

AN EVALUATION OF TRAINING IN BUSINESS

by
Kylee Krause

A Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
With a Major in

Applied Psychology

Approved: 4 Semester Credits

Investigation Advisor

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout
May, 2004

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751

ABSTRACT

<u>Krause</u>	<u>Kylee</u>	<u>J</u>
(Writer) (Last Name)	(First Name)	(Middle Initial)
<hr/>		
<u>An Evaluation of Training in Business</u>		
(Title)		
<hr/>		
<u>Applied Psychology</u>	<u>James Tan</u>	<u>May, 2004</u> <u>33</u>
(Degree program)	(Advisor)	(date) (# of pages)
<hr/>		
<u>American Psychological Association</u>		<u>5th edition</u>
(Style Manual used)		

The research was conducted to determine if the training program was effective in terms of learning. The study took place at a retail store in a Midwestern city. There were 12 participants who were all active employees involved in the new team-member training. The training session was four hours in length and covered important information that is essential for new employees. The participants were given a pre-test and a post-test immediately after the training. Three weeks later they were assessed once again with a post-test. The results show that the participants' scores increased after the training session. However, scores decreased on the second quiz that covered situational judgment questions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are so many to thank who contributed to my success in graduate school. First of all my husband Kyle Staebell who endured my late night classes and late nights at the library. And for his never ending encouragement and support. To my parents and sister who believed in me and encouraged me to be whatever I wanted in life. To my TOD family who strongly encouraged me to just “get it done!” Thank you to my graduate school posse (Ashley, Ashlee, Erin, Steve, Andy and Matt) who were always there for advice and encouragement. To Dr. Tom Franklin who has influenced my life in more ways than he will ever know. To my wonderful Advisor Dr. James Tan who lightened up the mood with his sense of humor and sarcastic nature. And for his compulsive attention to detail. Last but not least to UW-Stout who creates a positive and success minded environment for us to learn in.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
<i>Statement of the Problem</i>	1
<i>Purpose of the Study</i>	2
<i>Definition of Terms</i>	2
<i>Limitations of the Study</i>	3
<i>Methodology</i>	4
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	21
<i>Subject Selection and Description</i>	21
<i>Instrumentation</i>	21
<i>Data Collection Procedures</i>	22
<i>Data Analysis</i>	23
<i>Limitations</i>	23
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	24
<i>Item Analysis</i>	27
<i>Table 1</i>	28
<i>Table 2</i>	29
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION.....	30

<i>Limitations</i>	30
<i>Conclusions</i>	30
<i>Recommendations</i>	31
<i>Implications</i>	31
References.....	32

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Training is a costly yet vital part of operating a successful business in our country. It is the process through which employees learn their job for the first time. It can also be the means through which incumbents' knowledge is furthered so they can enhance their job performance. Whether a business is training an hourly worker or top executive this process affects the bottom line indirectly and thoroughly. According to Allerton (1997) businesses in the United States spend \$55.3 billion annually on training and expenses associated with this procedure. However, figures for the customer service industry shows that it spends much higher- approximately spends \$162 million on training (Allerton, 1997).

Statement of the Problem

In most organizations, training is typically evaluated using reactions data (Saari, Johnson, McLaughlin, & Zimmerle, 1988). The participants are asked about their satisfaction level of the training program, content and trainer. Companies should be evaluating their programs using data that show the amount of learning and transfer that takes place once the person returns to their job.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the training program to determine if the participants are gaining and retaining the knowledge presented in the training classes. The company only uses reactions data to determine if their training programs are effective. This will be the first study to show whether or not the employees are learning and retaining the information they are trained on. Through this study the company could better determine the worth of their training program and make any necessary improvements to facilitate learning.

Definition of Terms

Assessment. The assessments are comprised of two quizzes. The third assessment is comprised of two quizzes and four tests.

Assessment 1. The pre-test given before the training session.

Assessment 2. The post-test given immediately after the training session.

Assessment 3. The post-test given two weeks after the first post-test.

Quiz One. This quiz covers questions that are directly from the training material. The questions cover a broad range of topics that are important for a new employee to learn.

Quiz Two. This quiz covers questions constructed by a subject matter expert. The questions are situational judgment questions where the employee is asked to choose the best response.

Self-monitoring scale. This test is designed to see if participants change their behavior according to social cues or if they demonstrate consistent behavior in all situations.

PANAS. The PANAS scale measures positive and negative affectivity. The degree to which a person possesses these outlooks can impact their learning.

Button GOS. This test deciphers whether a person has a learning goal orientation or performance goal orientation. These two different ways of evaluating learning can influence how a person learns and how much they learn.

GOS. This test was designed specifically to assess the learning styles in adults in the workplace. It is an extension of the Button GOS.

Limitations of the Study

A larger sample size would have been more desirable in order to increase the amount of confidence placed on statistical findings. A few of the participants had worked in the company before but needed to repeat the training as new employees. Therefore, they may have already known some of the information prior to the training class. In terms of demographics the population was very homogeneous. It was mostly comprised of white, young females. This is however a fair representation of the demographics within the entire store.

Methodology

The participants were assessed at three different times during the training. They took a pre-test and two post-tests. The third assessment was given three weeks after the initial training. They were also assessed on personality and motivational factors that contribute to learning.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Training costs include the business to either purchase or construct their training materials that are relevant to their corporation (Hubbard, 1995). The trainer must also be compensated whether or not this person is internal (e.g., human resource personnel, store trainer) or external (e.g., out trainer/consultant). There are cost advantages for having in-house trainers for your organization. Initially there will be costs in developing the program. Some costs may only occur once at the beginning or not until the equipment or training materials are in need of replacement or updates. As for companies who hire externally there are some costs to consider before an outside source is hired. Smaller companies will have to pay the same amount for the trainer even though their class size may be much smaller than large companies. If the trainer is external they may need to fly in to train your employees. If your organization is located in several locations this person will need to be compensated for travel and training costs.

The space in which the training must take place needs to be considered. Will the training be held on or off-site? Student materials must be developed and produced. All of the costs and other miscellaneous resources are part of the expense that organization's take on as part of their training programs.

Hubbard (1995) suggests that all training programs should be evaluated. There are many reasons as to why it is essential that training is evaluated. According to Kraiger, Ford and Salas (1993) the most important reason is to discover if learning has taken place in the training session. Learning can take place mentally, emotionally or by a change in the level of skill a person acquires. Companies and especially decision makers will want

to understand how and why the training program is effective. And more than anything is the program cost effective? Training is costly but there are costs that are not monetary by nature but that can ultimately impact the cost-effectiveness of the company.

The cost of not training employees is something that all organizations should consider (Hubbard, 1995). These can have long lasting and highly negative impacts on the employees and the profitability of the company. Not training employees can yield a reduction in employee morale, a productivity decrease, more turn-over and increased errors in production.

The issue of instructor versus computer based-training is hotly debated within the world of training. Desai (2000) indicates that the need for computer literacy is at an all time high. Companies are depending on the use of computers in everyday work as well as training systems. The difficult issue is motivating employees to learn how to use the new technology. An even bigger issue that is part of the debate discusses which is more effective, computer or instructor based training? This study found that employees learned more from the computer based training immediately after the training and retained more information one month after the training had taken place. The issue that the researcher discovered was that even though employees learned more from the computer based training they did not accept it as well as a training tool. The study makes the suggestion that computer training could occur first and then be followed up by training where the instructor presents the information. Learning styles also play a part in which training program is more effective. Those who learn primarily visually may benefit more from the computer based learning system.

Hypothesis 1: The participants learn information from the instructor based training session.

Hypothesis 2: The participants will retain the information learned in the instructor based training session.

Computer-based training is a tool that many companies are beginning or have implemented in order to training their employees in a standard method. According to Brown (2001) computer-based training provides employees with more personal control in terms of how quickly and what they learn. The study found however that these aspects which may be seen as an avenue to increase effectiveness may actually be to the learner's detriment. In terms of control, the employee may make ill use of their time. They might elect to breeze through practice sessions or skip them all together. The practice sessions may be vital to the through understanding of the material. It may also hinder the transfer of knowledge from the training course to the job. Employees may also speed through the course in order to finish the program quickly in order to move on to more appealing tasks.

According to Leeds (1996) one-on-one training is one way to allow your best employees to train your up and coming best employees. This type of training is comparable to coaching where the trainee is given information in a way that is conducive to their learning pace and style. They are allowed time to reflect and clarify any misunderstanding of information. All of the trainer's attention is narrowly focused on the person being trained. The person feels more in control of their learning environment. The idea of one-on-one training is also a wise decision financially. According to the article companies spend anywhere from \$50,000 for three days of intense training for

their employees. One-on-one training could have been done for \$12,000 to \$36,000 for six employees in need of the training. However, in one-on-one training the trainer must be properly trained to teach the tasks. If not then the new team members will learn the wrong way to carry out the task. One-on-one training is also very time-consuming. The trainer and the team member must have scheduled time together in order to learn all of the information. People learn at different paces so eight hours of training may be enough for one person but not another.

Many companies such as the retail industry have a strong need to train employees to be customer focused. According to Brown (2003) the smart company's are taking this approach very seriously. Managers can not be there physically to solve all problems that arise throughout the day. Brown suggests that employees should feel empowered to handle the situation with the customer's best interest in mind. Employees can be taught to recognize the larger picture when it comes to their job. How does their job impact the whole scope of things? Employees who deal with people all day will eventually have a difficult time smiling at the 100th customer who comes in. Companies who understand this are helping their employees learn how to overcome these emotional barriers. Many of them are doing this through redesigning the job, rotating jobs and involving employees fully in their jobs. Culture plays a tremendous role in how employees will respond to a situation. Training programs done during orientation for new employees can facilitate this. They new hires can be taught what is expected of them and how they can service the customer in the best possible way. Managers and leaders can also teach this by modeling the behavior the company expects of its employees.

Training is a need that all organizations have in order to employ competent and efficient workers. However, there are large differences between a training program and an effective training program. Tall and Hall (1998) suggest that the training program can provide information and learning as well as other benefits to employees. People can divulge what they feel they need and communicate with the entire team in a more effective manner. Training can help to foster a sense of family or community among the people who work together. It can produce a positive self image and confidence. If people feel more competent it brings about a sense of self worth that spills over into ones work performance.

Tall and Hall (1998) state that no matter what type of style of learning one uses there are some important elements that must be in place for the training to be effective. Communication is a major key to the learning environment. People will be able to rid themselves of their fear or disregard any misunderstandings about the purpose of the learning. Open discussion is also important for the participants to voice their opinions and ask any questions. The trainer should indicate what the training goals and objectives are at the beginning of the session. This will help to maintain focus during the learning process. It should also be explained how the training will benefit the employee as well as the company in the long run.

The article also suggests that obstacles can impede the learning process so it is important to address them initially (Tall & Hall, 1998). Participants need to understand the goals and objectives of the training. If this is not done then learning will not continue for those involved. All of the camps must buy into the idea that this training is beneficial to the company as a whole. This is especially true for management otherwise the training

may never be implemented to begin with. Managers should ask for input and suggestions from the employees as to topics they would like to learn more about and learning styles they prefer. Training should allow enough time for learning to take place but not enough time for participants to become bored and uninterested. All distractions should be considered and planned for. Trainers should also be aware of the wide range of skills that could potentially be present within the learning session. If all of these issues are taken into consideration beforehand the program has an excellent chance of training its employees effectively.

Developing an effective training program is only important if the training is actually needed. According to Brown (2002) this is an ever evolving process by which a company evaluates if its employees are in need of training. The author states that there are four main reasons as to why a company would need a training program. First, the organization wants to discover and correct a problem area. This will be more effective than arbitrarily choosing a training program that may not be needed. Second, management support is needed or the training program will not have a chance of being implemented. According to Hays (1984) training can be hindered when top management is not supportive of the training program. The participants may not be as willing to learn or there may be a lack of resources or funding. He suggests that using marketing techniques can increase the chances that the training program will be accepted by management. Marketing is different from sales because it seeks out the needs of the potential clients. Then brainstorming is done in order to find the best program to solve the issue. In order for trainers to be successful in implementing their training programs Hays states that they should research to the clients needs in depth. Then they should

work side by side with management to procure a solution. This allows for the management team to feel a sense of ownership for the training program (Hays, 1984).

This will help to ensure buy in from the team and keep the program a float.

The leaders need to understand that training has a direct effect on the performance of their department as well as the bottom line financially. Third, in order for an evaluation to be conducted there will need to be preliminary data collected even before the training program is implemented. Fourth, it is important to be able to distinguish the costs as well as the benefits of the training. Managers and organizational leaders will want to know if the training is worth their money.

Brown (2002) indicates that tests are a means through which to gather useful data from employees. They can be constructed in order to assess the level of understanding an employee possess about their position. Tests are easily administered in a specific setting or the employee can fill them out from their home. This type of data collection is a great way to assess deficiencies in the skills of various employees or a specific target group.

Tests may be an efficient way to collect data but they may not be effective. Effectiveness is an important aspect of a training program otherwise the training is obsolete. Kraiger (2002), states that training now is more important than ever. Due to the global economy, businesses have more intense competition throughout the United States and the world. The marketplace is changing at a record speed and those who want to compete need to continue evolving. This includes having a customer focused workforce who can provide information and service like no other. This also means that companies need to attract and retain the best and brightest.

According to Kraiger (2002) there are several ways to ensure effective training in the workplace. Companies need to be evaluating their programs which research has shown that only 25% of them are taking this very necessary step. Most companies use reactions data where employees state their satisfaction with the information and the trainer. The participants in the training programs must be willing and ready to learn the material. They need to have motivation or a compelling reason to absorb the information. The information in the training program must be learned and transferred to the job. The participants must know why the training is occurring. The information presented needs to be significant to the trainees. They must be able to practice their knowledge and receive feedback from the trainers as to their progress. Furthermore, Alliger and his colleagues (Alliger & Janak, 1989; Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennett, Traver, & Shotland, 1997) showed that reactions data is correlated weakly at best with learning, behavior, and results data. In fact, Tan, Hall, & Boyce (2003) found that those who reported disliking the training program actually learned the most.

Additionally, there are specific characteristics that contribute to the facilitation of the learning. First, is the trainability of the people considered for the training program. Their cognitive ability impacts the amount of information they learn (Ree & Earles, 1992). Employees also need to possess the basic skills and minimum cognitive ability needed to perform the job. Second, their personality and specifically the trait of conscientiousness impacts the amount of learning that takes place (Kraiger, 2002). People who possess this trait tend to be dependable, responsible, organized, and strive toward achievement. Those who believe that they can learn are highly motivated to learn and value goals.

Goal orientation

A person's goal orientation has been shown to impact the learning and retention of knowledge (Kraiger, 2002). If a person has a master goal orientation they seek to gain new skills and experiences. Through this learning they strive to be more competent in the subject they are studying. They place a higher stress on learning and understanding the information. They also accept constructive criticism well and view it as a way to improve their skills. These people tend to be more motivated and actually learn more than people who are performance goal oriented.

People who have an orientation toward performance tend to be concerned with the end results. They would be content with an "A" even if they did not learn anything in the course. Anxiety can also impair learning. Those who have anxiety when learning tend to become distracted easily (Kraiger, 2002). Anxiety is shown to have a negative relationship to motivation and learning because it impedes the process (Kraiger, 2002). Lastly, trainees who are older tend to learn and participate less in training programs (Kraiger, 2002). It is important to point out the ease of learning something new so that they are open to the new knowledge or skills.

Dweck (1986) suggested that individual motivation can affect how children use the skills and knowledge they have learned thus far in their lives, the extent to which they learn new knowledge and skills and the extent to which they can use that knowledge when attempting new and foreign situations. The research shows that children tend to use and learn new information differently based on the type of motivational disposition they possess. Children with performance goal orientation tend to believe that intelligence

is a fixed quality and that their level of ability is what determines their amount of success (Dweck, 1986). If this child tries something new and the result is not positive they will internalize that and see it as a result of their low ability level.

Children with a learning goal orientation see intelligence as changeable and see effort as the way to be successful. They also tend to choose a task by the amount of learning that will happen as a result of the task completion. Learning goal orientation also fosters problem-solving by learning and creating new strategies to complete a task (Dweck, 1986). These children had more transfer of information take place than did the children with a performance goal orientation of learning.

Motivational and career attitudes can interfere with the amount of learning that takes place. The degree to which a person possesses self-efficacy can help or hinder their ability to learn. If one believes that they can learn something then they will be able to comprehend the material. Likewise, if a person does not think that they can learn information then they will create a psychological block which will impede learning. Also, if a person highly identifies themselves with their job then they will be more motivated to increase their knowledge, skills and abilities, moreover; increasing positive feelings toward themselves (Kraiger, 2002).

Button and Mathieu (1996) found that college students who perceived learning through learning goal orientation were more likely to believe that they personally had control over the events in their life including their learning capabilities. Those who held the performance goal orientation were more likely to worry about whom was evaluating their performance and how they would score compared to peers. Also, those with the

learning goal orientation were more likely to continue the completion of a task and were less likely to quit the task purposefully than those with performance goal orientation.

In terms of organizational concerns the authors suggest that those with learning goal orientation are more likely to continue to challenge themselves where performance goal oriented people will not increase the level of challenges in order to maintain positive evaluations by oneself and their superiors (Button & Mathieu, 1996). This study also holds major implication specifically for training programs. Those with performance goal orientation may be hesitant to partake in a training program. Their level of motivation, amount of learning in the program and transfer of knowledge to the job may be effected. Motivation can play an important role in the amount of information that is learned in the training program. The individual can interact with the environment depending on their perspective of learning and social cues.

The learning process is more important than the outcome of the learning. Those with a performance goal orientation see intelligence and competence as being unchangeable. People often feel the need to display their level of ability to others with the end result being an attractive outcome. Vandewalle (1997) saw performance goal orientation in two distinct components. The first is prove goal orientation where people attempt to prove their abilities and skills to themselves and others. The avoid goal orientation component is when people avoid being viewed as not having abilities and skills by others and themselves.

Hypothesis 3: Participants with a learning goal orientation will retain more knowledge by the second and third assessments.

Hypothesis 4: Participants with a performance goal orientation will not retain as much knowledge by the second and third assessments as those with learning goal orientation.

When implementing a training program developers must keep in mind the types of individuals that will be learning in the sessions. Employees' motivational styles can influence how much if any information is learned in the training. Button and Mathieu (1996) conclude that there are two ways in which people view learning. The first is performance goal where individuals want to show competence and are avoiding the possibility of appearing incompetent. Those operating under this perspective want to avoid challenges and view failure as a testament to their personal lack of ability. Competence is seen as stable and unable to change therefore it is pointless to seek out new challenges and learning above one's current state of competency. In the second style, learning goal orientation people want to learn something new and different as well as increase their competence level. Challenges are seen as an opportunity to grow and so is failure. Competence is not fixed and can be increased through learning.

VandeWalle (1997) developed the goal orientation scale in order to assess this dimension in the workplace. Most of the previous studies analyzed goal orientation in adolescents. Research thus far used a two-factor model where learning goal and performance goal orientation were seen as on the opposite ends of the spectrum. If a person has a learning goal orientation they tend to see intelligence as fluid and able to be

improved. People who fall into this style try to increase the amount of knowledge, skills and abilities that they possess.

Hypothesis 5: Participants with learning goal orientation will learn more but may not perform as well on the assessments.

Self-monitoring

Snyder (1974) proposed the idea that people are able to control their nonverbal behavior, behavior and the perception that others will make of them through self-monitoring behaviors. He found that individuals vary as to the amount they can and will do these behaviors. Cheng and Chartrand (2003) found that high self-monitors will tend to imitate the behavior of someone who they see as a peer or someone who is of higher status than them. Low self-monitors demonstrate the same behaviors no matter who they are interacting with. High self-monitors tend to observe and utilize the social cues around them that dictate how they should behave in the situation.

The study by Snyder (1974) showed that people generally fall into two groups in terms of self-monitoring behaviors. High self-monitors adjust their behaviors to the social situation. They behave in ways that others would consider to be appropriate in the given situation. Low self-monitors express how they truly feel on the inside rather than what is viewed as socially acceptable. This could have an impact on training for each group. High self-monitors pay attention and will not fall asleep because that is the appropriate thing to do, even if they are not interested in the material. Low self-monitors may not pay attention if they are not interested in the material and are bored (Snyder,

1974). If the group contains more low self-monitors they could influence the high self-monitors not to pay attention since they tend to use cues from the environment to base their personal behavior on.

Due to their awareness of social situations and their use of social cues high self-monitors tend to emerge as leaders in group situations (Eby, Cader, Noble, 2003). The others in the group rated them higher in terms of their leadership abilities. High self-monitors were also nominated for the leadership positions more often than low self-monitors. One of the main reasons for this occurring was due to the high self-monitors ability to display task structuring within the group. These tasks consisted of decision making, planning and organizing, taking initiative, and problem solving. These individual differences were what allowed high self-monitors to be elected into the leadership position of a small group of individuals more often than low self-monitors.

The 18 item survey was more internally consistent meaning that the items were more related to one another. It was also a better measurement of self-monitoring than was the 25 item survey (Snyder and Copeland, 1986).

Hypothesis 6: Those who score high on the self-monitoring scales will perform better on assessment 1 and assessment 2 due to the interpersonal interaction and intense supervision.

Hypothesis 7: Those who score high on the self-monitoring scales will perform worse on assessment 3 due to the low amount of interpersonal interaction and intense supervision.

Hypothesis 8: Those who score low on the self-monitoring scales will perform worse on the 1 and 2 assessments due to the high amount of interpersonal interaction and intense supervision.

Hypothesis 9: Those who score low on the self-monitoring scales will perform better on the 3 assessment due to the low amount of interpersonal interaction and intense supervision.

The self-monitoring behaviors of individuals can produce many impacts within organizations. When people are in the job hunting process they proceed in different ways. The high self-monitors tend to prepare themselves very well by researching the companies as well as discovering their own abilities and interests. They tend to seek out people who can connect them to a job or a company such as friends, family members or co-workers. High self-monitors prefer jobs where their job duties are described in great detail and laid out precisely. Low self-monitors prefer jobs where they can maintain their personal identity and uniqueness. Organizations should remember to use a variety of recruiting strategies in order to attract all types of people to the company. Otherwise the pool will be small and homogeneous (Snyder and Copeland, 1986).

Interviewing is another area where these two groups of people tend to behave very differently. High self-monitors will answer interview questions in a way that makes them seem perfect for this job. Low self-monitors will answer the questions how they truly feel and behave. These characteristics are very important because they can influence who is awarded the position. If people are conforming their attitudes and beliefs to how they think they should be then when they are placed in the job it may not

be the right fit. It is advantageous for companies to be aware of these behaviors when they are recruiting and selecting their employees (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1989).

Positive and negative affectivity

Watson and Clark (1988) conducted a study on negative and positive affect scales. They determined that the reliability and validity of many previous scales to be questionable. The researchers wanted to create a scale that would accurately and correctly measure the two constructs. Watson and Clark wanted the instrument to be short and concise. They constructed an instrument that covered 20 items with 10 for each construct. Positive and Negative affect are two dimensions of mood. Some people tend to be higher on one than on the other. Positive affect is associated with feeling good and being in a state of being focused, energized and happiness. Negative affect is associated with unpleasant or unhappy feelings. The research shows that the PANAS is internally consistent. The measures also produce similar, stable results over a 2 month span of time.

Hypothesis10: Participants with positive affect will perform better on the training assessments.

Hypothesis 11: Participants with negative affect will perform worse on the training assessments than those with positive affect.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Training is an expensive and time consuming task that companies consider to be essential to the functioning of their business. However, many companies and organizations do not know if their training is effective. This study was to discover whether or not the training program in hand is effective in terms of the participants learning and retaining the information.

Subject Selection and Description

Twelve new employees participated voluntarily in the research project. The store employees 125 total employees. The employees were recently hired at the retail store operating in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. There were 10 female new hires and two male new hires. All of the new hires were Caucasian. There were 10 part-time employees and 2 full-time employees. The participants were a mix of sales associates from all selling areas of the store. The participants will be given three assessments at three different times. This will help to determine if the employees learned and then if they retained the knowledge they acquired so that it can be transferred to the job.

Instrumentation

The first quiz was constructed by reading through the training material and identifying key information that the participants should take with them. The second quiz was constructed by interviewing a subject matter expert and determining the questions and appropriate answers to the questions. All of the assessments are paper and pencil

tests. Quiz one assesses the knowledge they acquire through the training course. Quiz two consists of questions derived from a subject matter expert on job content. The first and second assessments are exactly the same except the questions are in a different order to control for practice effects. The third assessment is exactly the same except for the order of the questions and it also contains four additional tests. Those include The Positive and Negative Affectivity Scale (Watson & Clark, 1988), Button Goal Orientation Scale (Button et al., 1996), Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974) and The Vandewalle's Goal Orientation Scale (Vandewalle, 1996). The motivational surveys that are found only in the third assessment come from research in training and industrial and organizational psychology. They will assess individual differences in terms of motivation and learning.

Data collection Procedures

The participants will be trained in a classroom setting. The training lasts for four hours with a 15 minute break half-way through. The data will be collected at three different times. First the participants will complete the packet of questions before the training session. Then they will complete the same packet immediately following the training session. Three weeks later the same packet but also including the four motivation assessments will be placed in their work mailboxes. They will be asked to complete the packets, place them in the stamped envelopes and mail them to the researcher.

Data analysis

To analyze the data the Statistical program SPSS version 11.0 was used (2003). Paired sample T-Tests were used to analyze the composite scores between the scores on quiz one for the pre-test and the post-test. An One-way ANOVA was used to compare the scores between the first, second and third assessments. The PANAS was calculated by totaling the scores for the positive and negative affect scales. The Self-Monitoring Scale was computed by summing the items. The Goal Orientation was arrived at by correlating the three total scores for learning, prove and avoid for each individual participant. A total score was also reached for the intelligence level. Totals for the Button GOS were calculated by summing the total scores for the two constructs of learning and performance.

Limitations

The research design was quasi-experimental which only allowed for correlational analysis to be conducted. The sample size was considerably small therefore conclusions can only be drawn with a small amount of confidence. The sample was also very homogenous in terms of sex, race and age.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The study was conducted to discover the level of effectiveness for the training program in question. The assessments were given to the same group of participants at three different time periods. This was to show effectiveness and well as information retention. The participants did learn information from the instructor based training session. For quiz one which covered the material in the training class the mean for the pre-test was 11.17 and the mean for the post-test was 12.58. There was a change from pre to post-test. The significance level was .89. Therefore the change was not statistically significant. For quiz two which was based on situational judgment questions the mean for the pre-test was 15.08 and the mean for the post-test was 14.67. The significance level was .34. There was a moderate correlation even though not significant, probably due to the small sample size. There was not a change in scored form pre to post-test.

The participants did retain the information learned in the instructor based training session. The participants did retain the information learned from the pre-test to the post-test that was given three weeks later. The mean for quiz one assessment one was 11.00 and the mean for quiz one assessment three was 13.17. The significance level was .72. The participants score also increased for quiz two. The mean for quiz two assessment one was 14.67 and the mean for quiz two assessment three was 15.17. The significance level was .85 meaning it was not statistically significant.

Goal Orientation

GOS prove and GOS avoid moderately correlated $r = .38$ even though not significant because of small sample size. GOS Intelligence moderately correlated with GOS Learning $r = .31$ but not statistically significant due to small sample size. Half of the participants scored higher on the perform component of the Button GOS. The other half scored higher on the learn component of the Button GOS. The hypothesis that those with performance goal orientation would not retain as much information was not supported by the data. The hypothesis that participants with performance goal orientation would perform better and not learn as much was not supported by the data. The hypothesis that those with learning goal orientation will learn more but may not perform as well on the assessments was not supported by the data.

Self-monitoring

Only one participant scored high on the self-monitoring scale. The other participants all scored either a four or five on the scales. Those who score high on the self-monitoring scales did perform better on assessment 1 and assessment 2 due to the interpersonal interaction and intense supervision. Those who score high on the self-monitoring scales did perform worse on assessment 3 due to the low amount of interpersonal interaction and intense supervision. Those who scored low on the self-monitoring scales did perform worse on the 1 and 2 assessments due to the high amount

of interpersonal interaction and intense supervision. Those who scored low on the self-monitoring scales did perform better on the 3 assessment due to the low amount of interpersonal interaction and intense supervision.

PANAS

All participants scored considerably higher on the PANAS positive component than the PANAS negative affectivity component. Participants with positive affect did perform better on the training assessments by assessment three. Participants with negative affect did perform worse on the training assessments than those with positive affect by assessment three.

Table 1.

Correlations Among Study Scale Scores

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 (SMS)	-											
2 (GOS-I)	-.55	-										
3 (GOS-L)	-.38	.31	-									
4 (GOS-A)	-.62	.20	-.39	-								
5 (GOS-P)	-.01*	-.10	-.07	.38	-							
6 (B-L)	.60	-.32	-.56	.03*	.55	-						
7 (B-P)	.23	-.30	.02*	-.45	-.90	-.47	-					
8 (PAN-N)	.86	-.54	-.31	-.60	.10	.78	.05	-				
9 (PAN-P)	.14	-.47	-.61	.11	-.52	.04*	.62	.19	-			
10 (A1)	-.43	.61	-.12	.28	-.67	-.56	.39	-.59	.28	-		
11	.11	.00**	-.58	.20	.11	.68	-	.45	.45	.255	-	

(A2)							.22						
12 (A3)	-.76	.34	-.07	.93	.44	-.24	.52	.77	.18	.250	.079	-	-

Note: $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

1=Self-Monitoring Scale Total Score; 2=Goal Orientation Scale Intelligence; 3= Goal Orientation Scale Learning; 4=Goal Orientation Scale Avoid; 5=Goal Orientation Scale Perform; 6=Button GOS Learn; 7=Button GOS Perform;

8=PANAS Negative Affect; 9=PANAS Positive Affect; 10=Assessment One; 11=Assessment Two; 12=Assessment 3

Table 2.

T-Test

Assessment Number	Means	Standard Deviation	Alphas
1 and 2	-1.0	2.4	.42
1 and 3	-2.6	1.6	.63
2 and 3	-2.3	2.3	.88

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Limitations

A larger sample size would have been more desirable in order to increase the amount of confidence placed on statistical findings. A few of the participants had worked in the company before but needed to repeat the training as new employees. Therefore, they may have already known some of the information prior to the training class. In terms of demographics the population was very homogeneous. It was mostly comprised of white, young females. This is however a fair representation of the demographics within the entire store. The research design was quasi-experimental which only allowed for correlational analysis to be conducted. The sample size was considerably small therefore conclusions can only be drawn with a small amount of confidence. The sample was also very homogenous in terms of sex, race and age.

Conclusions

The instructor-based training session is effective in terms of participants learning the material. There was a mean increase but it was not statistically significant due to sample size. Learning environments can influence the amount of information that employees learning based on their self-monitoring behavior. Those with a positive affect learned more information than those with negative affect. Individual traits can really influence how and if a person learns information in a training situation.

Recommendations

If the training is shown to be effective then the company can continue with the program the way that it is. If not then some changes can be made in order to make the training more effective for the employees. There may only be small changes that need to be made in order to maximize effectiveness in terms of learning. The company will also be interested to know if the program is worth the money that they are spending on it to date. More companies should have a built in evaluation system in their training programs. Research needs to be conducted on the effectiveness of training programs in organizations and industry.

Implications

This research should help to open the eyes of the business community in seeing that evaluation of their training programs is vital. Not only in terms of the bottom line but in terms of having well trained and prepared employees. Most companies do not have their programs evaluated appropriately. Companies may want to consider building an evaluation into the training program. This could have important impacts on saving time and money. It will also be vital to the continuation of evaluating training programs that this company carries out in the future.

References

- Allerton, Haidee E. (1997). What Training Costs. *Training & Development*. 51, (12).
- Brown, Judith (2002). Training Needs Assessment: A Must for Developing an Effective Training Program. *Personnel Management*, 31(4).
- Brown, Kenneth G. (2001). Using Computers to Deliver Training: Which Employees Learn and Why? *Personnel Psychology*, 54, (2).
- Brown, Stephen W.(2003). The Employee Experience. *Marketing Management*. 12,(2).
- Button, Scott B and John E. Mathieu (1996). Goal Orientation in Organizational Research: A Conceptual and Empirical Foundation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 67, (1), 26-48.
- Cheng, Clara-Michelle and Tanya L. Chartrand. (2003). Self Monitory with out Awareness: Using Mimicry as a Nonconscious Affiliation Strategy. *Journal of Psychology and Social Psychology*, 85, (6), 1170-1179.
- Desai, Mayur S. (2000). A Field Experiment: Instructor Based Training VS. Computer Based Training. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 27, (4).
- Dweck, Carol S. (1986). Motivational Processes Affecting Learning. *American Psychologist*, 41, (10), 1040-1048.
- Eby, Lillian T., Jailza Cader, Carrie L. Noble. (2003). Why Do High Self-Monitors Emerge as Leaders in Small Groups? A Comparative Analysis of the

Behaviors of High Versus Low Self-Monitors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, (7), 1457-1479.

Giocalone, Robert A and Paul Rosenfeld (eds.) (1989). *Impression Management in the Organization*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associate : New Jersey.

Hays, Richard D. (1984). To Market, To Market. *Training and Development Journal*, 38, (6), 61-62.

Hubbard, Andy (1995). A Price Tag on Training. *Mortgage Banking*. 55, (5).

Kraiger, Kurt, Kevin Ford and Eduardo Salas. (1993). Application of Cognitive, Skill-Bases, and Affective Theories of Learning Outcomes to New Methods of Training Evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78,(2), 311-328.

Kraiger, Kurt (eds.)(2002). *Creating, Implementing and Managing Effective Training and Development: State-of-the-Art Lessons for Practice*. Jossey-Bass San Francisco

Snyder, Mark. (1974). Self-Monitoring of Expressive Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 30, (4), 526-537.

Tall, Susan and Laura Hall (1998). *Effective Training*. IIE Solutions, 30,(6).

Vandewalle, Don (1997). Development and Validation of a Work Domain Goal Orientation Instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 57, 995-1015.

Watson, David, Lee Anna Clark and Auke Tellegen. (1988). Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 54, (6), 1063-1070.