and training outcomes should be made clear.

Conclusion

The purpose of the current study was to examine the role CSE plays on training outcomes such as perceptions of transfer, utility and affective reaction survey items, and learning outcomes. The study also aimed to examine the finding that utility measures correlate positively with knowledge gains. However, due to study limitations, hypotheses related to perceptions of training transfer could not be tested. Other study hypotheses examining the relationship between CSE and different rates of learning, the relationship between CSE and both utility and affective reaction survey items, and the relationship between utility reaction survey items and different rates of learning were tested; however, these three hypotheses were not supported. Notably, however, because of the limitations of the current study, it is unclear whether these constructs are truly unrelated or if these null effects were an artifact of this study. As such, more research is needed.

References

Aleven, V. A., & Koedinger, K. R. (2002). An effective metacognitive strategy: Learning by doing and explaining with a computer-based cognitive tutor. *Cognitive Science*, *26*, 147-179. doi:10.1016/S0364-0213(02)00061-7

Alliger, G. M., & Janak, E. A. (1989). Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. *Personnel Psychology, 42*, 331-342. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1989.tb00661.x

Alliger, G. M., Tannenbaum, S. I., Bennett, W., Traver, H., & Shotland, A. (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*, 341-358. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00911.x

Baldwin, T. T., Magjuka, R. J., & Loher, B. T. (1991). The perils of participation: Effects of choice of training on trainee motivation and learning. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 51-65. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00690.x

Ban, C., & Faerman, S. R. (1990). Issues in the evaluation of management training. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, *13*, 271-286. doi:10.2307/3380922

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*, 191-215. doi:10.1037//0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*, 117-148.

Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Huang, J. L. (2010). Transfer of training: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management, 36*, 1065-1105. doi:10.1177/0149206309352880

Campion, M. A., Campion, J. E. (1987). Evaluation of an interviewee skills training program in a natural field setting. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 675-691.

Cascio, W. F. (1989). Using utility analysis to assess training outcomes. *Training and Development in Organizations,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 63, 88.

Egan, T. M., Yang, B., & Bartlett, K. R. (2004). The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15,* 279-301. doi:10.1002/hrdq.1104

Facteau, J. D., Dobbins, G. H., Russell, J. E., Ladd, R. T., & Kudisch, J. D. (1995). The influence of general perceptions of the training environment on pre-training motivation and perceived training transfer. *Journal of Management, 21,* 1-25. doi:10.1111/1468-2419.00031

Faerman, S. R., & Ban, C. (1993). Trainee satisfaction and training impact: Issues in training evaluation. *Public Productivity & Management Review, 16,* 299-314. doi:10.2370/3380872

Ghodsian, D., Bjork, R. A., & Benjamin, A. S. (1997). Evaluating training during training: Obstacles and opportunities. In M. A. Quiñones & A. Ehrenstein (Ed.), *Training for a rapidly changing workplace: Applications of psychological research.* (pp. 201-222). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Harter, S. (1989). Causes, correlates, and the functional role of global self-worth: A life span perspective. In J. Koiligan & R. Sternberg (Eds.), *Perceptions of Competence and Incompetence Across the Life Span.* 43–70.

Hills, P., & Argyle, M. (2001). Emotional stability as a major dimension of happiness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31,* 1357-1364. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00229-4

Hofstadter, D. R., & Dennett, D. C. (1981). *The mind's I: Fantasies and reflections on self and soul*. Brighton, UK: Harvester Press.

Honeycutt, E. D., & Stevenson, T. H. (1989). Evaluating sales training programs. *Industrial Marketing Management, 18,* 215-222. doi:10.1016/0019-8501(89)90038-2

Judge, T. A. (2009). Core self-evaluations and work success. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18,* 58-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01606.x

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The core self-evaluations scale: Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology, 56,* 303-331. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00152.x

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 530-541. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.530

Judge, T. A., & Hurst, C. (2007). Capitalizing on one's advantages: Role of core self-evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1212–1227.

Kirkpatrick, D. (1959). Techniques for evaluating training programs. *Journal of the American Society for Training and Development, 13,* 3-9.

Kirkpatrick, D. (1996). Revisiting Kirkpatrick’s four-level model. *Training and Development, 1,* 54–59.

Kraiger, K., Ford, J. K., & Salas, E. (1993). Application of cognitive, skill-based, and affective theories of learning outcomes to new methods of training evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 311-328. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.78.2.311

Kumpikaitė, V. (2007). Human resource training evaluation. *Engineering Economics, 55*, 29-36.

Leach, M. P., & Liu, A. H. (2003). Investigating interrelationships among sales training evaluation methods. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 23*, 327-340.

Locke, E. A., McClear, K., Knight, D. (1996). Self-esteem and work. *International Review of Industrial/Organizational Psychology, 11,* 1-32.

Lorge, S. (1998). Getting into their heads. *Sales & Marketing Management, 2,* 58–64.

Mathieu, J. E., & Button, S. B. (1992). An examination of the relative impact of normative information and self-efficacy on personal goals and performance over time. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *22*, 1758-1775.

Mathieu, J. E., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Salas, E. (1992). Influences of individual and situational characteristics on measures of training effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 828-847. doi:10.2307/256317

Miller, L. (2012). 2012 ASTD state of the industry report: Organizations continue to invest in workplace learning. *Training & Development Magazine, 66,* 42-48.

Morgan, R. B., & Casper, W. J. (2000). Examining the factor structure of participant reactions to training: A multidimensional approach. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *11*, 301-317. doi:10.1002/1532-1096(200023)11:3<301::AID-HRDQ7>3.0.CO;2-P

Noe, R. A., & Wilk, S. L. (1993). Investigation of the factors that influence employees' participation in development activities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 291. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.78.2.291

Phillips, J. J. (1997). *Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods*. Houston, TX: Gulf.

Quiñones, M. A. (1997). Contextual influences on training effectiveness. *Applications of Psychological Research,* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 177-199. doi:10.1037/10260-000

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 80,* 1.

Rouiller, J. Z., & Goldstein, I. L. (1993). The relationship between organizational transfer climate and positive transfer of training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 4,* 377-390. doi:10.1002/hrdq.3920040408

Ruona, E. A., Leimbach, M., Holton, E. F. III., Bates, R. (2002). The relationship between learner utility reactions and predicted learning transfer among trainees. *International Journal of Training and Development, 6,* 218-228.

Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. P. (2005). Learning versus performance goals: When should each be used? *The Academy of Management Executive, 19,* 124-131. doi:10.5465/AME.2005.15841964

Towler, A. (2009). Effects of trainer expressiveness, seductive details, and trainee goal orientation on training outcomes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 20,* 65-84. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20008

Trahan, W. A., & McAllister, H. A. (2002). Master's level training in industrial/organizational psychology: Does it meet the SIOP guidelines? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16,* 457-465.

Van Buren, M. E., & Erskine, W. (2002). The 2002 ASTD state of the industry report. Alexandria, VA: American Society of Training and Development.

Warr, P., & Bruce, D. (1995). Trainee characteristics and the outcomes of open learning. *Personnel Psychology, 48,* 347–375. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01761.x

Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York: Guilford Press.

Weiner, B., Nierenberg, R., & Goldstein, M. (1976). Social learning (locus of control) versus attributional (causal stability) interpretations of expectancy of success. *Journal of Personality, 44,* 52-68. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1976.tb00583.x

Appendix A. Core Self-evaluations Survey and Enrollment Measure

(Course Name)
Attitude Survey
(Date)

Please rate the following statements using the provided scale.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1) I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2) Sometimes I feel depressed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3) When I try, I generally succeed.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4) Sometimes when I fail I feel worthless.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5) I complete tasks successfully.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6) Sometimes, I do not feel in control of my work.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7) Overall, I am satisfied with myself.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8) I am filled with doubts about my competence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9) I determine what will happen in my life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10) I do not feel in control of my success in my career.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11) I am capable of coping with most of my problems.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12) There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

What is your enrollment type for the Career & Workforce development courses?

a) Open enrollment
b) Contract
c) Cohort

Appendix B. Perception of Self-Transfer Survey

(Course Name)
Follow-Up Survey
(Date)

Rate the following statements based on the course **[INSERT COURSE NAME] using the provided scale**.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1) Supervisors, peers, or subordinates have told me that my behavior has improved following the training course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2) The productivity of my subordinates has improved due to the skills that I learned in the training course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3) Absenteeism in my group has decreased due to the skills that I developed in the training course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4) Turnover in my group has decreased due to the skills that I developed in the training course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5) Morale of my work group is higher due to the skills that I developed in the training course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6) My subordinates are more committed to the mission of the organization due to the skills that I developed in the training course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7) I am able to transfer the skills learned in the training course back to my actual job.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8) I have changed my job behavior in order to be consistent with the material taught in the training course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9) My actual job performance has improved due to the skills that I learned in the training course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix C. Morgan and Casper's (2000) Reaction Survey

Factor 1 - trainee satisfaction with instructor
Factor 2 - trainee satisfaction with the training management administration process
Factor 3 - trainee satisfaction with the testing process
Factor 4 - trainee perceptions of the utility of the training
Factor 5 - trainee perceptions of course materials
Factor 6 - trainee perceptions to the course structure

Item	Factor
1) How satisfied are you with the instructor's knowledge of course material and subject matter?	1
2) How satisfied are you with the instructor's ability to keep the interest of the class?	1
3) How satisfied are you with the instructor's presentation and explanation of course materials?	1
4) How satisfied are you with the instructor's responsiveness to student questions and problems?	1
5) How satisfied are you with the instructor's ability to relate to students individually?	1
6) How satisfied are you with the instructor's overall effectiveness?	1
7) How satisfied are you with the availability of training courses for individuals in your job classification?	2
8) How satisfied are you with the communication of training information to employees in your facility?	2
9) How satisfied are you with the quality of training services provided locally?	2
10) How satisfied are you with the quality of training services provided regionally?	2
11) How satisfied are you with the registration process and information you received prior to arrival at training?	2
12) How satisfied are you with the quality of training courses provided by management?	2
13) How satisfied are you with the relevance of training you received for specific job functions?	2
14) How satisfied are you with the fairness of the course exam?	3
15) How satisfied are you with the exam coverage and importance of material tested?	3
16) How satisfied are you with the feedback you received as a result of course testing?	3
17) How satisfied are you with the communication of course objectives in clear, understandable terms?	4
18) How satisfied are you with the match of course objectives with your idea of what would be taught?	4
19) How satisfied are you with the relevance of the course content to your job?	4

20) How satisfied are you with the course's emphasis on most important information?	4
21) How satisfied are you with the extent to which the course prepared you to perform new job tasks?	4
22) How satisfied are you with the extent to which the course prepared you to perform current job tasks more effectively?	4
23) How satisfied are you with the quality of this training course overall?	4
24) How satisfied are you with the quality of course materials?	5
25) How satisfied are you with the audio and visual aids used by the instructors?	5
26) How satisfied are you with the supplies and equipment for this course?	5
27) How satisfied are you with the classrooms, furniture, learning environment, etc.?	5
28) How satisfied are you with the length of the training course?	6
29) How satisfied are you with the pace of the course material?	6

The following items were not included in the previous 6 factors.

30) The length of the training course was…	Too long	Just right	Too short
31) The amount of student participation was…	Too much	Just right	Too little
32) The pace of the training course was…	Too slow	Just right	Too fast

Appendix D. Study Reaction Survey

CONTINUING & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Lifelong Learning | Career & Workforce Development

(Course name)
Reaction Survey
(Date)

We hope this course has been of value to you. To help us continue to improve the quality of the training courses offered, please rate the following items concerning the training course.

How satisfied are you with the…

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	N/A
1. instructor's knowledge of course material and subject matter	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. instructor's ability to keep the interest of the class	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. instructor's presentation and explanation of course materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. instructor's responsiveness to student questions and problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. instructor's ability to relate to students individually	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. instructor's overall effectiveness	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. fairness of the course exam	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. exam coverage and importance of material tested	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. feedback you received as a result of course testing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. communication of course objectives in clear, understandable terms	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. match of course objectives with your idea of what would be taught	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. relevance of the course content to your job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. course's emphasis on most important information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. extent to which the course prepared you to perform new job tasks	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. extent to which the course prepared you to perform current	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

job tasks more effectively						
16. quality of this training course overall	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. quality of course materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. audio and visual aids used by the instructors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. supplies and equipment for this course	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. classrooms, furniture, learning environment, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please circle the response that best reflects your opinion of the training course:

21. The length of the training course was…	Too long	Just right	Too short
22. The amount of student participation was…	Too much	Just right	Too little
23. The pace of the training course was…	Too slow	Just right	Too fast
24. The challenge level of the course was…	Too difficult	Just right	Too easy

25. Additional Comments (these are extremely helpful to us):

_____

_____

Appendix E. Reaction Survey Item Classification

Item	Affective %	Utility %	Neither %	Classification
1. instructor's knowledge of course material and subject matter	33.3	33.3	33.3	Neither
2. instructor's ability to keep the interest of the class	100	0	0	Affective
3. instructor's presentation and explanation of course materials	66.7	33.3	0	Neither
4. instructor's responsiveness to student questions and problems	88.9	11.1	0	Affective
5. instructor's ability to relate to students individually	88.9	11.1	0	Affective
6. instructor's overall effectiveness	55.6	33.3	11.1	Affective
7. fairness of the course exam	44.4	33.3	22.2	Neither
8. exam coverage and importance of material tested	44.4	44.4	11.1	Neither
9. feedback you received as a result of course testing	44.4	44.4	11.1	Neither
10. communication of course objectives in clear, understandable terms	22.2	66.7	11.1	Neither
11. match of course objectives with your idea of what would be taught	44.4	33.3	22.2	Neither
12. relevance of the course content to your job	11.1	88.9	0	Utility
13. course's emphasis on most important information	11.1	66.7	22.2	Neither
14. extent to which the course prepared you to perform new job tasks	0	100	0	Utility
15. extent to which the course prepared you to perform current job tasks more effectively	0	100	0	Utility
16. quality of this training course overall	77.8	11.1	11.1	Neither
17. quality of course materials	55.6	33.3	11.1	Neither
18. audio and visual aids used by the instructors	88.9	11.1	0	Affective
19. supplies and equipment for this course	33.3	44.4	22.2	Neither
20. classrooms, furniture, learning environment, etc.	55.6	11.1	33.3	Neither

Note. $n = 9$

Appendix F. Updated Team Decision Making Learning Assessment

WKU® CONTINUING & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Lifelong Learning | Career & Workforce Development

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) What are moral values directly linked to?
   a) How people make decisions
   b) The types of groups they lead
   c) How often they make decisions
   d) The type of help they seek in making decisions

2) Which category of decision making is described by doing what is right for everyone?
   a) Universal
   b) Majority
   c) Follow the rules
   d) Pleasure seeking
   e) Discipline

3) What does framing a decision involve?
   a) Writing a problem statement and establishing objectives
   b) Deciding how to take action
   c) Determining the origin of the problem
   d) Finding a solution that helps as many people as possible

4) Which of the following is <u>not</u> included in the decision making objectives?
   a) Provide a basis for evaluating the decision
   b) Guide information collection
   c) Clarify the importance of the decision
   d) Enable justification of the decision
   e) Determine how the problem is viewed
   f) All of the above are included

5) What are two poor approaches to making group decision work well?
   a) Groupthink and debating
   b) Groupthink and coming to the meeting with a goal in mind
   c) Debating and coming to the meeting with a goal in mind
   d) All of these are poor approaches

6) Which category of decision making is described by a response to avoid punishment?
   a) Universal
   b) Majority

c) Pleasing
d) Pleasure seeking
e) Discipline

7) After defining objectives, setting parameters, collecting information, and exploring alternatives, a choice can often be made clear by examining?
a) Perks
b) Closures
c) Possible consequences
d) Rewards

8) Typically, the greater the risk…
a) The higher the perceived outcome will be
b) The perceived outcome will be the same
c) The lower the perceived outcome will be

9) When are mistakes often made?
a) Consequences are weighed
b) Steps are not carried out to the fullest
c) Creativity is encouraged
d) Feedback is supported

Appendix G. Updated Time Management Learning Assessment

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) Which is not of the four "D"s of prioritizing?
   a) Do
   b) Delegate
   c) Delay
   d) Delete
   e) Dream

2) Which is not a reason for procrastinating?
   a) Don't know where to start
   b) Afraid to fail
   c) Avoid an unpleasant task
   d) If you put it off, someone else will do it
   e) Eagerness to begin the project
   f) Have too much information

3) Which is not a good place to use your waiting time?
   a) On public transportation
   b) At a doctor's office
   c) Waiting for a plane or bus
   d) All of these are good places

4) Which of these is not one of the five objectives in setting goals?
   a) Specific
   b) Measurable
   c) Achievable
   d) Realistic
   e) Time-based
   f) Imaginative

5) When should you save the easiest tasks for?
   a) The beginning of the day
   b) The end of the day
   c) After lunch
   d) Right before lunch

6) In prioritizing, it is important to ask yourself each of the following except:
   a) What the worst that could happen?
   b) Must it be done now?
   c) Am I the only person who can do this?
   d) How enjoyable is this task?

7) Knowledge from external sources is great, but…
   a) the best way to really understand is by doing things and learning from your own failures and then doing it again with your new understanding in mind
   b) research is key in finding an answer
   c) timing is more important

8) Which is <u>not</u> a tip for managing your energy levels?
   a) Work out
   b) Eat enough
   c) Sleep enough
   d) Research more

9) Which of these is <u>not</u> a tip for doing research?
   a) Read books
   b) Talk to people who have already been where you want to go
   c) Look for shortcuts
   d) Look for the most common mistakes people make

10) In prioritizing, it is best to:
   a) Take things as they come
   b) Attach deadlines to things you delay
   c) Address the smallest issues first, then address the biggest issues

Appendix H. Updated Easier Said Than Done Learning Assessment

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) How much meaning is understood through non-verbal communication?
   a) Less than 10%
   b) 20-50%
   c) More than 50%

2) Which of these is <u>not</u> an indication someone is lying?
   a) Lack of gesturing
   b) Skin around the eyes crinkle when smiling
   c) Excessive blinking
   d) Sharp pauses
   e) Tight lips

3) Which are feelings and emotions more accurately revealed by?
   a) Non-verbal means
   b) Verbal means

4) The non-verbal portion of communication?
   a) Conveys meanings and intentions that are relatively free of deception and meaning
   b) Should be ignored in business situations
   c) Is unimportant as long as the verbal meaning is understood
   d) Should be understood before the verbal message is listened to

5) Emotions are expressed more clearly on which side of the face?
   a) Left
   b) Right

6) Proxemics is the study of:
   a) Personal space
   b) Furniture arrangement
   c) Listening
   d) Silence

7) Which is the primary source of information in interpersonal communication?
   a) The hands
   b) The legs
   c) The face

d) The upper body

8) Non-verbal communication is:
a) Unintentional
b) Intentional
c) Both intentional and unintentional

9) Mirroring another's body language is known as:
a) Postural congruence
b) Nonverbal mimicking
c) Body echoing
d) Partner miming

10) Active listening does <u>not</u> include:
a) Paraphrasing
b) Questioning
c) Lecturing
d) Responding

Appendix I. Updated Effective Discipline Learning Assessment

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) What is a rule or approach to remember when disciplining employees?
   a) The "Hot Stove" rule
   b) The "Simmering Pot" rule
   c) The Level approach
   d) The Timing approach

2) Which of these is not a characteristic of a progressive discipline system?
   a) Clearly defined punishments
   b) Prompt and consistent reinforcement
   c) Disciplinary actions in front of peers
   d) Established appeals process

3) Which behavior reinforcement theory teaches about principals of behavior in shaping behavior?
   a) The Timing approach
   b) Skinner's behavioral reinforcement theory
   c) Melvin's approach
   d) Withdrawal theory

4) Which of these is not a recommended measurement, rule, or guideline in communicating with employees?
   a) Tell your employees what you want
   b) Be simple
   c) Show benefit
   d) Allow no feedback for the guidelines

5) Which is not a recommendation for managing conflict effectively?
   a) Identify the goals of both parties
   b) Brainstorm solutions
   c) Prepare a statement
   d) Determine decision based on past behavior

6) Which of these is not a tip in disciplining?
   a) Discipline the individual, not the act
   b) Seek more information
   c) Give additional training
   d) Refer the person to another authority

7) What is the purpose of discipline?
   a) To establish a boundary between work and personal life
   b) To allow freedom to some employees while limiting others
   c) To direct and redirect the behavior of employees in an effective and comfortable way to use as managers
   d) To control the hierarchy of the organization

8) Which of these is <u>not</u> a tip in communication?
   a) Use negative rather than the positive
   b) Be aware of your biases
   c) Build a positive communication climate
   d) Give praises (in public)

Appendix J. Updated Habits Of Successful People Learning Assessment

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) What does working from the "Inside Out" mean?
   a) To start with your paradigms, your character, and your motives
   b) To start with your goals in mind
   c) To start with public victories as an end goal
   d) To start by designing a proactive work area

2) What is the principal of habit 1: Be Proactive?
   a) I am free to choose and am responsible for my choices
   b) Think Win/Win
   c) To communicate effectively, we must first understand each other
   d) The whole is greater than the sum of its parts

3) What is the principal of habit 3: Put First Things First?
   a) Things which matter most should never be at the mercy of the things which matter the least
   b) Effective, long-term relationships require mutual respect and mutual benefit
   c) The whole is greater than the sum of its parts
   d) To maintain and increase effectiveness, we must renew ourselves in body, heart, mind, and spirit

4) Which is an example of reactive language?
   a) I can choose a different approach
   b) I control my own feelings
   c) I will
   d) That's just the way I am

5) Which is an example of proactive language?
   a) I must
   b) There's nothing I can do
   c) Let's look at our alternatives
   d) If only

6) Which of these is <u>not</u> a basic element of a personal mission statement?
   a) What do you want to be?
   b) What do you want to do?
   c) What things do you want to have?
   d) Where do you want to be?

7) Which of the situations is more appropriate when relationships are paramount?
   a) Win/win
   b) Win/lose

8) What is the foundation in a Win/Win situation?
   a) Character
   b) Relationships
   c) Agreements
   d) Support system and process

9) How much do people grasp of what they hear?
   a) 10-40%
   b) 40-70%
   c) 70-95%

10) Which of the following is <u>not</u> an important reason for being listened to?
   a) So we are taken seriously
   b) So our ideas and feelings are known
   c) So we feel what we have to say matters
   d) So it doesn't lead to "filling in the gaps"

11) The idea that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts is known as?
   a) Synergy
   b) Cooperation
   c) Networking
   d) Proxemics

Appendix K. Updated Coaching Learning Assessment

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) When involved in their own learning, which is not a way adults learn best?
   a) Diagnosing
   b) Planning
   c) Implementing
   d) Projecting

2) To help individuals feel comfortable as quickly as possible, you should make them:
   a) Feel part of the group
   b) Experience small success early on
   c) See you as more approachable to them
   d) All of the above

3) Which of the following is not a type of learner?
   a) Visual
   b) Auditory
   c) Physical
   d) Spatial

4) What can Non-verbal cues help?
   a) Achieve high-quality information
   b) Represent a much more efficient means of communicating than verbal cues
   c) Both A and B
   d) Neither A nor B

5) What is the degree to which people face toward or away from someone with their body, feet, and head known as?
   a) Body orientation
   b) Diversion
   c) Orientation theory
   d) Masking

6) What is the strongest indication of harmony between two people?
   a) Mirror-image postural congruence
   b) Negative posturing
   c) Positive posturing
   d) Neutral posturing

7) In communication, which indicates a greater interest?
   a) Leaning backward
   b) Leaning forward
   c) Supporting your head in your hand

8) What are two barriers to the transfer of training?
   a) Too much information and spaced learning
   b) Feeling self-conscious and too much information
   c) Overlearning and feeling self-conscious
   d) Spaced learning and overlearning

Appendix L. Updated Basic Supervision Learning Assessment

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) Which is not one of the three general responsibilities of a non-supervisory employee?
   a) Doing a day's work
   b) Being cooperative with his/her supervisor and fellow workers
   c) Following the rules and regulations which apply to him/her and to his work
   d) Creating a safe zone

2) Which is not one of the four general responsibilities of a supervisory employee?
   a) Getting results through people
   b) Passing information
   c) Planning jobs
   d) Using authority properly
   e) Maintaining a hierarchy

3) What is a way to reduce defensiveness?
   a) Go out and find something that is broken
   b) Speak in an critical tone to convey supervisory status
   c) Wait for others to make the first move in relationship building

4) Which is not a fundamental technique/tip in handling people?
   a) Don't criticize, condemn or complain
   b) Throw down a challenge
   c) Create an eager want in the other person
   d) Wait for the other person to approach you

5) What should supervisors routinely do in addition to their supervisory duties?
   a) Share in the actual work production
   b) Manage payroll accounts
   c) Decide on discipline policy
   d) Oversee executive functions

6) A good supervisor should:
   a) Avoid delegating to others
   b) Delegate tasks as needed
   c) Convey leadership strengths by undertaking tasks personally
   d) Liberally delegate tasks to others

7) Subordinates of low-trust managers are typically not:
   a) High performing
   b) Suspicious
   c) Unreceptive
   d) Withholding

8) When it comes to trust, it is recommended to:
   a) Wait for others to open up lines of communication
   b) Find out what the other person thinks is trustworthy behavior
   c) Be a risk taker

Appendix M. Updated Assertive Communication Learning Assessment

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) Which is not a roadblock to assertive communication?
   a) Sending wrong or mixed signals
   b) Fear or negative thinking
   c) Poor self-concept
   d) Lack of concrete skills
   e) Positive self-talk

2) What is the purpose of a coping statement?
   a) To stop the thoughts that led to anxiety, and to replace these thoughts with realistic rational thoughts
   b) To help plan which goals to focus on and which to discard
   c) To build a pathway from confusion to clear understanding

3) What does negative assertion involve?
   a) Accepting the truthful part of a criticism made against you, and stating it in positive terms
   b) Denying the negative criticism outright
   c) Using words that acknowledge the other person's point of view and accepting that it might be true under circumstances, but without accepting that it is true of you
   d) When someone is attacking you ask them for constructive criticism

4) What does negative enquiry involve?
   a) When someone is attacking you ask them for constructive criticism
   b) Acknowledging the other person's point of view and accepting that it might be true under circumstances, but without accepting that it is true of you
   c) Denying the negative criticism outright
   d) Accepting the truthful part of a criticism made against you, and stating it in positive terms

5) What does fogging involve?
   a) When someone is attacking you ask them for constructive criticism
   b) Acknowledging the other person's point of view and accepting that it might be true under circumstances, but without accepting that it is true of you
   c) Denying the negative criticism outright
   d) Accepting the truthful part of a criticism made against you, and stating it in positive terms

6) Which is a recommended communication tool?
   a) DESC communication tool
   b) The SORT approach
   c) The Gateway theory
   d) TAXI communication tool

7) Which is an example of a coping statement?
   a) When this is over, I'll be glad I did it
   b) This will get harder and harder over time
   c) Anxiety is dangerous as well as uncomfortable

8) Which is <u>not</u> a tip for initiating conversation?
   a) Give a compliment
   b) Comment on the situation
   c) Disclose something about yourself
   d) Tell a joke
   e) Ask about personal information

Appendix N. Updated Dealing With Change Learning Assessment

WKU® CONTINUING & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Lifelong Learning | Career & Workforce Development

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) Whereas change is inevitable, what is optimal?
   a) Growth
   b) Fostering dependence
   c) Finding the time to adjust
   d) Developing strategies
   e) Creating a work flow

2) People respond to change based on all of the following except their:
   a) Personal Visions
   b) Personalities
   c) Histories
   d) Education
   e) Perceptions

3) Regarding change, a leader's job is to do all of the following except?
   a) Shape it
   b) Control it
   c) Guide it
   d) Influence it

4) Which is not a signal of change related stress?
   a) Productivity drops
   b) No clear leadership
   c) Gossip and rumors increase
   d) Rules and regulations are made more clear
   e) When good people are recruited away

5) In the cycle of change, which process often follows comfort and control?
   a) Learning acceptance and commitment
   b) Growth and adjustment
   c) Inquiry, experimentation, and discovery
   d) Fear, anger, and resistance

6) Which is not one of the three attitudes toward change?
   a) Advocate
   b) Wobbler
   c) Ambivalent
   d) Critic

7) Which model is a way to identify your reaction to a major change going on in your life right now?
   a) MOVE
   b) STAND
   c) FLOW
   d) ADJUST

8) Which is not a recommended positive strategy for coping with change?
   a) Maintain balance
   b) Develop a plan
   c) Take control
   d) Build resistance
   e) Seek support

Appendix O. Updated A Job Well Done Learning Assessment

Please circle the correct answer to the following questions:

1) In its simplest form, what is ethics?
   a) Knowing what is right
   b) Acting on what is right
   c) Doing what is best for the greatest number of people
   d) Determining the best course of action

2) Which is not one of the elements of ethical leadership?
   a) Make decisions ethically
   b) Be ethical all the time
   c) Determine the simplest way to do something

3) What does the "If it's necessary, it's ethical" approach often lead to?
   a) Ends-justify-the-means reasoning and treating non-ethical tasks or goals as moral imperative
   b) Deciding what you want and then changing ethics to suit your needs
   c) Finding the approach the works best for everyone
   d) Picking the lessor of two evils

4) Why do we often fall into the "necessity trap"?
   a) We overestimate the cost of doing the right thing and underestimate the cost of failing to do so
   b) We think that the simplest outcome is often the most ethical
   c) We underestimate the burdens others face when making ethical decisions
   d) We search for an easy work around for an ethical dilemma and choose that

5) Which rational entails a safety in numbers rationale?
   a) Everyone's doing it
   b) It doesn't hurt anyone
   c) I can still be objective
   d) It's for a good cause

6) The Heinz Dilemma involves?
   a) A train about to crash and a switch
   b) A man thinking about stealing medicine for his wife
   c) A starving family and a loaf of bread
   d) A lifeboat and a bottle of water

7) A strong work ethic often means:

a) Deciding what is best for everyone
b) No short-cuts
c) Working late
d) Finding the balance between complicated and simple

Appendix P. Updated Strategic Planning Learning Assessment

CONTINUING & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Lifelong Learning | Career & Workforce Development

Strategic Planning
Learning Assessment

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1) Strategic Planning is a process whereby management makes choices about overall direction. One such goal within strategic planning is establishing the:
   a) Goals of the organization
   b) Financing of capital assets
   c) Distribution of stock dividends
   d) Election of officers

2) Strategic Planning should be used for each of the following except for:
   a) Finding a vision for the organization
   b) Determining future strategies or objectives
   c) Getting the organization out of crisis
   d) Managing the long-term future

3) Strategic Planning can result in change and people often resist change. People's resistance to change can be reduced by:
   a) Making the planning process extremely formal.
   b) Categorizing the process as re-engineering
   c) Making the process very experimental.
   d) Getting people involved within the process.

4) The first real phase of strategic planning is:
   a) Issuing the Draft Plan
   b) Organizing the Process
   c) Approving the Plan
   d) Developing the Operating Plan

5) In what phase of strategic planning does close identification of strengths and weaknesses take place?
   a) Organizing
   b) Approval of the Plan
   c) Assessment
   d) Implementation

6) A good mission statement should include:
   a) Be extremely specific for measurement
   b) Have references to management
   c) Outline the tactics of the organization
   d) Set direction for the organization

Continued on back

7) Each of the following is important for developing strategic objectives **except:**
   a) Tradeoffs between upper and lower management
   b) How the organization got started
   c) Review of available resource
   d) Strengths and weaknesses of the organization

8) Marco Corporation has included the following statement within its strategic plan: *By December 31st, the Production Department will re-align the Eastern Distribution System to better serve markets in Canada.* This statement is an example of a:
   a) Strategic Goal
   b) Mission Statement
   c) Organizational Weakness
   d) Principle or Value

9) Which of the following controls can help evaluate the performance within an Operating Plan?
   a) Organizational Charts
   b) Budgets
   c) Bank Reconciliations
   d) Audit Reports

10) To help manage unplanned events or "what if" type events, Operating Plans should include:
   a) Approvals by Shareholders
   b) References to Old Plans
   c) Contingency Plans
   d) Profiles of the Organization

Appendix Q. Updated Excel Intermediate II Learning Assessment

CONTINUING & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Lifelong Learning | Career & Workforce Development

Excel Intermediate II
Learning Assessment

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1) What can the first character in the name of a cell not start with?
   a) Letter
   b) Underscore character (_)
   c) Number
   d) Backslash (\ )

2) What is a 3-D reference?
   a) A reference to a cell or a range of cells that spans two or more worksheets in a workbook
   b) A reference to a formula used to total cells on multiple dimensions
   c) A reference to points on a graph of a PivotChart
   d) A reference to a formula used to separate missing data

3) What is conditioning formatting?
   a) A format that Excel automatically applies if a specified condition is true
   b) A format that divides cell ranges by conditions
   c) A format that returns the condition of a cell to normal if it exceeds a certain value
   d) A format that clears the format of a cell when applied

4) What can goal seek be used for?
   a) To find a value that will yield specific results
   b) To find a cell with a particular value
   c) To find the value needed to balance a formula
   d) To find a cell with a particular formula

5) What is an array formula?
   a) A formula that can perform multiple calculations on one or more sets of values and return a single result or multiple results
   b) A formula that can total a range of cells
   c) A formula that can balance a Pivot Table
   d) A formula used to estimate a certain range of values needed

6) What are precedent cells?
   a) Cells referred to in a formula
   b) Cells that contain the formulas that reference particular cells for their data
   c) Cells that introduce a value that is to be alluded to later
   d) Cells that set a format

7) What are dependent cells?

a) Cells that contain the formulas that reference particular cells for their data
b) Cells referred to in a formula
c) Cells that introduce a value that is to be alluded to later
d) Cells that set a format

Appendix R. Updated Dealing With Difficult Personalities Learning Assessment

Dealing With Difficult Personalities
Learning Assessment

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1) What is a characteristic "tank" behavior?
   a) Identifies their target's weakness and uses them it to sabotage the efforts of others
   b) Feels hopeless and overwhelmed by an unfair world
   c) Assumes the ends justifies the means
   d) Does not know much but is not deterred by this fact

2) What is a characteristic "Yes" person behavior?
   a) Feels helpless and overwhelmed by an unfair world
   b) Loud, forceful, confrontational, and often angry
   c) Leaves a trail of unfinished work and broken promises
   d) Starving for attention and recognition

3) What is a characteristic "time bomb" person behavior?
   a) Unfocused ranting and raving
   b) No verbal or nonverbal feedback
   c) The ultimate in pushy demanding behavior
   d) Uses rude comments, biting sarcasm or a well-timed roll of the eyes to make their target look foolish

4) What is a characteristic "no" person behavior"?
   a) Hopelessness, despair, and frustration are their man products
   b) Procrastinates in hopes a better choice will present itself
   c) No verbal or nonverbal feedback
   d) Quick to agree, but slow to respond

5) When the intent to **"to get it done"** is thwarted, behavior becomes more controlling. Which of the following is <u>not</u> one of the likely behavior types people are as likely to become?
   a) Tanks
   b) Sniper
   c) Know-it-all
   d) The time bomb

6) What is meant by blending?
   a) Any behavior where you reduce differences between you and someone else to move to common ground

b) Any behavior where you use that rapport to change the direction of an interaction to occur
c) Any behavior used to change the behavior type of someone from negative to positive
d) Any behavior where people understand you feel what they are feeling

7) What is a recommended strategy for dealing with "the sniper" behaviors?
   a) Open their mind to new ideas
   b) Form a problem-solving alliance
   c) Get commitments you count on
   d) Bring them out of hiding

Appendix S. Learning Assessment Difficulty Analysis

Team Decision Making

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) What are moral values directly linked to?	100	0	Easy
2) Which category of decision making is described by doing what is right for everyone?	85.7	14.3	Easy
3) What does framing a decision involve?	71.4	28.6	Medium
4) Which of the following is not included in the decision making objectives?	28.6	71.4	Hard
5) What are two poor approaches to making group decision making work well?	85.7	14.3	Easy
6) Which category of decision making is described by a response to avoid punishment?	42.9	57.1	Hard
7) After defining objectives, setting parameters, collecting information, and exploring alternatives, a choice can be often made clear by examining?	100	0	Easy
8) Typically, the greater the risk…	85.7	14.3	Easy
9) Mistakes are often made when?	100	0	Easy

Note. $n = 7$

Time Management

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) Which is not of the four "D"s of prioritizing?	42.9	57.1	Hard
2) Which is not a reason for procrastinating?	100	0	Easy
3) Which is not a good place to use your waiting time?	85.7	14.3	Easy
4) Which of these is not one of the five objectives in setting goals?	100	0	Easy
5) When should you save the easiest tasks for?	100	0	Easy
6) In prioritizing, it is important to ask yourself each of the following except:	28.6	71.4	Medium
7) Knowledge from external sources is great, but…	100	0	Easy
8) Which is not a tip for managing your energy levels?	100	0	Easy
9) Which of these is not a tip for doing research?	100	0	Easy
10) In prioritizing, it is best to:	57.1	42.9	Medium

Note. $n = 7$

Easier Said Than Done

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) How much meaning is understood through non-verbal communication?	28.6	71.4	Hard
2) Which of these is not an indication someone is lying?	85.7	14.3	Easy
3) Which are feelings and emotions more accurately revealed by?	100	0	Easy
4) The non-verbal portion of communication?	57.1	42.9	Medium
5) Emotions are expressed more clearly on which side of the face?	71.4	28.6	Medium
6) Proxemics is the study of:	71.4	28.6	Medium
7) Which is the primary source of information in interpersonal communication?	71.4	28.6	Medium
8) Non-verbal communication is:	85.7	14.3	Easy
9) Mirroring another's body language is known as:	28.6	71.4	Hard
10) Active listening does not include:	14.3	85.7	Hard

Note. $n = 7$

Effective Discipline

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) What is a rule to remember when disciplining employees?	14.3	85.7	Hard
2) Which of these is not a characteristic of a progressive discipline system?	57.1	42.9	Medium
3) Which Behavior reinforcement theory teaches about principals of behavior in shaping behavior?	85.7	14.3	Easy
4) Which of these is not a recommended measurement, rule, or guideline?	100	0	Easy
5) Which is not a recommendation for managing conflict effectively?	57.1	42.9	Medium
6) Which of these is not a tip in disciplining?	28.6	71.4	Hard
7) The purpose of discipline is to?	100	0	Easy
8) Which of these is not a tip in communication?	85.7	14.3	Easy

Note. $n = 7$

Habits of Successful People

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) What does working from the "Inside Out" mean?	42.9	57.1	Hard
2) What is the principal of habit 1: Be Proactive?	57.1	42.9	Medium
3) What is the principal of habit 3: Put First Things First?	28.6	71.4	Hard
4) Which is an example of Reactive language?	57.1	42.9	Medium
5) Which is an example of Proactive Language?	28.6	71.4	Hard
6) Which of these is not a basic element of a personal mission statement?	42.9	57.1	Hard
7) Which of the situations is more appropriate when relationships are paramount?	100	0	Easy
8) What is the foundation in a Win/Win situation?	100	0	Easy
9) How much do people grasp of what they hear?	57.1	42.9	Medium
10) Which of the following is not a reason for the importance of being listened to?	71.4	28.6	Medium
11) The idea that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts is known as?	100	0	Easy

Note. $n = 7$

Coaching

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) When being involved in a task, which is not a way adults learn best?	42.9	57.1	Hard
2) To help individuals feel comfortable as quickly as possible, you should make them:	100	0	Easy
3) Which of the following is not a type of learner?	42.9	57.1	Hard
4) Non-verbal cues can help?	71.4	28.6	Medium
5) What is the degree to which people face toward or away from someone with their body, feet, and head known as?	100	0	Easy
6) What is the strongest indication of harmony between two people?	28.6	71.4	Hard
7) In communication, which indicates a greater interest?	85.7	14.3	Easy
8) What are two barriers to the transfer of training?	100	0	Easy

Note. $n = 7$

Basic Supervision

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) Which is not one of the three general responsibilities of a nonsupervisory employee?	28.6	71.4	Hard
2) Which is not one of the four general responsibilities of a supervisory employee?	57.1	42.9	Medium
3) What is a way to reduce defensiveness?	28.6	71.4	Hard
4) Which is not a fundamental technique tip in handling people?	42.9	57.1	Hard
5) What do many supervisors do in addition to their supervisory duties?	71.4	28.6	Medium
6) A good supervisor should:	42.9	57.1	Hard
7) Subordinates of low-trust managers are typically not:	42.9	57.1	Hard
8) When it comes to trust, it is recommended to:	14.3	835.7	Hard

Note. $n = 7$

Assertive Communication

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) Which is not a roadblock to assertive communication?	85.7	14.3	Easy
2) What is the purpose of a coping statement?	85.7	14.3	Easy
3) What does Negative Assertion involve?	14.3	85.7	Hard
4) What does Negative Enquiry involve?	42.9	57.1	Hard
5) What does fogging involve?	28.6	71.4	Hard
6) Which is a recommended Communication tool?	42.9	57.1	Hard
7) Which is an example of a coping statement?	100	0	Easy
8) Which is not a tip for initiating conversation?	71.4	28.6	Medium

Note. $n = 7$

Dealing With Change

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) Whereas change is inevitable, what is optimal?	87.5	12.5	Easy
2) People respond to change based on all of the following except their:	25	75	Hard
3) Regarding change, a leader's job is to do all of the following except?	100	0	Easy
4) Which is not a signal of change related stress?	100	0	Easy
5) In the cycle of change, which process often follows comfort and control?	0	100	Hard
6) Which is not one of the three attitudes toward change?	75	25	Easy
7) Which model is a way to identify your reaction to a major change going on in your life right now?	25	75	Hard
8) Which is not a recommended positive strategy for coping with change?	62.5	37.5	Medium

Note. $n = 8$

A Job Well Done

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) In its simplest form, what is ethics?	12.5	87.5	Hard
2) Which is not one of the elements of ethical leadership?	87.5	12.5	Easy
3) What does the "If it's necessary, it's ethical" approach often lead to?	100	0	Easy
4) Why do we often fall into the "necessity trap"?	62.5	37.5	Medium
5) Which of the following rationales entails a safety in numbers rationale?	50	50	Hard
6) The Heinz Dilemma involves?	87.5	12.5	Easy
7) A strong work ethic often means:	75	25	Easy

Note. $n = 8$

Strategic Planning

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) Strategic Planning is a process whereby management makes choices about overall direction. One such goal within strategic planning is establishing the:	100	0	Easy
2) Strategic Planning should be used for each of the following except for:	100	0	Easy
3) Strategic Planning can result in change and people often resist change. People's resistance to change can be reduced by:	100	0	Easy
4) The first real phase of strategic planning is:	62.5	37.5	Medium
5) In what phase of strategic planning does close identification of strengths and weaknesses take place?	62.5	37.5	Medium
6) A good mission statement should include:	50	50	Hard
7) Each of the following is important for developing strategic objectives except:	75	25	Easy
8) Marco Corporation has included the following statement within its strategic plan: *By December 31st, the Production Department will re-align the Eastern Distribution System to better serve markets in Canada.* This statement is an example of a:	87.5	12.5	Easy
9) Which of the following controls can help evaluate the performance within an Operating Plan?	37.5	62.5	Hard
10) To help manage unplanned events or "what if" type events, Operating Plans should include:	87.5	12.5	Easy

Note. $n = 8$

Excel Intermediate II

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) What can the first character in the name of a cell not start with?	62.5	37.5	Medium
2) What is a 3-D reference?	50	50	Hard
3) What is conditioning formatting?	87.5	12.5	Easy
4) What can goal seek be used for?	62.5	37.5	Medium
5) What is an array formula?	87.5	12.5	Easy
6) What are precedent cells?	50	50	Hard
7) What are dependent cells?	25	75	Hard

Note. $n = 8$

Dealing With Difficult Personalities

Item	% Correct	% Incorrect	Item Difficulty
1) What is a characteristic “tank” behavior?	25	75	Hard
2) What is a characteristic “Yes” person behavior?	50	50	Hard
3) What is a characteristic “time bomb” person behavior?	28.6	71.4	Hard
4) What is a characteristic “no” person behavior?	0	100	Hard
5) When the intent to “to get it done” is thwarted, behavior becomes more controlling. Which of the following is not one of the likely behavior types people are as likely to become?	25	75	Hard
6) What is meant by blending?	100	0	Easy
7) What is a recommended strategy for dealing with “the sniper” behaviors?	62.5	37.5	Medium

Note. $n = 8$